

Summer June 18, 2020

Toward an Anti-Imperialistic Critical Race Analysis of the Model Minority Myth

Varaxy Yi Borromeo, *California State University, Fresno*

Jacqueline Mac, *Indiana University - Bloomington*

Vanessa Na, *University of California, San Diego*

Rikka Venturanza, *University of California, San Diego*

Samuel Museus, *University of California, San Diego*, et al.

Toward an Anti-Imperialistic Critical Race Analysis of the Model Minority Myth

Varaxy Yi

California State University, Fresno

Jacqueline Mac 

Northern Illinois University

Vanessa S. Na

University of California, San Diego

Rikka J. Venturanza

University of California, Los Angeles

Samuel D. Museus

University of California, San Diego

Tracy Lachica Buenavista

California State University, Northridge

Sumun L. Pendakur

University of Southern California

Over the past three decades, many higher education scholars have engaged in efforts to counter the stereotype that Asian Americans achieve universal and unparalleled academic success. While most of these scholars adopt an anti-oppression approach, some researchers have claimed that this literature reinforces oppressive deficit paradigms. To understand this conflict in existing literature, the current authors utilize an anti-imperialistic approach to analyze scholarship on the model minority myth. The current analysis reveals little evidence that research on the myth reinforced hegemonic deficit thinking. Instead, authors find that scholars largely utilized complex and multifaceted antideficit approaches, challenged dominant essentialist model minority frames, engaged in strategic (anti-)essentialism to navigate complex pan-

racial contexts, and reframed the myth to achieve diverse purposes that speak to different audiences. Several implications for conducting critiques of literature reviews and future research on the myth are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, model minority myth, critical race theory, deficit thinking, racism, diversity, higher education

The model minority myth¹ is one of the most prominent themes in research on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. The myth is often defined as the overgeneralization that Asian Americans achieve universal educational and occupational success (Chou & Feagin, 2015; S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Suzuki, 2002). While this stereotype is typically used to essentialize Asian Americans, the fact that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have been historically lumped into the same category means that this trope can sometimes mask the significant diversity that exists within both communities and lead to their exclusion from research, policy, and practice (Museus, 2014; Teranishi, 2010).

Since the myth's emergence, it has been used to inflict significant harm upon Asian Americans (Hartlep, 2013; S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Museus, 2014; Pendakur & Pendakur, 2016; Suzuki, 2002; Teranishi, 2010). As a result, a large body of education literature is focused on understanding and challenging this stereotype's impact on these communities. While much of this scholarship has been framed as anti-oppressive (Museus et al., 2016), researchers have recently made the claim that this scholarship reinforces hegemonic² paradigms because it does not focus attention on how the stereotype affects other racial groups (Poon et al., 2016). As a result, there are contrasting views about whether research on the myth actually combats or reinforces systemic oppression, leading to confusion and uncertainty about new directions in this research.

The current article aims to achieve two primary purposes. First, we analyze literature on the myth to make sense of the aforementioned contradiction and assess whether scholarship on the myth reinforces hegemonic paradigms. Second, through this analysis, we model how critical race theory (CRT) can be effectively used to conduct an anti-imperialistic analysis of literature. In doing so, we demonstrate how to account for multiple layers of critical contexts to analyze research that is primarily produced by scholars of color. When we utilize this approach to analyze literature on the myth, we find little evidence that researchers who have studied this topic embraced hegemonic deficit frames. We explain how prior conclusions that existing research on the myth reinforces hegemonic paradigms are likely a function of the failure to account for complex contexts and partial application of relevant theoretical frameworks.

In the following section, we discuss the historical context surrounding the emergence of the myth and the study of it in the field of higher education. We also detail the conflicting perspectives in existing literature regarding the impact of research on the myth in higher education. Then, we outline the key definitions and

frameworks that guided our analysis. The remainder of the article focuses on detailing our review and its implications for future research on the myth.

Historical Context of the Emergence and Analysis of the Myth

Given that the racialization of communities of color is a complex process that evolves and adapts across time and space (García, 2018), historical context is important to shed light on the diverse ways in which these processes affect communities of color (Iftikar & Museus, 2019). While evidence of the myth's presence in U.S. discourse can be traced back to the 1800s (Wu, 1995), this stereotype rose to prominence in the mid-1900s (S. J. Lee, 2006). In 1965, the U.S. Department of Labor released the *Moynihan Report*, which examined the causes and state of racial conditions and disparities in the United States. The report highlighted systemic racism and the impact racial subordination had on Black families and communities. After the release of the report, public discourse emphasized the report's suggestion that the disintegration of the Black nuclear family was to blame for the significant poverty within these communities, thereby shifting the focus and blame for racial inequities from systemic racism to Black families (Patterson, 2010). Given how White supremacy weaponized the myth as a political tool to invalidate claims of systemic racism against non-Asian American people of color and advance the notion that the cultures of these communities of color were the cause of inequalities (S. J. Lee, 2006; Osajima, 1998), it is not surprising that scholars have discussed how the myth can also pit Asian Americans against other people of color, hindering social justice efforts (Pendakur & Pendakur, 2016; Wing, 2007).

The myth contributed to the racial exclusion of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education policy and practice throughout the latter half of the 20th century. During this time, the federal government lumped these two racial groups into the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) category. As a result, federal agencies produced policies and data sets that aggregated these groups and made it difficult to separate and analyze them separately. In 1997, the federal Office of Management and Budget released standards to improve data quality and endorsed the separation of the Asian American and Pacific Islander categories (Wright & Balutski, 2013). In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau finally included "Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander" as a distinct racial category. The Office of Management and Budget standards and the resulting changes enabled more nuanced scholarly research related to Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. However, the federal government continued to create new policies and initiatives in the 2000s, such as the Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) program, that aggregate the two groups (Park & Chang, 2008).

Throughout the latter half of the 20th century, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and other historically oppressed groups (e.g., Black, Latina/o/x, and Native American communities) were relatively invisible in higher education research. In fact, scholars who conducted reviews of top-tier higher education journals and key education search databases in the late 2000s found that less than 1% of publications included an explicit focus on Asian Americans and Pacific

Islanders (Museus, 2009; Teranishi, 2010). Museus and Chang (2009) and Museus and Kiang (2009) noted that this invisibility is likely partially due to the myth fueling assumptions that Asian Americans, and sometimes Pacific Islanders, are not really minoritized, do not face racial challenges, and do not need support. Given that the pervasiveness of the myth in the scholarly community fueled the need for researchers to justify the importance of their work to get it published, scholars studying and advocating for the inclusion of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders throughout the 2000s were forced to engage the myth to challenge racialized publication processes that excluded this population in the field.

One way in which scholars excavated the complexity of Asian Americans and Pacific Islander categories was by highlighting the systemic contexts that differentially shape the conditions of diverse ethnic groups within them. For example, while capitalism facilitated the migration of many East (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean) and South (e.g., Indian and Pakistani) Asian communities to meet U.S. job market demands, U.S. imperialism and war displaced many Southeast Asian communities that migrated to and resettled in the United States (Espiritu, 2017; Museus, 2014). Moreover, histories of U.S. imperialism and colonization have heavily shaped the conditions of Pacific Islander communities across the nation (Wright & Balutski, 2013). As a result, several education scholars note that U.S. society has created unique challenges for Southeast Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, who face substantial disparities in college access, degree attainment, and occupational outcomes (Chhuon & Hudley, 2008; Museus, 2013; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Uy, 2015; Vue, 2013; Xiong & Wood, 2016).

Since the 2000s, these contexts have shifted. First, widespread social movements have swept across the nation and throughout higher education (Museus et al., 2016), making public discourse about systemic racism significantly more commonplace. In addition, the field of higher education has diversified substantially, sparking an increase in numbers of publications in mainstream academic journals focused on issues of diversity and employing critical frameworks and approaches. During this time, scholars have also generated a substantial body of knowledge about Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education, leading to increased awareness of these populations. These realities suggest that scholars currently studying Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders navigate different social and political contexts and constraints compared to those who produced research in the 2000s.

Existing Tension in Research on the Myth

A handful of comprehensive reviews of literature that focus on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education scholarship were published between 2000 and 2015 (e.g., Museus et al., 2012; Ng et al., 2007; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Teranishi, 2010). Most of these reviews appear to be based on the notion that the myth is a problematic systemic racial project that directly and negatively affects the experiences of Asian Americans, and sometimes Pacific Islanders. These reviews also suggest that the myth fuels the exclusion of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders from research, policy, and practice considerations. Authors of these reviews generally have sought to generate understandings of scholarship on these communities to inform research, policies, and practices that might better support Asian Americans and Pacific Islander communities in education.

More recently, Poon et al. (2016) utilized critical race, racial triangulation, deficit thinking, and framing theories to examine literature published on the myth between 2000 and 2013 and claim that this research “has assumed the logic of oppressive dominant frameworks like deficit thinking and has consequently reinforced hegemonic frames and systems” (p. 475). In doing so, they diverged from the perspectives of other scholars. Their claims were grounded in the idea that framing of issues can shape how people recognize and seek to address problems (Kumashiro, 2008; Sexton, 2010), and they argued that research on the myth reinforces oppressive narratives because it uses a frame that relies on “ahistorical definitions of the myth” and “maintains the invisibility of the process of racial triangulation and reinforces deficit thinking” (Poon et al., 2016, p. 475). This claim implies that scholars who pursued work to combat the myth’s direct impact on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, without centering the racialization of other communities of color, reinforced White supremacy. As a result of the aforementioned claims, there are divergent views about whether research on the myth combats or reinforces systemic racial oppression. In the current review, we utilize CRT and the other aforementioned key frameworks to understand and reconcile this tension.

Critical Race Theory

While we discuss several frameworks in the following sections, CRT is the overarching perspective that guided our analysis. CRT was developed in the legal field to prompt and guide analyses of how systemic racial oppression shapes social institutions (Bell, 1987; Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ledesma & Calderón, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). CRT centers the normalization of race and racism in society, the reality that race is socially constructed, ways in which communities of color are differentially racialized, how intersecting systems of oppression operate and mutually shape realities and experiences, and the value of centering marginalized voices to challenge dominant narratives and essentialist understandings of communities of color (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

CRT was first introduced to the field of education 25 years ago. In their introduction, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued for a critical race analysis of education because race continues to be a significant element of U.S. society. They contended that CRT is a useful analytical framework to understand educational processes and issues related to racism. Over the past 25 years, a growing number of researchers have used CRT in education (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). CRT scholars have developed theoretical tools tailored to the nuances of AAPI racialization, histories, and experiences. Specifically, scholars have developed Asian critical theory (AsianCrit; Curammeng et al., 2017; Iftikar & Museus, 2019), Tribal critical theory (TribalCrit; Brayboy, 2005), and Kanaka critical theory (KanakCrit; Reyes, 2018) to underscore key elements of the lived realities that are often not centered in larger conversations about racism but are critical to the ways in which racial oppression shapes the lives and experiences of various Asian American and Pacific Islander groups.

AsianCrit highlights the reality that Asian Americans are uniquely racialized as model minorities, deviant minorities, and perpetually foreign threats, which are racial formations that are deployed to harm Asian Americans and other communities of color (Iftikar & Museus, 2019). AsianCrit acknowledges that transnational contexts (e.g., historical and contemporary U.S. imperialism and global migration)

differentially shape Asian American subgroups' experiences. Moreover, AsianCrit recognizes that racism and the racialization of Asian Americans lead them to engage in *strategic (anti-)essentialism*, which denotes that Asian American communities both embrace and challenge socially constructed racial categories in complex and strategic ways to advance social justice. Strategic (anti-)essentialism can be useful in understanding how Asian American scholars, and perhaps other scholars of color, leverage racial (e.g., Asian American) and pan-racial (e.g., AAPI) labels in some contexts and challenge them (e.g., through data disaggregation) in others to work towards social, economic, and political transformation.

However, AsianCrit is not focused on analyzing how Asian Americans are complicit in settler colonialism and obscures Pacific Islander sovereignty projects, making it insufficient to understand Pacific Islander lives (Curammeng et al., 2017; Reyes, 2018; Wright & Balutski, 2013). In contrast, TribalCrit underscores the ways in which critical analyses of Indigenous populations center colonialism, imperialism, and forced assimilation (Brayboy, 2005). TribalCrit also highlights the central role of sovereignty, autonomy, and self-determination in Indigenous efforts to resist systemic forms of oppression. Moreover, building on TribalCrit and based on Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) ways of knowing, Kanaka critical theory centers the fact that Kanaka Maoli are Indigenous people, whose efforts towards sovereignty and self-determination can sometimes conflict with Asian American desires for social and political inclusion (Reyes, 2018). Taken together, we use these nuanced critical race perspectives to guide our analysis of literature on the myth (Reyes, 2018).

Toward an Anti-Imperialistic Critical Race Approach to Critique

We also draw on CRT and critical pedagogy to maximize the likelihood that our analysis is anti-imperialistic. As researchers, our “productivity” is tied to our material security and we are conditioned to employ imperialistic approaches to scholarly critique that might seek to extend our influence over historically minoritized people or dictate how these communities should view the world. Instead, we sought to ensure that our analysis both builds on the work of prior generations of scholars of color and advances dialogue in ways that support diverse lines of scholarship among future generations of these scholarly communities.

First, CRT methodology in education takes into account the importance of sociohistorical context (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), and anti-imperialistic approaches to critique *engage multiple layers of context* in analysis. Context is not simply a singular historical event (e.g., initial emergence of the myth) in the experiences of oppressed communities, although such moments are critical elements of context. Consistent with CRT and critical discourse analysis scholars (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Ledesma & Calderón, 2015; Rogers et al., 2005), we adopt a more complex conceptualization of context that acknowledges how racism has long and complex histories, such as the continued, differential, and evolving violence that the myth enacts on both Asian American *and* other communities. Equally important, we acknowledge that such contexts also shape how scholars and advocates generate, analyze, exchange, and deploy knowledge to advance equity agendas. Therefore, we believe it is important to also consider the following contexts in any critical analysis or critique of literature:

- *Theoretical contexts*: It is important to refrain from decontextualizing and utilizing selective elements of theories that align with one's thesis and consider all elements of such frameworks when applying them. In addition, it is critical to understand how theories have been developed, conceptualized, and employed. This context is vital to ensure that frameworks drawn from some bodies of literature are accurately applied in new settings. This context is also important to ensure that researchers do not apply theories to support arguments that contradict salient elements of these frameworks.
- *Discursive contexts*: It is important to consider the discourse and ideas surrounding the texts analyzed. This point underscores the value of resisting the urge to decontextualize ideas or text that confirm one's critique and overlook data that contradict it. Accounting for discursive contexts allows researchers to holistically consider the ideas presented in publications and larger bodies of literature examined, ensure that their appraisals of research do not lead to sweeping conclusions that negate significant portions of literature that is analyzed, and maximize the credibility of their critique.
- *Advocacy contexts*: It is important to consider the varied contexts within which research emerges, such as the social and political context of the time in which it was produced, disseminated, and utilized. It is also important to consider the social and political context of the time and place of the audiences that this research is intended to affect and equip to advance change. As we discuss in the following sections, this type of context is critical to avoid making oversimplified assumptions about how scholars approach their work or whether a particular approach reinforces oppression or advances social justice. Such contexts are also necessary to avoid deficit views of scholars of color.

Second, anti-imperialistic approaches to analysis aim to *constructively engage and build on work of other equity scholars and advocates of color*. CRT scholars note that their work was made possible by generations of social justice advocates who came before them (Matsuda et al., 1993), and assert that CRT should primarily focus on building upon and extending prior progressive efforts rather than unconstructive critique of advocates in previous eras (Crenshaw, 1988; Tate, 1997). We believe critique is unconstructive when its goal is to frame scholars' and advocates' work as insufficiently critical, without generating useful insights that can advance conversations about solidarity and how to collectively construct a better world.

Third, anti-imperialistic approaches *acknowledge the complexity of social justice advocacy*. Delgado (1987) cautioned against simplistic assumptions that people of color unknowingly buy into hegemonic systems that degrade them and rejected the devaluation of strategic incremental changes that might not appear the most radical on the surface. Specifically, he encouraged restraint in drawing conclusions that incremental changes and beliefs that drive them inevitably denote the adoption of hegemonic frames (Tate, 1997). He argued that such conclusions can be considered imperialistic because they prescribe how people of color should interpret events in their lives and devalue the role that modest reforms can play as catalysts for more revolutionary transformation in the future.

Finally, anti-imperialistic approaches to analysis *reject neoliberal logics*. Neoliberalism fosters cultures founded on surveillance and hypercompetition (Brown, 2006). In some cases, neoliberal approaches might prompt scholars to become hyperfocused on monitoring each other and promote the weaponization of critique to engage in the positioning of oneself as more critical than others for their own gain (Museus, 2020). Such approaches can fuel counterproductive hypercompetition among scholars of color who are working toward the same social justice goals. In contrast, anti-imperialist approaches affirm the ability for all of those concerned with social justice, including those who critique and are critiqued, to constantly develop and reshape their analysis and praxis, so they can remain constructively engaged in the evolving process of movement building (F. Lee, 2018).

Aligned with these perspectives, our anti-imperialistic approach to scholarly analysis recognizes the complex contexts within which scholars and communities of color generate and deploy knowledge to advocate social justice. In doing so, it acknowledges the complexities and value of advocates' strategic and diverse efforts to advance equity agendas across diverse policy and practice contexts and seeks to emphasize how we can collectively build upon this work, it refrains from making hasty assumptions that people of color buy into hegemonic systems without compelling evidence to support such claims, aims to support rather than strip agency from other scholars of color, and leverages the value of multiple forms of social justice advocacy to minimize unhealthy competition among communities of color. Approaching our analysis with this anti-imperialistic lens allows us to avoid perpetuating deficit perspectives of scholars of color by blaming them for the racist systems that they are forced to navigate. Doing so also allows us to view scholarly endeavors related to the myth with compassion and complexity within diverse contexts. We also hope that this approach discourages hypersurveillance and hypercompetition that hinder innovation among scholars of color, while *opening up* possibilities for new lines of inquiry and supporting their work.

Additional Relevant Theoretical Frameworks

In addition to CRT, three other frameworks guide our analysis and effort to make sense of divergent perspectives in existing literature. First, Kim (1999) analyzed how Asian Americans are racialized and exist in a field of relative racial positions. She proposed a *racial triangulation* framework, which suggests that Asian Americans have historically been valorized relative to Black communities and racialized as inferior to Whites. This concept also underscores that Asian Americans have been racialized as outsiders relative to both Black and White communities. As a result, Asian Americans have been used to blame other communities of color for racial inequalities and racially excluded from many aspects of society. The relative valorization of Asian Americans compared to Black communities (and Indigenous and communities of color) has historical connection to deficit perspectives toward the latter.

Second, deficit thinking is both a function of systemic oppression and reinforces these hegemonic systems (Ladson-Billings, 2007; Valencia, 1997). Valencia (1997) noted that *deficit thinking* refers to perspectives “that the student who fails in school does so because of internal deficiencies. Such deficits manifest, it is alleged, in limited intellectual abilities, linguistic shortcomings, lack of

motivation to learn and immoral behavior” (p. 2). This victim-blaming is what makes deficit thinking distinct and insidious (Ladson-Billings, 2007; Valencia, 1997), and should therefore be central to evaluations of whether a body of knowledge is deficit-oriented.

Finally, the concept of issue framing also plays an important role in our analysis. Lakoff (2004) discussed how *framing* is a process of conceptualizing and communicating the nature of social and political issues, which influences how people make sense of them. However, it is important to note that Lakoff’s larger body of scholarship on framing processes underscored the reality that the effectiveness of particular frames in affecting other people’s behavior depends partly on the existing epistemologies and values of the intended audiences and the degree to which the utilized frames *resonate* with them. This point is consistent with the larger body of research on how social movements use frames to influence policies (Benford & Snow, 2000), which notes that particular frames are more effective at changing a target’s perspectives when they resonate with existing knowledge and values possessed by that audience (Schemer et al., 2012).

Moreover, scholarship on framing suggests that if an issue is framed in a way that fails to resonate with the audience, it can be rejected and will not advance the intended cause (Benford & Snow, 2000). Thus, activists sometimes choose to utilize multiple frames and strategically tailor their messages to resonate with diverse audiences so they can have a concrete material impact on policy and practice, raising serious questions regarding whether anyone can legitimately declare one single framing of an issue exclusively effective in advancing anti-oppression agendas in all contexts and suggesting that such declarations might convey a false sense of certainty that lacks logical or empirical foundations. Based on these frameworks and bodies of research, we turn to the definition of the myth that guided our analysis.

Toward a Multifaceted Critical Race Definition of the Myth

The claim that prior literature on the myth is deficit-oriented is grounded in the assumption that any scholarship on the myth must be couched in racial triangulation language to avoid reinforcing systems of oppression (Poon et al., 2016). Specifically, these claims are embedded in the assumption that a

sociohistorically accurate, critical race definition of the [myth] acknowledges two key, interlocked elements that symbiotically reproduce and reinforce white dominance. First, Asian Americans are strategically presented as a model of self-sufficient minority success. Second, the stereotype of success among Asian Americans is used to blame another minority group for its struggles, thus perpetuating the deficit thinking model prevalent in education. (Poon et al., 2016, pp. 474–475)

While initially appealing because this definition highlights the intersections of systemic racialization processes, it assumes that the *only* noteworthy way in which White supremacy deploys the myth to reinforce systemic oppression is by fueling the blaming of non-Asian American communities of color for their own failures. This reality is evident in the fact that the definition ignores the harm that the myth directly inflicts on Asian Americans. Such framing can perpetuate assumptions that Asian Americans do not face challenges worthy of their own analysis, thereby reinforcing the myth and racial exclusion of these communities.

Given these realities, we utilize a *multifaceted critical race definition of the myth* that acknowledges the diverse ways in which this trope can inflict harm on different communities of color. Building on prior scholarship (Kim, 1999; S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Museus et al., 2016; Suzuki, 2002; Teranishi, 2010), we define the myth as a White supremacist racial project that strategically frames Asian Americans as a universally successful racial group to maintain systems that enact differential forms of violence on *all* communities of color. The myth perpetuates such violence through mechanisms that include, but are not limited to, the racial exclusion of Asian Americans (and sometimes Pacific Islanders) from many aspects of society and perpetuation of deficit ideologies that deny the existence of inequitable structures of access and opportunity while blaming other People of Color for not working hard enough or having the right cultural values. This definition suggests that scholarship examining the effects of the myth on Asian American communities is not inherently hegemonic but rather advances one of multiple elements of an anti-oppression agenda to address this trope and its negative effects on *both* Asian Americans *and* other communities of color. This definition guides our analysis of literature on the myth.

Method

Since the conflicting perspectives discussed above emerged from a critique of literature published on the myth from 2000 to 2013, our aim was to conduct an analysis of research during this period to make sense of these divergent views. We sought to answer the following main research questions:

Research Question 1: Why is there disagreement regarding whether framing of the myth reinforces deficit paradigms?

Research Question 2: After making sense of these divergent perspectives, how do we understand the ways in which the myth is framed in existing research?

The second question consisted of two subquestions: How do systemic contexts shape the ways in which the myth has been framed in research? What are the ramifications of the ways in which the myth has been framed in this literature for social justice agendas?

Search Strategy and Study Selection Procedure

To execute our analysis of literature, we borrow heavily from the search methods employed in the systematic review that concluded that scholarly research on the myth was deficit-oriented and fueled the existing tension in this body of literature (Poon et al., 2016). Research in this earlier review was collected from several electronic databases, including Google Scholar, JSTOR, EBSCO Host, Educational Research Complete, and ERIC. The review was also based on a wide range of search terms:

Asian American, Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, Samoan American, Chamorro, Korean American, Cambodian American, Hmong American, Vietnamese American, Indian American, Chinese American, Filipino American, and Asian American Studies, in combination with higher education, college, college students, graduate students, student affairs, college administrators, and faculty. (Poon et al., 2016, p. 477)

Thus, we began with the list of 112 sources from this earlier analysis.

After reviewing this list, we noticed that some literature meeting the defined search criteria was missing, so we conducted a follow-up search to capture pieces omitted from the earlier review. We added relevant literature that emerged in our follow-up search to our review. Since we were not conducting an original search but sought to capture missing works through our follow-up search, we relied on Google Scholar, which integrates a wide range of education, social science, and other databases. To execute the follow-up Google Scholar search, we utilized relevant racial labels (“Asian American” and “Pacific Islander”) in combination with a list of higher education concepts (“higher education,” “college,” “college students,” “graduate students,” “student affairs,” “college administrators,” “faculty”) in the list above.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

A publication was included in our analysis if it (1) was published between 2000 and 2013; (2) was generated in the United States, given the myth’s specific salience within this context; (3) explicitly discussed one or more groups within the Asian American or Pacific Islander racial categories in higher education; and (4) was a published peer-reviewed journal, scholarly book, or research report. Dissertations (e.g., Choi, 2010) and bulletins (e.g., Balón, 2005) were excluded (see Supplemental Appendix in the online version of the journal for a full list of publications included in the analysis). We reviewed titles and abstracts to decide if they met criteria for inclusion in our analysis.

A few caveats are important to note. First, we included publications that embedded Asian American or Pacific Islander groups in broader foci on racially minoritized populations. Second, we excluded publications in noneducation fields that focused on issues affecting Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders in general but utilized college student samples. A total of 150 texts were included in our analysis. Finally, among publications that mentioned the myth, over two thirds (69%) explicitly focused on undergraduate or graduate students, while only a few works explicitly centered on faculty (3%) or administrators (4%). The remaining 24% focused more generally on these communities rather than specifically on students, faculty, or administrators. Reflecting this distribution, much of our discussion focuses on Asian American or Pacific Islander communities generally, with specific examples primarily focused on students.

Data Analysis Procedure

We conducted three phases of analysis. In the first phase, we initially reviewed literature related to the theories and research utilized in prior research on the myth to understand the potential causes of the conflicting perspectives regarding whether this research combats or reinforces hegemonic paradigms. Doing so allowed us to gain a deeper sense of the theoretical context (e.g., all critical elements of relevant theoretical frameworks and research that produced them) and discursive context (e.g., what the larger discussion in publications suggest are the causes of racial and ethnic inequalities) relevant to our analysis.

In Phase 2, research team members systematically analyzed and coded focal literature. All codes and notes were kept in one central database. We utilized the

three forms of context mentioned above to generate our coding scheme and coded each publication according to it. First, we assigned each publication one of three codes that specified how the myth was engaged and informed the research. These codes specified whether the publication (1) examined the causes of the trope, (2) analyzed the effects of the myth, or (3) challenged the myth's essentialist frame of Asian Americans. To gain a better understanding of discursive context surrounding researchers' mention of the myth, we also paid attention to how the myth was discussed and positioned related to other aspects of the articles (e.g., whether use of racial and ethnic disparities to challenge the myth was used to justify larger antideficit analyses of communities of color).

Second, we sought to gain a deeper understanding of discursive contexts surrounding text of articles that have been critiqued for being deficit-oriented to understand whether the larger discussion within these publications aligned with a victim-blaming mentality (1 = *clearly engaged in victim-blaming*, 2 = *possibly engaged in victim-blaming*, 3 = *unlikely to have engaged victim-blaming*, 4 = *clearly did not engage in victim-blaming*). Works that asserted or implied racially minoritized communities were responsible for their challenges were coded as "1," those that primarily centered community or cultural influences in explanation of disparities while mentioning how systemic contexts influence them were coded as "2," publications that focused on both cultural and systemic explanations were coded as "3," and those that primarily centered structural and systemic explanations of racial challenges were coded as "4."

Third, we coded each publication based on whether and how they used pan-racial Asian American and Pacific Islander labels (e.g., Asian Pacific American, Asian American Pacific Islander [AAPI], Asian Pacific Islander American). We assigned each publication a code denoting whether it utilized one or more of these labels (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*). Then, we qualitatively coded each publication that employed these pan-racial labels with regard to how systemic contexts, if any, could have shaped their use of these terms (e.g., preexisting data lumping Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders together and prohibiting disaggregation). This coding process helped us better understand the advocacy contexts that might have constrained these researchers' discussion of these communities.

Fourth, to better understand how researchers might frame their work for different advocacy contexts and audiences, we coded each text for the field in which it emerged (1 = *education*, 2 = *Asian American studies*, 3 = *other fields*), and the target audiences (1 = *research*, 2 = *practitioners*, 3 = *policymakers*, 4 = *community members*). Audiences were primarily determined by analyzing the type of publication (e.g., scholarly, policy, or practitioner journal) and nature of implications offered. For these categories, each publication was assigned one or more codes (some appeared to speak to multiple fields or audiences). In addition, our analysis revealed that Southeast Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were sometimes used to counter the myth and might be discussed with more deficit-oriented framing, so we coded each text for whether it included discussion of these groups. Then, each researcher reviewed the initial codes of another team member to enhance trustworthiness (Tierney & Clemens, 2011).

In Phase 3, the larger team came together to collectively discuss themes. First, to build consensus regarding the larger themes emerging from the data, individual

team members analyzed the larger set of codes to identify emergent themes, and then came together to collectively identify convergence in themes across team members' conclusions. Second, to address uncertainty of individual team members regarding how to code particular publications, the larger team helped build consensus around appropriate coding.

Author Positionalities

To ensure critical and reflexive dialogue that constructively advances knowledge about communities of color, it is important to recognize how various positionalities offer scholars important insights while also potentially limiting their perspectives. If researchers do not critically and reflexively consider their multiple positionalities, they risk drawing conclusions that might unintentionally harm communities they seek to support without fully understanding the damage caused. While these risks may not completely be mitigated, attending to our positionalities in these ways can lead us to deeper understanding regarding how we position not only ourselves but also our communities in the research.

Collectively we represent Asian American communities who are disproportionately racialized as “Brown,” from families whose presence in the U.S. was facilitated by war and/or labor brokerage systems, and whose experiences are underrepresented in higher education discourse. As socially, politically, and economically marginalized members of the larger Asian American community, our subjectivities deeply inform our care to create space for minoritized voices within Asian American education discourse. In the current context, it might partially be these collective positionalities as both scholars from communities that are marginalized within the larger Asian American population and advocates fighting to advance social justice agendas that lead to our conclusions about this confusion.

In reflecting on our own positionalities, we note multiple ways in which they shape our perspectives. First, as a collective of Asian American scholars and educators committed to fostering solidarity and socially just environments for all oppressed communities, we have complex relationships with the myth. At earlier points in our trajectories, we internalized the myth and believed that Asian American issues held little relevance in social justice conversations. As a result, we must continually reflect on our internalized anti-Asianness so that we can constantly resist notions that racial violence toward Asian Americans is unworthy of attention unless it informs knowledge about other groups.

Second, we recognize that our identities might sometimes lead us to focus on our respective communities and divert our attention away from how the myth affects other groups. At the same time, we are susceptible to marginalizing the views of smaller Asian American ethnic communities that we do not represent. To address these potential limitations in the current analysis, we engaged various steps to check our assumptions and biases. For example, we deeply reflected on the ways previous research and our analysis could potentially reinforce anti-Blackness and deficit perspectives of other communities of color. Moreover, we solicited feedback from five Asian American and other racially minoritized scholars, resulting in hours of conversation and reflection about how our analysis might affect diverse communities. In addition, we constructed an ethnically diverse research team in the design, analysis, and writing of this piece. Finally, multiple

authors coded the literature to minimize possibility that bias led to misinterpretation, discussing points of agreement and disagreement throughout this process.

Third, we acknowledge that the sociopolitical conditions of the current historical moment heavily constrain our perspectives and interpretation of research. As such, like other researchers, we are susceptible to misinterpreting the intentions and actions of scholars in previous decades if we do not try to comprehend their respective contexts. To avoid decontextualizing scholars and ideas from conditions of their time that are necessary to understand their intentions and actions, we kept such contexts in mind throughout our analysis. While we acknowledge that we might never know scholars' realities in some cases, we sought to take this context into account to minimize the likelihood that we make assumptions that scholars in previous decades were reinforcing hegemonic paradigms even if their actions were considered radical within their respective historical and advocacy contexts.

Finally, we have recently perceived significant confusion around what is considered "acceptable" or "appropriate" ways of talking about, thinking about, or studying the myth within educational research circles and are concerned that this lack of clarity undermines and discourages work on Asian American communities. The ways in which narrow prescriptions of "appropriate" research have constrained or inhibited racial justice research and advocacy for our communities make us especially resistant to imposition of such parameters. To ensure we did not disregard how racial justice scholarship might reify oppressive systems, we constantly reflected on the extent to which this was the case throughout our analysis.

Limitations

Before discussing our findings, there are at least three important limitations that should be noted. First, because our aim was to analyze the scholarship produced from 2000 to 2013, literature generated in this time constituted the primary source of data. If we conducted an analysis of literature published since 2013, it is possible that they would generate different results. However, it is also important to note that we *did* take more recent literature into account in our efforts to make sense of the scholarship that we analyzed. For example, we highlight advances that have been made since 2013 to address some of the limitations of conducting research during the period analyzed in our discussion.

Second, while a few of us identify with ethnic communities that have suffered from long histories of colonization in the Pacific, none of us identify with the Pacific Islander racial category. Thus, we do our best to carefully engage Pacific Islander contexts and realities but cannot speak on behalf of these communities, make assumptions about what they want or need, or prescribe acceptable ways to engage them in our work without their perspective. As we discuss in the following sections, the relationship between the Asian American and Pacific Islander racial categories is complex and requires ongoing intentional navigation until the pan-racial (e.g., AAPI) categories are eradicated from U.S. systems and structures. Until this time, we encourage readers to reference the work of Pacific Islander scholars (e.g., Diaz, 2004; Reyes, 2018; Tevis & Arvin, 2018; Wright & Balutski, 2013) to guide how to responsibly engage in conversations with them about the myth in diverse contexts.

Finally, because literature on South Asian Americans in higher education during the period under examination is difficult to find, we do not attempt to fully grapple with the positionality of these communities in the current article. There is evidence that this subgroup experiences forms of racialization similar to other Asian Americans (Harpalani, 2013) but also faces unique forms of racial violence that mirror other communities of color. For example, South Asian Americans are sometimes racialized as Black, targets of anti-Black racism, and racially profiled as a threat (Ali, 2016). While these experiences are not central to our current analysis, they further complicate conversations about how Asian Americans are racialized relative to other groups, reinforce our position that prescribing uniform ways of thinking and talking about Asian American racialization are problematic, and are an area of investigation that is worthy of pursuit.

Findings

In this section, we outline major findings that emerged from our analysis and situate them within research on the myth from 2000 to 2013. Our overarching result is that we find little evidence to support the conclusion that this scholarship perpetuated deficit perspectives. Specifically, our analysis generated four themes that show how scholars studying the myth (1) utilized complex antideficit approaches, (2) advanced a counterhegemonic anti-essentialist agenda, (3) used diverse framings of the myth to engage it in different advocacy contexts, and (4) navigated complex racialized structures that imposed problematic pan-racial categories on them. Within each theme, we explain the sources of tensions in prior scholarship, and then clarify our anti-imperialistic interpretation of the literature. Together, these themes generate a complex and cohesive picture regarding the nature of research on the myth that reconciles prior contradictions.

Complex Antideficit Approaches

Existing evidence reveals some disagreement regarding whether research on the myth reinforces deficit thinking. Scholarship on the myth from 2000 to 2013 generally critiqued this trope as a systemic problem that negatively affects Asian American communities (Museus & Kiang, 2009; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Teranishi, 2010), suggesting that it focused on the structural causes of racial problems and is antideficit in nature. Researchers who have argued that this scholarship is deficit-oriented initially invoked a definition of deficit thinking that is consistent with those who developed this concept but shifted this definition as they moved their analysis forward, leading to a misapplication of the concept. For example, Poon et al. (2016) applied deficit thinking to describe prior scholars' discussions of racial disparities as inherently deficit in orientation, while overlooking the critical victim-blaming element of deficit perspectives. Specifically, they argued,

In an effort to counter a stereotype of universal success, much of this research implicitly drew on a dominant lens of deficit thinking, by arguing that it obscured deficiencies found among AAPIs that would generally warrant research attention and investment on other students of color. . . the strategy of countering the myth involved demonstrating socioeconomic disparities among AAPIs to align with deficit understandings of race and racism in education. (p. 481)

However, while the research that Poon et al. cite to support claims that scholarship on the myth has been deficit-oriented did indeed argue that the myth obscures disparities in educational outcomes among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (e.g., S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Museus & Kiang, 2009; National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education [CARE], 2008), a careful review of these publications reveals no evidence that they attributed the challenges, failures, or disparities faced by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to their individual or cultural attributes to perpetuate a blame-the-victim way of thinking about them. Thus, such claims appear to be grounded in an assumption that simply noting existing racial disparities automatically implies that these students are to blame for these inequities and reinforces hegemonic narratives—an assumption that is inconsistent with Valencia's (1997) definition and the majority of scholarship on deficit thinking.

In addition, researchers who claimed that research on the myth is deficit-oriented supported this assertion by expanding the conceptualization of deficit thinking to encompass any discussion of barriers, even if they are systemic and environmental. For example, Poon et al. (2016) noted that Nadal et al. (2010) analyzed Pilipino Americans and “deficiencies in their graduate school experiences,” and claimed that they “directly asserted a deficit framework to the study of Pilipino Americans, playing into a hegemonic racial framework to justify the need for more institutional attention and support” (p. 482). However, the bulk of Nadal et al.'s (2010) analysis focused on deficiencies in the graduate school *environment*, such as a lack of faculty support, experienced alienation, and lack of mentoring provided by the institution. Thus, while Nadal et al. used the term *deficiencies*, a careful analysis of their work reveals that they did not suggest that *internal* deficiencies of students themselves were primarily responsible for the challenges or inequities they faced and arguably did not engage in victim-blaming.

Moreover, it is unclear whether claims that research on the myth is deficit-oriented fully account for the knowledge that exists in relevant bodies of literature. For example, researchers making these claims contrasted scholarship on the myth with studies of Black students (e.g., Fries-Britt & Griffin, 2007; Griffin et al., 2010; Harper, 2010) and presented the latter as models of how to effectively use antideficit perspectives (Poon et al., 2016). While the scholarship on Black students certainly offers valuable models of antideficit approaches, scholars who produced it also utilize data to demonstrate that their focal populations face significant racial and gender disparities in education to justify the importance of their work (Griffin et al., 2010; Harper, 2009; Wood & Harper, 2015). Thus, these authors' scholarship is not antideficit because it avoids any discussion of inequalities. Rather, it is antideficit because it merges knowledge of disparities with research that complicates understandings of communities of color, excavates the systemic challenges that they face, and underscores their successes.

Our analysis reveals that Asian American and Pacific Islander scholars who studied the myth took similar approaches to their scholarship as these other researchers of color (e.g., CARE, 2008; S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Maramba, 2011; Museus, 2008; Museus & Park, 2015). These scholars regularly utilized inequalities to clarify the urgency of moving beyond this trope, and then leveraged antideficit lenses to complicate stories of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders,

reveal systemic racial and cultural challenges that these populations face, and focus attention on the strengths that exist within these cultural communities and how educational institutions can change to be more equitable and better serve them. Therefore, it appears that claims that existing research on the myth has been deficit-oriented are based on taking one aspect of discourse on the myth (i.e., the discussion of racial disparities in educational attainment) and a different element of other scholars' work (i.e., stories of students' academic achievements) out of their respective contexts to construct a comparison and argument that does not hold when considering the content of these larger bodies of knowledge in their totality.

Considering the reality that deficit thinking attributes failure to cultural or individual deficiencies, our analysis reveals no compelling evidence to support the argument that research on the myth reinforced hegemonic deficit thinking. On the contrary, this literature is largely antideficit in orientation, with less than 5% of articles potentially or clearly employing a deficit approach that primarily linked disparities or challenges to deficiencies in individual or cultural community characteristics. Rather than attributing racial disparities or barriers to individual or group deficiencies, many researchers attributed these challenges to larger systems. For example, some scholars discussed existing systems of racial oppression (e.g., militarization of immigration and educational institutions dominated by Whiteness) in society as critical context and sources of extant challenges (Buenavista et al., 2009; Teranishi et al., 2009). Other scholars employed perspectives that accounted for the impact of institutional Whiteness and marginalization of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders within these organizations (Museus, 2008; Vue, 2013). In addition, several scholars called for meaningful structural and institutional changes (e.g., changing federal legislation and funding, increasing institutional support) in an effort to advance positive systemic advances for these populations (Teranishi, 2010; Wright & Balutski, 2013).

Although some might argue that this body of knowledge is deficit-oriented in its totality if it only examined Asian Americans' and Pacific Islanders' problems and ignored their strengths and successes, we did not find evidence to support this claim either. While shedding light on systemic challenges, many scholars also used an asset-based orientation of Asian American and Pacific Islander cultural communities. Some scholars, for example, highlighted how these cultural communities served as effective buffers from systemic challenges and allowed Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to thrive (Museus, 2008; Museus & Maramba, 2011; Vue, 2013; Wong, 2013). While many scholars described the challenges that these populations face, we found that scholars also highlighted the ways in which these groups embody agency and resilience within hostile institutional environments, such as the traditional predominantly White college classrooms, by claiming and reclaiming such spaces as ones where they too belonged (Chhuon & Hudley, 2008; Museus, Mueller, & Aquino., 2013; Vue, 2013).

A Counterhegemonic Anti-Essentialism Agenda

Another area of confusion in existing research on the myth involves whether it reinforces hegemonic paradigms through its primary focus on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Several scholars showed how systemic racism deploys the myth to directly harm Asian Americans (Buenavista et al., 2009; Museus &

Maramba, 2011; Teranishi, 2010). A plethora of evidence suggests this myth leads to the racial exclusion of Asian Americans, and sometimes Pacific Islanders, from social and educational discourses, agendas, policies, and programs despite the fact that some ethnic and socioeconomic subgroups within these categories face drastic inequalities (S. J. Lee & Kumashiro, 2005; Museus & Kiang, 2009). In doing so, the myth has historically masked widespread systemic prejudice and discrimination, isolation and marginalization, and violence that are inflicted upon these communities and contribute to the inequities (Buena Vista et al., 2009; Teranishi, 2010).

As mentioned, some researchers have utilized a definition of the myth that ignores the ways in which this trope fuels the exclusion and invisibility of Asian Americans, and sometimes Pacific Islanders, to argue that this body of work is deficit-oriented because it does not focus on other communities of color (Poon et al., 2016). When we engage a more multifaceted definition of the myth, which acknowledges that it harms Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders as well, we find no evidence to support this claim. Instead, we conclude that research on the myth largely utilized an anti-essentialist approach to counter hegemonic narratives that are grounded in the myth and ultimately harm Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and other communities of color. Specifically, our analysis determined that approximately 21% of the studies that mention the myth examined factors that perpetuate it, 27% sought to unveil the diversity of various Asian American and Pacific Islander communities to directly challenge homogenous racial constructions of them, and 43% analyzed the negative impact of the myth on these groups. Thus, scholars' primary reason for engaging the myth appeared to be to counter, deconstruct, disprove, and transcend it using multiple strategies.

Approximately 90% of the scholars who mentioned the myth in their research within this era focused their primary energies on the role of this stereotype in shaping the realities of these communities specifically. Given Asian American and Pacific Islander higher education scholars analyzing the myth have primarily focused on their communities, it is not surprising that they did not invest their energies in analyzing effects of the myth on other communities of color. We certainly find this to be an important limitation of existing literature. However, given that only a few of these publications engaged in victim-blaming and the bulk of them advanced an anti-essentialist agenda, we do not find it feasible to conclude that there is compelling evidence that this lack of focus translates into deficit framing of any communities of color.

Almost half of these publications (approximately 43%) briefly discussed the stereotype's negative effects on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to contextualize their research, underscore the need to pay greater attention to these populations, and justify the relevance of their work (Hune, 2011; Museus, Nguyen, et al., 2013; Park, 2008). Many scholars noted the ways in which aggregate statistics reinforce the myth and called attention to the need to disaggregate data. For example, scholars described how aggregate data mask the varied experiences of Asian American and Pacific Islander communities and contribute to their racialized invisibility (Museus & Chang, 2009; Museus & Kiang, 2009). Some studies examined the impact that disaggregated quantitative data can have on developing targeted policies (e.g., federal educational aid, statewide funding for mental health services, and institutional funding for Asian American studies programs; CARE, 2008). Other research demonstrated the utility of disaggregated qualitative data to

provide more complex portraits of the experiences of specific ethnic groups (e.g., Chinese and Filipino Americans, etc.; Museus & Truong, 2009; Wong, 2013). In addition, scholars acknowledged the challenges of navigating racial labels and highlighted the need to disaggregate Asian American and Pacific Islander data.

Furthermore, researchers attempted to challenge the dominant monolithic and overly simplistic model minority narrative of Asian Americans by centering their complex lived experiences, characterized by their challenges, successes, and everything in-between (Buenavista et al., 2009; Chhuon et al., 2010; Nadal et al., 2010). These scholars also sought to directly challenge the myth by utilizing students' voices to construct counterstories that illuminated the invisibility, exclusion, and other racial realities of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education, as well as how cultural communities can facilitate their successes (Vue, 2013). Many of these scholars engaged the myth to underscore it as an important element of systemic racism that their research sought to deconstruct. While some researchers claimed that dispelling the myth reifies its centrality and limits our understanding of Asian American and Pacific Islander humanity beyond their racialization (Poon et al., 2016), such perspectives suggest that these efforts are somehow mutually exclusive or conflicting. On the contrary, it is important to recognize that scholars simultaneously engaged in *both* countering the myth and humanizing Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders through the countermyth project.

Differential Framing of the Myth for Diverse Advocacy Contexts

Tension exists around what constitutes appropriate framing of the myth. Like other researchers who analyze racism and racialization processes, scholars studying the myth must make ongoing context-informed and calculated decisions about how to (re)frame their narratives. In some cases, they might focus on critiquing systems of oppression. In other situations, they might weigh the many complicated, multifaceted, and sometimes contradictory effects of various frames and make strategic choices to utilize frames that resonate with less critical audiences or key decision makers to advance more racially equitable policy. Such strategies are consistent with the larger body of scholarship on framing choices and effects, which suggests that activists might not always center a single frame but instead strategically tailor frames to their varied contexts in order to effectively advance concrete policies that contribute to social justice agendas (Armstrong & Crage, 2006).

Researchers have utilized Lakoff's (2004) definition of framing to claim that any scholarship that focuses on the myth's impact on non-Asian American communities of color is anti-oppressive, while arguing that research that does not use this specific frame is historically inaccurate and reinforces hegemonic systems (Poon et al., 2016). Yet the assumption that a single framing of the myth can be prescribed as the only effective one to advance anti-oppression agendas within every context and for all audiences ignores the diversity and complexity of social justice advocacy. Higher education researchers studying the myth write for a diverse range of audiences, including critical theorists who deeply understand racial issues (Iftikar & Museus, 2019), policymakers and practitioners whom they seek to convince to provide resources and support for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (CARE, 2008; Museus, 2008), and community members who

seek to achieve concrete material outcomes in their unique advocacy contexts (Asian Pacific American Legal Center & Asian American Center for Advancing Justice, 2011). They also publish in a wide range of venues, some of which support critical scholarship and others that are more heavily shaped by racism and racially exclude scholarship on minoritized communities (Coleman, 2005). As a result of these diverse contexts, they might choose to highlight society's deployment of the myth to invalidate civil rights agendas in some contexts (S. J. Lee, 2006; Museus, 2009; Museus et al., 2016), and focus their energies on how it perpetuates racial violence toward Asian Americans in others.

Indeed, these varied contexts are likely one reason that scholars defined the myth in diverse ways during the period under examination (e.g., Chung Allred, 2007; Fujimoto, 1996). Poon et al. (2016) noted that these scholars discussed the myth as depicting Asian Americans as averse to challenging authority, adaptive, assimilationist, demure, shy, and isolated. Poon et al. (2016) also noted that scholars argued the myth depicts Asian Americans as intelligent, quiet and obedient, and capable of overcoming disadvantages through strong family values and hard work. From this observation, they claimed that researchers have haphazardly used the myth as a "catch-all phrase that incorporated practically any racial or cultural stereotype about Asian Americans" (p. 482).

However, concluding that scholars' definitions of the myth are haphazard assumes that this trope cannot be linked to a wide range of racial attributes and that researchers intended to offer static and mutually exclusive definitions of it. More complex views of racialization processes suggest that such stereotypes are socially constructed and adaptable (Omi & Winant, 2014) and might be linked to different assumptions and attributes across time and space. Many scholars would agree that it is precisely this complexity that allows racial constructs, such as the myth, to be so insidious, pervasive, and durable. Accounting for these realities, we are careful not to assume that scholars haphazardly framed the myth and instead acknowledge that different racial contexts might warrant diverse presentations of this racial construct.

Our analysis does reveal that higher education researchers analyzing the myth produced literature for a diverse range of audiences, intentionally tailoring their engagement of this trope to their different contexts. Based on the venue and types of implications, we find that approximately 81% of publications spoke to researchers, while many of them also appeared to target policymaker (45%), practitioner (82%), and community (21%) audiences. For example, scholars who produced literature for policy audiences centered the ways in which the myth shapes federal and state policies to exclude consideration of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (CARE, 2008; Teranishi & Nguyen, 2012). In contrast, researchers who generated data to inform campus practices noted the ways in which the myth masks concrete everyday challenges, such as experienced prejudice and discrimination or students' inability to find culturally relevant educational opportunities or support (Museus, 2008; Vue, 2013). Scholars who focused their work on counseling and psychology discussed the ways in which the myth leads to the dismissal of significant mental health issues among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (Suzuki, 2002). Thus, this body of knowledge suggests that there might be many legitimate ways to engage this stereotype in counterhegemonic efforts.

Navigating Racial Structures and the Imposition of Racial Labels

With regard to labels, Poon et al. (2016) noted that the Native Hawaiian scholar Benham (2006) did not mention the myth in her comprehensive review of literature on Pacific Islanders in education and inferred that this might be because “the myth does not historically include Pacific Islanders” (p. 485). We affirm Pacific Islanders’ assertions that pan-racial labels should be rejected when possible (Diaz, 2004; Teves & Arvin, 2018). However, we do not assume that such perspectives imply that pan-racial categories and the myths that society has attached to them have historically *never* been relevant to any Pacific Islander realities.

Poon et al. (2016) also contrasted the absence of the myth from Benham’s (2006) analysis to its presence in literature reviews from Asian American scholars (Ng et al., 2007; Ngo & Lee, 2007), and concluded that Asian American researchers are not intentional about using these labels while recommending that these researchers “be more intentional in their use of panethnic terms and labels” (Poon et al., 2016, p. 491). However, engaging a more complex consideration of the political contexts surrounding the production and dissemination of knowledge allows us to refrain from assuming that researchers have not been intentional in their use of the pan-racial label, they are free from the complex contextual influences that complicate the utilization of these terms, or they (rather than systemic racial contexts) are responsible for the confusion themselves. Instead, engaging these various layers of systemic context in our analysis prompts us to shift the primary source of confusion surrounding the Asian Americans and Pacific Islander category from individual scholars of color to the systemic racial forces that perpetuate this confusion, that constrain researchers’ approaches, and to which researchers are responding. Doing so paints a more complex picture, in which systemic racial processes complicate what would otherwise be simple decisions about who to exclude or include in projects and narratives.

One example of the ways in which systemic forces complicate the use of pan-racial categories manifests in discourse on AANAPISIs. As mentioned, the federal government’s categorization of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders as a singular racial group fueled widespread lumping of these communities into a single category (Wright & Balutski, 2013), and some federal policies continue to perpetuate this problematic aggregation today. In addition, research on AANAPISIs shows that the myth continues to hinder efforts to develop resources and support tailored to both Asian Americans *and* Pacific Islanders (Mac et al., 2019). Thus, many researchers and advocates working at and with AANAPISIs that serve Pacific Islanders might disagree with the assumption that the myth is not relevant to this population.

Another example of how pan-racial labels are systemically forced upon scholars and advocates doing work with and within Asian American and Pacific Islander communities is the scholarly dialogue within which we are currently engaged. Researchers who have critiqued the use of such labels as haphazard shift back and forth between using “AAPIs” and “Asian Americans” themselves (e.g., Poon et al., 2016), demonstrating how their own work is shaped by larger historical and systemic forces that pressured them to use the pan-racial label in ways that could be perceived as haphazard. Similarly, we are not impervious to these

systemic influences ourselves, as intentionally and accurately engaging different elements of these scholars' analysis requires us to grapple in complicated ways with their varied utilization of these labels. Thus, even when intentionality drives use of racial labels, it cannot eradicate such complexities.

Despite scholars' repeated efforts to challenge the myth's essentialism, our analysis suggests that researchers studying Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education have been forced to grapple with existing pan-racial labels. Nearly half (approximately 47%) of the education scholars who studied these populations did not use these pan-racial labels (e.g., Buenavista, 2013; Chhuon et al., 2010; Museus, 2008). Of those who did use such labels, less than 5% used racial (e.g., Asian American) and pan-racial (e.g., AAPI) labels interchangeably.

Moreover, evidence indicates that researchers were forced to navigate preexisting structures that lumped Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders into a single category. For example, some scholars referred to national data sets that merged these groups together and hindered the disaggregation of data on these two racial groups (Dugan & Komives, 2010; Inkelas, 2003; Nadal et al., 2010). Similarly, researchers used pan-racial labels to discuss courses and community organizations that included both racial groups in their titles (e.g., the Asian Pacific American Legal Center; Balón & Shek, 2013; Museus 2014; Tran & Chang, 2013). In addition, scholars sometimes discussed AANAPISI legislation, which was partly designed to combat the myth and consequent exclusion of both Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders from higher education policy and practice (Park & Chang, 2008). Thus, it appears that researchers used these labels to accurately reference these preexisting structures. Therefore, while scholars rarely thoroughly explained their rationale for using these labels, we find little evidence that they used them haphazardly.

The literature that we analyzed offers some indication that researchers leveraged racial and pan-racial labels to engage in strategic anti-essentialism, aggregating and disaggregating these categories to advocate for Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. For example, some scholars utilized pan-racial labels when they intended to be inclusive of both Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as in edited books that include authors from both communities (e.g., Ching & Agbayani, 2012; Museus, Maramba, & Teranishi, 2013). In contrast, they used specific racial and ethnic labels when intentionally focusing on subgroups within the pan-racial category. Without taking into account and understanding the contextual structures discussed in previous sections, such shifting can easily be (mis)interpreted as haphazard. It is important to note that some government agencies and several educational institutions still aggregate these groups in data systems and many others continue to transition to more disaggregated approaches. Thus, during the period under examination, researchers were forced to grapple with even more widespread problematically aggregated racialized data systems that no longer exist today, and we would expect existing structures to progressively enable higher education scholars to avoid pan-racial labels moving forward.

Among the publications that mentioned pan-racial labels, approximately 17% discussed the complexity of the such categories and problematized how Pacific Islanders are subsumed under this label (e.g., Kodama et al., 2001; Pizzolato

et al., 2013). However, only a handful of these authors meaningfully engaged the existing work of Pacific Islander scholars or engaged in deeper analysis of the contexts, cultures, and experiences of these communities. The absence of such engagement limits understanding of Pacific Islander histories, contexts, struggles, and agendas (Reyes, 2018). We revisit this point in the following sections.

Discussion

Several major conclusions can be drawn from the findings of the current analysis, and we discuss the most salient among them herein. In doing so, we revisit the theoretical bases and clarify the contributions of our review. These contributions have implications for how scholars might constructively advance research on the myth and with Asian Americans and Pacific Islander communities. Given that our conclusions and recommendations for future research are so inextricably intertwined, we integrate them in the current section.

First, our analysis helps reconcile tensions in existing scholarship. We find little evidence to support claims that authors who produced scholarship on the myth between 2000 and 2013 reinforced hegemonic deficit paradigms, and our overarching conclusion is that research on the myth overwhelmingly advances antideficit, anti-essentialist, and antiracist agendas. This conclusion appears to be consistent with the views of many education scholars who produced research with anti-oppression goals in mind during this period (Chang & Kiang, 2002; Museus, Maramba, & Teranishi, 2013; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Teranishi, 2010) but contradicts other claims that this research is deficit-oriented and reinforces hegemonic frames (Poon et al., 2016). In the remainder of this section, we highlight several factors that explain why our conclusions deviate from these previous claims.

Second, our analysis contributes to prior scholarship by offering a new multifaceted critical race definition of the myth that recognizes how this trope is deployed to enact systemic violence on *both* Asian Americans and other communities of color. This conceptualization of the myth deviates from the recently proposed sociohistorical definition of the myth (Poon et al., 2016). The earlier definition centered the harm that the myth causes other communities of color, while rendering the racial violence that it perpetuates toward Asian Americans invisible. However, failing to acknowledge the ways in which White supremacy utilizes the myth to harm Asian Americans ignores vital elements and effects of this racial project. Therefore, rather than dismiss the value of analyzing the myth's impact on Asian Americans, our proposed definition and analysis point to the value of continued scholarly efforts to complicate understanding of the multiple ways that this racial trope harms them.

Our multifaceted critical race definition of the myth also leads us to conclude that existing research has overwhelmingly tackled one of the multiple ways in which White supremacy deploys it to reinforce complex hegemonic systems. Scholars who studied the myth in higher education between 2000 and 2013 placed primary emphasis on understanding its direct impact on Asian Americans (e.g., Chang & Kiang, 2002; Museus, Maramba, & Teranishi, 2013; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Park, 2009; Teranishi, 2010), while giving little attention to the ways in which it reinforces negative views of other populations. Thus, we conclude that more

research on how the myth harms other communities of color is warranted. Future scholarship, for example, could explore whether and how comparisons of Asian Americans and other communities of color are used to inform decisions about higher education policies and programs, as well as how these decisions affect the conditions and lives of non-Asian American communities of color on college campuses.

Both our overarching finding and proposed multifaceted critical race definition of the myth suggest that racial justice for Asian American communities does not have to negate justice for other racially minoritized populations. If the myth can be considered a systemic racial project that perpetuates racial violence toward both Asian Americans and other communities of color, complex and diverse anti-essentialist efforts to deconstruct the myth are vital to racial justice for all. Such efforts can directly challenge the centrality of the myth in society's conceptualization of Asian Americans and undermine its efficacy in perpetuating deficit perspectives of other communities of color as well. In contrast, labeling research that works to disprove the myth as oppressive can undermine important anti-oppression efforts that ultimately benefit all communities of color. Moreover, suggestions that Asian Americans are worthy of attention only when it serves the interests of other populations of color can promote an either-or mentality that pits these communities against each other (S. J. Lee, 2006).

Third, the current analysis contributes to CRT scholarship by demonstrating how it can inform anti-imperialistic analysis and critique. CRT scholarship underscored the endemic nature of racism, the profound impact of racism on education systems, and the utility of these perspectives in analyzing the realities of people of color in U.S. education (Bell, 1987; Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ledesma & Calderón, 2015; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Prior scholarship also noted the value of context in understanding race and racism (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Ledesma & Calderón, 2015; Rogers et al., 2005; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), recognizing and building on the contributions of earlier generations of racial justice advocates (Crenshaw, 1988; Matsuda et al., 1993; Tate, 1997), avoiding assumptions that people of color have bought into hegemonic frames (Delgado, 1987; Tate, 1997), and rejecting hypercompetition among social justice scholars and advocates (Museus, 2020). The current analysis utilizes these perspectives to generate and apply an anti-imperialistic framework for analyzing scholarly discourse. This approach engages the complex contexts within which scholars of color produce and utilize knowledge to advance social justice, recognizes advocates' strategic and diverse efforts to advance equity across diverse policy and practice settings, focuses efforts on collectively building upon this work, refrains from making problematic assumptions that people of color adopt hegemonic frames without compelling support for such claims, and values multiple forms of advocacy to reduce unhealthy competition within and across social justice communities. We believe that future critical analyses of scholarly research and discourse can benefit from employing such an anti-imperialistic approach.

It is important to reiterate that our anti-imperialistic approach to critical analysis demonstrates the importance of considering context when engaging in

critique. Researchers who claimed that scholarship on the myth is deficit-oriented acknowledged their lack of emphasis on systemic contexts surrounding the generation, application, and utilization of knowledge as a limitation of their analysis (Poon et al., 2016). However, we explicitly consider these contexts in our review. Specifically, we engage the full content of articles and bodies of literature surrounding the text analyzed (discursive contexts), the discourses surrounding theories used to critique research on the myth (theoretical contexts), and the diverse advocacy contexts of scholars and advocates working to challenge the myth (advocacy contexts). Our holistic engagement of these contexts leads us to conclusions that diverge from these other researchers. As a result, we partially attribute their claims that scholarly research on the myth during this era reinforced deficit frames to an inadequate consideration of multiple layers of context.

Fourth, our review builds on AsianCrit specifically by shedding light on how Asian American scholars might engage in strategic (anti-)essentialism. AsianCrit acknowledges that Asian Americans engage in strategic (anti-)essentialism to contest and engage racial categories to advance social justice causes (Iftikar & Museus, 2019). The current findings add to this literature showing that systemic forces shape complexities that perpetuate pan-racial labels, as well as how scholars navigate these systemic contexts. Specifically, our analysis suggests that existing data systems and policies create conditions in which Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are forced into the same category and pressured to navigate it to advocate for these diverse communities (Maramba, 2011; Museus, 2014; Teranishi, 2010; Wright & Balutski, 2013). In addition, the findings highlight how Asian American scholars strategically engaged or rejected these categories to advocate for social justice. It is critical that Asian American scholars continue to resist these systemic pressures, and we urge scholars who utilize these labels to continue discussing the complexity and potential harm that they cause.

A deeper discussion about use of the pan-racial labels is beyond the scope of the current article, but it is warranted. Meanwhile, we caution against Asian American scholars placing narrow parameters around potential collaborations and coalitions between Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. We believe that prescriptive or simplistic recommendations may not apply in every context, and we support our Pacific Islander friends and colleagues in making their own situational choices or collaborating to co-construct decisions regarding whether and how they are to be included in scholarly publications, projects, and conversations. In future research, a more constructive discussion might prompt scholars to examine the most effective strategies to engage these problematic categories within systemic contexts that force these labels upon them.

Sixth, the current findings complicate knowledge regarding the application of racial triangulation. Specifically, the importance of acknowledging ethnic distinctions has vital implications for the analysis of racial positions, as the experiences of various Asian American subgroups are shaped by differential racialization processes. Kim's (1999) racial triangulation framework arguably centered the realities of East Asian Americans whose experiences are more heavily racialized as model minorities, while decentering the racial realities of Southeast Asian

Americans who are racialized as deviants, dropouts, and welfare sponges in some contexts (e.g., Ngo & Lee, 2007). Thus, it is important to acknowledge that the field of racial positions is not static, and Kim's framework might not be as effective at explaining and representing the experiences of Southeast Asian Americans. These realities suggest that the myth might harm certain ethnic subgroups in ways that are similar to the injuries it causes other communities of color because they are racially positioned as inferior to East Asian Americans (Yi, 2018). As a result, we encourage Asian American researchers to imagine and construct new ways of thinking about and analyzing racial positions that build on racial triangulation but more fully capture the complexity with which different Asian American ethnic groups are racialized in U.S. society.

Seventh, our findings contribute important knowledge to theory and discourse related to deficit thinking. As mentioned, scholars who study deficit thinking have underscored the reality that such perspectives are a symptom of larger systems of oppression and perpetuate a blame-the-victim way of thinking about communities of color and suggest that deficit-oriented research would engage in such victim-blaming (Banks, 2014; Gorski, 2008, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2007; Valencia, 1997). Patton Davis and Museus (2019) noted that researchers have conceptualized and applied the concept of deficit thinking in various ways, with some defining the concept with a victim-blaming element, others offering similar definitions but then dismissing the victim-blaming element when applying the concept, and still others choosing not to define it at all. As a result, there is some confusion regarding what constitutes deficit thinking. Our analysis reinforces earlier assertions that it is important to contend with the victim-blaming element of deficit thinking (Patton Davis & Museus, 2019) but adds to this discussion by highlighting the ways in which ignoring the victim-blaming element of deficit thinking can lead researchers to misinterpret research as deficit-oriented because it acknowledges inequalities, even if the discussion of such disparities is couched in antideficit perspectives and agendas that focus on the systemic, institutional, or environmental causes of inequalities or challenges.

In addition, dismissing this critical victim-blaming element of deficit thinking can obscure the lines between actual harmful deficit perspectives that blame the victim and important anti-oppression work that aims to eradicate disparities faced by communities of color. Such conflation can devalue and inhibit scholarship that examines and challenges real systemic barriers that these communities face (Patton Davis & Museus, 2019). It is also important to note that embracing deficit views of institutions does not equate to hegemonic deficit views of students or communities of color on the other. Conflating these perspectives can lead to confusion, misunderstanding, and misleading interpretations and critiques of discourse. Therefore, we encourage researchers to apply the concept of deficit thinking carefully and ensure they use this label to characterize research that blames underserved populations for the challenges they face.

Eighth, our findings also add to existing research on framing theory and research on framing processes within higher education. Prior scholarship underscored that frames help people make sense of important issues, that framing processes are complex, and that their effectiveness partly depends on the degree to which frames resonate with intended audiences (Benford & Snow, 2000; Lakoff,

2004; Schemer et al., 2012). The current analysis extends this scholarship by highlighting how scholars might frame research in diverse ways to advance social justice within varied advocacy contexts. Specifically, our findings suggest that scholars do intentionally frame and reframe their messages for target audiences.

Not considering the complexity of framing processes in diverse advocacy contexts can lead to dangerously narrow prescriptions of acceptable research on the myth and inhibit diverse and strategic efforts to effect concrete changes in complicated policy and practice contexts, thereby undermining social justice agendas. For example, evidence suggests that systemic contexts pressure scholars and advocates of AANAPISIs to center and challenge the myth's direct harm toward Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and justify the allocation of resources (e.g., time and energy) to support this population (Park & Chang, 2010; Mac et al., 2019). These efforts are especially important for communities (e.g., Southeast Asian American and Pacific Islanders) that face drastic inequities and have been subsumed and marginalized within the broader pan-racial category (Diaz, 2004; Espiritu, 2017). The suggestion that these scholars and advocates are subconsciously conforming to and reinforcing hegemonic ideologies unless they focus their energies on the ways in which the myth is used to harm other communities of color ignores their advocacy contexts and efforts. Instead, we encourage researchers to grapple with the reality that these scholars and advocates might be using a conscious, strategic framing of the myth to impact policy and achieve material racial progress.

We recognize that it is important to acknowledge scholars' agency and responsibility. However, considering how context shapes the capacity of scholars' framing choices offers a more holistic and realistic perspective about scholarly agency that exists in symbiotic relationship with context (Baez, 2000). Context and agency are not independent of one another, and one cannot be examined without considering the other. Moreover, focusing on the agency of scholars of color without considering context can fuel deficit views of them.

Considering the systemic racial contexts that scholars and advocates are forced to navigate enables us to better understand the primary source of problematic racial and pan-racial categories. Rather than placing primary blame on the researchers and advocates who engage the myth and pan-racial labels, a deeper understanding of these systemic contexts allows us to critique the federal policies and structures that force these labels upon scholars and advocates. While some might argue that allowing systemic constraints to exert *any* influence on one's framing of the myth is uncritical and reifies hegemonic narratives, such conclusions dismiss the real power of systemic racial forces and ignore the racial realities within which people advocate for social justice (Brown, 2006; Crenshaw, 1988; Delgado, 1987; F. Lee, 2018; Matsuda et al., 1993; Tate, 1997). Moreover, such perspectives are inconsistent with CRT philosophies and agendas that seek to understand such contexts in all of their complexity. Instead of adopting and promoting the perspective that scholars can avoid perpetuating hegemonic systems only by focusing on the relative valorization of Asian Americans compared to other communities of color, more fruitful lines of inquiry might be to examine how scholars and advocates negotiate complex processes of framing the myth to advance social justice agendas and assess the relative impact of these framing processes on policy and practice.

Finally, our analysis underscores the importance of more fully accounting for differential racialization processes among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. For example, scholars have noted the reality that White supremacy, enacted through colonialism, shapes the contexts and realities of Indigenous Pacific Islander communities in distinct ways (Curammeng et al., 2017; Reyes, 2018; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Wright & Balutski, 2013). The distinction between systemic nativistic racism toward Asian American immigrants and the occupation of Pacific Islander nations is one with which we must contend to understand how Indigenous populations can be better supported. Specifically, it is important to comprehend how the myth might reinforce processes of settler colonialism and contribute to the ongoing oppression of Indigenous communities. These realities reinforce our assertion that prescribing a singular approach to engaging the myth hinders important diverse lines of inquiry.

Moreover, while scholars have often underscored the relatively low graduation rates of Southeast Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to counter essentializing racial projects, such as the myth, the voices of these communities are typically not centered in research, policy, and practice (Diaz, 2004; Espiritu, 2017). While a handful of scholars centered the voices of these groups during the period we examined (e.g., Kiang, 2002, 2009; Museus, 2013; Vue, 2013; Wright & Balutski, 2013), East Asian American (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, and Korean American) perspectives are more often centered in this discourse. However, Southeast Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have distinct histories and concerns that should not be erased within larger pan-racial agendas (Diaz, 2004; Espiritu, 2017; Kiang, 2004). Therefore, it is important that higher education recognize the need to center issues uniquely and directly affecting these communities in future scholarship. While these groups are still underrepresented, there has been increased knowledge about them since the time period under examination (e.g., Reyes, 2018; Saelua et al., 2016; Uy, 2015; Xiong & Wood, 2016). With the ongoing growth in visibility of education scholars from these communities, we expect this trend to continue.

Conclusion

Evidence that the myth inflicts harm on Asian American and Pacific Islander communities is irrefutable (Museus & Kiang, 2009; Teranishi, 2010; Yi & Museus, 2015). These wounds are significant. While we certainly advocate for scholarship that advances knowledge about how the myth continues to inform deficit perspectives of other communities of color, it is equally legitimate for scholars to center analyses on how the myth contributes to the racial subjugation of Asian Americans. Moreover, suggestions that Asian Americans are worthy of attention only when it serves other communities of color can promote an either-or mentality that pits these communities against each other (S. J. Lee, 2006). Therefore, rather than dismiss the value of scholarship analyzing effects of the myth on Asian Americans, we assert the importance of continued efforts to expand our imagination about the possibilities of research on the myth and complicate understanding of its impact on these groups.

Constructing a comprehensive research agenda on the myth is beyond the scope of this article and will require more comprehensive conversations within education

scholarly communities. However, scholars should generate robust research agendas and knowledge about how the myth affects concrete perceptions and decisions that shape policy and practice. In doing so, they can challenge people to consider that there might still be much that we do not know about *how* this stereotype operates and significant room for innovative scholarship that examines the myth. For example, while scholars and advocates tailor their framing of the myth to various audiences, we know relatively little, beyond personal opinions or anecdotal evidence, regarding the degree to which their chosen frames are effective at shifting perspectives and decisions to be more aligned with social justice agendas. In addition, much still remains to be learned about the myth's impact on the daily challenges faced by Southeast Asian Americans and refugees, how the myth impedes work at AANAPISIs, and how social justice advocates can most effectively engage the myth to change policy and perspectives. Such scholarship would transcend knowledge of the myth as a nebulous racial construct and enhance understanding regarding its material impact on communities of color and social justice efforts.

Lastly, we encourage researchers to be cautious in their consumption and adoption of critique. Our analysis underscores how varying considerations of context and degrees of complexity in the application of frameworks can lead to drastically different interpretations, critiques, and conclusions. Therefore, it is important that researchers and educators not adopt the findings of literature reviews, including the current one, without thoroughly engaging the literature that is being critiqued. Doing so can lead to decontextualized understandings of existing knowledge and social justice efforts. This caution is important even if the critiques being consumed claim to be critical or counterhegemonic. In sum, we encourage critique, but our analysis underscores that critiquing within context and with complexity is important.

ORCID iD

Jacqueline Mac  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4073-6819>

Notes

Authors would like to thank the community of scholars and reviewers who provided valuable feedback and insights, which contributed significantly to the interpretations and conclusions presented herein.

¹ Throughout this article, the model minority myth is referred to as “the myth.”

² We use “hegemony” to refer to a system of domination, and “hegemonic” to denote something that supports such systems (Gramsci, 1971).

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the systematic literature review and cited in the text.

Ali, A. I. (2016). Citizens under suspicion: Responsive research with community under surveillance. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12136>

Armstrong, E. A., & Crage, S. M. (2006). Movements and memory: The making of the Stonewall myth. *American Sociological Review*, 71(5), 724–751. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100502>

- Asian Pacific American Legal Center & Asian American Center for Advancing Justice. (2011). *A community of contrasts: Asian Americans in the United States, 2011*. Asian American Center for Advancing Justice. https://advancingjustice-aajc.org/sites/default/files/2016-09/Community_of_Contrasts_US.pdf
- Baez, B. (2000). Agency, structure, and power: An inquiry into racism and resistance for education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 19*(4), 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005241732091>
- Balón, D. G. (2005, April 6). *Asian Pacific American college students on leadership: Culturally marginalized from the leader role?* NASPA NetResults. http://daniello.balon-home.net/Balon_APAs_Leadership.pdf
- *Balón, D. G., & Shek, Y. L. (2013). Beyond representation: Confronting the new frontier for Asian American leadership. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Ternishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 311–326). Stylus.
- Banks, T. (2014). From deficit to divergence: Integrating theory to inform the selection of interventions in special education. *Creative Education, 5*(7), 510–518. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.57060>
- Bell, D. A. (1987). *And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. Basic Books.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*(1), 611–639. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>
- *Benham, M. K. P. (2006). A challenge to Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander scholars: What the research literature teaches us about our work. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*(1), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320500490705>
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review, 37*(5), 425–446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y>
- Brown, W. (2006). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratization. *Political Theory, 34*(6), 690–714. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591706293016>
- *Buenavista, T. L. (2013). Overstaying our welcome: Undocumented Asian immigrant experiences with racial microaggressions in research and education. In R. Endo & X. L. Rong (Eds.), *Educating Asian Americans: Achievement, schooling, and identities* (pp. 103–128). Information Age.
- *Buenavista, T. L., Jayakumar, U. M., & Misa-Escalante, K. (2009). Contextualizing Asian American education through critical race theory: An example of U.S. Pilipino college student experiences. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2009*(142), 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.297>
- Chang, M. J., & Kiang, P. N. (2002). New challenges of representing Asian American students in US higher education. In P. G. Altbach, K. Lomotey, & W. A. Smith (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 137–158). SUNY Press.
- *Chhuon, V., & Hudley, C. (2008). Factors supporting Cambodian American students' successful adjustment into the university. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2008.0005>
- *Chhuon, V., Hudley, C., Brenner, M. E., & Macias, R. (2010). The multiple worlds of successful Cambodian American students. *Urban Education, 45*(1), 30–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085909352583>

- Ching, D. M., & Agbayani, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education: Research and perspectives on identity, leadership, and success*. NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.
- Choi, D. K. (2010). *A unique racial experience: Examining Asian American and Pacific Islander college students and campus climate* (UMI No. 3439412) [Doctoral dissertation, New York University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Chou, R., & Feagin, J. (2015). *The myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism*. Routledge.
- *Chung Allred, N. (2007). Asian Americans and affirmative action: From yellow peril to model minority and back again. *Asian American Law Journal*, 14(1), 57–84.
- Coleman, M. G. (2005). Racism in academia: The White superiority supposition in the “unbiased” search for knowledge. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 21(3), 762–774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2004.08.004>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1988). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. *Harvard Law Review*, 101(7), 1331–1387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1341398>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Curammeng, E. R., Buenavista, T. L., & Cariaga, S. (2017). *Asian American critical race theory: Origins, directions, and praxis*. UCLA Center for Critical Race Studies Research Briefs.
- Delgado, R. (1987). The ethereal scholar: Does critical legal studies have what minorities want. *Harvard Civil Rights–Civil Liberties Law Review*, 22(2), 301–322.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). NYU Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780195301731.013.51089>
- Diaz, V. M. (2004). “To ‘P’ or not to ‘P’?”: Marking the territory between Pacific Islander and Asian American studies. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 7(3), 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jaas.2005.0019>
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000340971>
- *Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students’ capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(5), 525–549. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2010.0009>
- Espiritu, Y. (2017). Critical refugee studies and Native Pacific studies: A transpacific critique. *American Quarterly*, 69(3), 483–490. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0042>
- Fries-Britt, S., & Griffin, K. (2007). The black box: How high-achieving Blacks resist stereotypes about Black Americans. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 509–524. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0048>
- *Fujimoto, M. (1996). The community college presidency: An Asian Pacific American perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1996(94), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.36819969407>
- García, D. G. (2018). *Strategies of segregation: Race, residence, and the struggle for educational equality*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520296862.001.0001>
- Gorski, P. C. (2011). Unlearning deficit ideology and the scornful gaze: Thoughts on authenticating the class discourse in education. *Counterpoints*, 402, 152–173.

- Gorski, P. C. (2008). Peddling poverty for profit: Elements of oppression in Ruby Payne's framework. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(1), 130–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680701761854>
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Griffin, K. A., Jayakumar, U. M., Jones, M. M., & Allen, W. R. (2010). Ebony in the ivory tower: Examining trends in the socioeconomic status, achievement, and self-concept of Black, male freshmen. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(2), 232–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665681003704915>
- Harpalani, V. (2013). DesiCrit: Theorizing the racial ambiguity of South Asian Americans. *NYU Annual Survey of American Law, 69*(1), 77–183.
- Harper, S. R. (2009). Race, interest convergence, and transfer outcomes for Black male student athletes. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2009*(147), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.375>
- Harper, S. R. (2010). An anti-deficit achievement framework for research on students of color in STEM. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2010*(148), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.362>
- Hartlep, N. D. (2013). *The model minority stereotype: Demystifying Asian American success*. Information Age Publishing.
- *Hune, S. (2011). Asian American women faculty and the contested space of the classroom: Navigating student resistance and (re)claiming authority and their rightful place. In G. Jean-Marie, B. Lloyd-Jones, & L. Bass (Eds.), *Women of color in higher education: Turbulent past, promising future* (pp. 307–335). Emerald. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3644\(2011\)0000009019](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3644(2011)0000009019)
- Iftikar, J. S., & Museus, S. D. (2019). On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 31*(10), 935–949. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1522008>
- *Inkelas, K. K. (2003). Diversity's missing minority: Asian Pacific American undergraduates' attitudes toward affirmative action. *Journal of Higher Education, 74*(6), 601–639. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2003.0044>
- Kiang, P. N. (2002). Stories and structures of persistence: Ethnographic learning through research and practice in Asian American Studies. In Y. Zou & H. T. Trueba (Eds.), *Advances in ethnographic research: From our theoretical and methodological roots to post-modern critical ethnography* (pp. 223–255). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kiang, P. N. (2004). Linking strategies and interventions in Asian American Studies to K–12 classrooms and teacher preparation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(2), 199–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653871>
- Kiang, P. N. (2009). A thematic analysis of persistence and long-term educational engagement with Southeast Asian American college students. In L. Zhan (Ed.), *Asian American voices: Engaging, empowering, enabling* (pp. 21–58). NLN Press.
- Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society, 27*(1), 105–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005>
- *Kodama, C. M., McEwen, M. K., Liang, C. T. H., & Lee, S. (2001). A theoretical examination of psychosocial issues for Asian Pacific American students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 38*(4), 411–437. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1150>
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2008). *The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools*. Teachers College Press.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2007). Pushing past the achievement gap: An essay on the language of deficit. *Journal of Negro Education*, 76(3), 316–323.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green.
- Ledesma, M. C., & Calderón, D. (2015). Critical race theory in education: A review of past literature and a look to the future. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(3), 206–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414557825>
- Lee, F. (2018). *Toward an ethics of activism: A community investigation of humility, grace and compassion in movements for justice*. Hello Frances Lee. <https://hello-franceslee.files.wordpress.com/2018/05/toward-an-ethics-of-activism-20182.pdf>
- *Lee, S. J. (2006). *Unraveling the “model minority” stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. Teachers College Press.
- *Lee, S. J., & Kumashiro, K. K. (2005). *A report on the status of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education: Beyond the “model minority” stereotype*. National Education Association.
- Mac, J., Sarreal, A. D., Wang, A. C., & Museus, S. D. (2019). Conditions that catalyze the emergence of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2019(186), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20324>
- *Maramba, D. C. (2011). The importance of critically disaggregating data: The case of Southeast Asian American college students. *AAPI Nexus: Policy, Practice and Community*, 9(1–2), 127–133. https://doi.org/10.36650/nexus9.1-2_127-133 Maramba
- Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence, C. R., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). *Words that wound*. Westview.
- McCoy, D. L., & Rodricks, D. J. (2015). Critical race theory in higher education: 20 Years of theoretical and research innovations [Monograph]. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 41(3), 1–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20021>
- *Museus, S. D. (2008). The role of ethnic student organizations in fostering African American and Asian American students' cultural adjustment and membership at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(6), 568–586. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0039>
- Museus, S. D. (2009). A critical analysis of the invisibility of Southeast Asian American students in higher education research and discourse. In L. Zhan (Ed.), *Asian voices: Engaging, empowering, and enabling* (pp. 59–76). NLN Press.
- *Museus, S. D. (2013). Unpacking the complex and multifaceted nature of parental influences on Southeast Asian American college students' educational trajectories. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(5), 708–738. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2013.0031>
- *Museus, S. D. (2014). *Asian American students in higher education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203753002>
- Museus, S. D. (2020). Humanizing scholarly resistance: Toward greater solidarity in social justice advocacy within the neoliberal academy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 33(2), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1681544>
- Museus, S. D., Antonio, A. L., & Kiang, P. N. (2016). The state of scholarship on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education: Anti-essentialism, inequality, context, and relevance. In S. D. Museus, A. Agbayani, & D. M. Ching (Eds.), *Focusing on the underserved: Immigrant, Refugee, and Indigenous Asian American and Pacific Islanders in higher education* (pp. 1–51). Information Age.

- *Museus, S. D., & Chang, M. J. (2009). Rising to the challenge of conducting research on Asian Americans in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2009*(142), 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.299>
- *Museus, S. D., & Kiang, P. N. (2009). Deconstructing the model minority myth and how it contributes to the invisible minority reality in higher education research. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2009*(142), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.292>
- *Museus, S. D., Lâm, S. C., Huang, C., Kem, P., & Tan, K. (2012). Cultural integration in campus subcultures: Where the cultural, academic, and social spheres of college life collide. In *Creating campus cultures* (pp. 116–139). Routledge.
- Museus, S. D., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2016). Racism and racial equity in higher education [Monograph]. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 42*(1), 1–112. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20067>
- *Museus, S. D., & Maramba, D. C. (2011). The impact of culture on Filipino American Students' sense of belonging. *Review of Higher Education, 34*(2), 231–258. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2010.0022>
- Museus, S. D., Maramba, D. C., & Teranishi, R. T. (Eds.). (2013). *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education*. Stylus.
- *Museus, S. D., Mueller, M. K., & Aquino, K. (2013). Engaging Asian American and Pacific Islander culture and identity in graduate education. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 106–123). Stylus.
- *Museus, S. D., Nguyen, T. K., Vue, R., & Yeung, F. (2013) A model of Southeast Asian American identity development: Merging theoretical perspectives. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp.47–66). Stylus.
- Museus, S. D., & Park, J. J. (2015). The continuing significance of racism in the lives of Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(6), 551–569. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0059>
- *Museus, S. D., & Truong, K. A. (2009). Disaggregating qualitative data from Asian American college students in campus racial climate research and assessment. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2009*(142), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.293>
- *Nadal, K. L., Pituc, S. T., Johnston, M. P., & Esparrago, T. (2010). Overcoming the model minority myth: Experiences of Filipino American graduate students. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(6), 694–706. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2010.0023>
- *National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education. (2008). *Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Facts, not fiction: Setting the record straight*. College Board. <https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/professionals/asian-americans-and-pacific-islanders-facts-not-fiction.pdf>
- Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes: A critical review of literature on Asian Americans in education. *Review of Research in Higher Education, 31*(1), 95–130. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07300046095>

- Ngo, B., & Lee, S. J. (2007). Complicating the image of model minority success: A review of Southeast Asian American education. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(4), 415–453. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307309918>
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203076804>
- Osajima, K. (1998). Pedagogical considerations in Asian American studies. *Journal of Asian American Studies, 1*(3), 269–292. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jaas.1998.0028>
- *Park, J. J. (2008). Race and the Greek system in the 21st century: Centering the voices of Asian American women. *NASPA Journal, 45*(1), 103–132. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1909>
- *Park, J. J. (2009). Taking race into account: Charting student attitudes towards affirmative action. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(7), 670–690.
- Park, J. J., & Chang, M. J. (2008). *Policy brief: Asian American & Pacific Islander serving institutions*. UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- *Park, J. J., & Chang, M. J. (2010). Asian American Pacific Islander serving institutions: The motivations and challenges behind seeking a federal designation. *AAPJ Nexus: Policy, Practice and Community, 7*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.36650/nexus7.2_107-128_ParkChang
- Patterson, J. T. (2010). *Freedom is not enough: The Moynihan Report and America's struggle over black family life—From LBJ to Obama*. Basic Books.
- Patton Davis, L., & Museus, S. D. (2019). What is deficit thinking? An analysis of conceptualizations of deficit thinking and implications for scholarly research. *Currents, 1*(1), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.110>
- Pendakur, S. L., & Pendakur, V. (2016). Beyond boba tea and samosas: A call for Asian American race consciousness. In S. D. Museus, D. M. Ching, & A. Agbayani (Eds.), *Focusing on the underserved: Immigrant, refugee, and Indigenous Asian American and Pacific Islanders in higher education* (pp. 55–72). Information Age.
- *Pizzolato, J. E., Nguyen, T. K., Johnston, M. P., & Chaudhari, P. (2013). Naming our identity: Diverse understandings of Asian American-ness and student development research. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 124–139). Stylus.
- Poon, O., Squire, D., Kodama, C., Byrd, A., Chan, J., Manzano, L., Furr, S., & Bishundat, D. (2016). A critical review of the model minority myth in selected literature on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(2), 469–502. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315612205>
- Reyes, N. A. S. (2018). A space for survivance: Locating Kānaka Maoli through the resonance and dissonance of critical race theory. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 21*(6), 739–756. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1376632>
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(3), 365–416. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003365>
- Saelua, N., Wright, E. K. A., Kukahiko, K. I. T., & Thornton, M. M. (2016). Pacific Islander education and retention: The development of a student-initiated, student-run outreach program for Pacific Islanders. In S. D. Museus, A. Agbayani, & D. M. Ching (Eds.), *Focusing on the underserved: Immigrant, Refugee, and Indigenous Asian American and Pacific Islanders in higher education* (pp. 121–138). Information Age.

- Schemer, C., Wirth, W., & Matthes, J. (2012). Value resonance and value framing effects on voting intentions in direct-democratic campaigns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *56*(3), 334–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211426329>
- Sexton, J. (2010). Properties of coalition: Blacks, Asians, and the politics of policing. *Critical Sociology*, *36*(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920509347142>
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). A critical race counterstory of race, racism, and affirmative action. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845284>
- *Suzuki, B. H. (2002). Revisiting the model minority stereotype: Implications for student affairs practice and higher education. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2002*(97), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.36>
- Tate, W. F., IV. (1997). Chapter 4: Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, *22*(1), 195–247. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X022001195>
- *Teranishi, R. T. (2010). *Asians in the ivory tower: Dilemmas of racial inequality in American higher education*. Teachers College Press.
- *Teranishi, R. T., Behringer, L. B., Grey, E. A., & Parker, T. L. (2009). Critical race theory and research on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2009*(142), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.296>
- *Teranishi, R. T., & Nguyen, T. K. (2012). Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and the changing demography of the United States: Implications for education policy. *Harvard Journal of Asian American Policy Review*, *22*, 17–27.
- Teves, S. N., & Arvin, M. (2018). Decolonizing API: Centering Indigenous Pacific Islander feminism. In L. Fujiwara & S. Roshanravan (Eds.), *Asian American feminisms and women of color politics* (pp. 107–138). University of Washington Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Clemens, R. F. (2011). Qualitative research and public policy: The challenges of relevance and trustworthiness. In J. Smart & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 26, pp. 57–83). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0702-3_2
- *Tran, M., & Chang, M. J. (2013). To be mice or men: Gender identity and the development of masculinity through participation in Asian American interest fraternities. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 67–85). Stylus.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.
- Uy, P. S. (2015). Supporting Southeast Asian American family and community engagement for educational success. *Journal of Southeast Asian American Education and Advancement*, *10*(2), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.7771/2153-8999.1131>
- Valencia, R. R. (1997). Conceptualizing the notion of deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 1–12). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367855581-1>
- *Vue, R. (2013). Campus contexts and Hmong students' experiences negotiating identity and higher education. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 182–197). Stylus.

- *Wing, J. Y. (2007). Beyond black and white: The model minority myth and the invisibility of Asian American students. *The Urban Review*, 39(4), 455–487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-007-0058-6>
- Wood, J. L., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Advancing Black male student success from preschool through PhD*. Stylus.
- *Wong, A. (2013). Racial identity construction among Chinese American and Filipino American undergraduates. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 86–105). Stylus.
- *Wright, E. K., & Balutski, B. J. N. (2013). The role of context, critical theory, and counter-narratives in understanding Pacific Islander indigeneity. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 140–158). Stylus.
- Wu, F. H. (1995). Neither black nor white: Asian Americans and affirmative action. *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, 15(2), 225–284.
- Xiong, S., & Wood, J. L. (2016). Noncognitive predictors of help-seeking among Southeast Asian men in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(5), 452–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1080201>
- Yi, V. (2018). A phenomenological inquiry into the racialized experiences of Southeast Asian American community college students (UMI No. 108251181) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Yi, V., & Museus, S. D. (2015). The model minority myth. In J. Stone (Ed.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of race, ethnicity and nationalism*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118663202.wberen528>

Authors

VARAXY YI, PhD, is an assistant professor of educational leadership at California State University, Fresno, 5005 N. Maple Avenue M/S ED 303, Fresno, CA 93704-0001; email: varaxy@csufresno.edu. She conducts research to advance equity, access, and opportunity for historically underserved communities, such as racially minoritized, Southeast Asian American, and refugee populations.

JACQUELINE MAC, PhD, is a visiting assistant professor of higher education at Northern Illinois University, Gabel Hall 200, 1425 W. Lincoln Hwy., DeKalb, IL 60115; email: jackimacphd@gmail.com. She examines institutional transformation towards equity in higher education, with a particular focus on equity-oriented teaching and learning pedagogies, effective training and educational interventions, and organizational change processes.

VANESSA S. NA is a doctoral student in education studies at the University of California, San Diego, and a research associate for the National Institute for Transformation and Equity; 4219 Felton Street 2, San Diego, CA 92104; email: vteck@ucsd.edu. Her research examines equity and justice in higher education, with a focus on examining the solidarity and coalition efforts of racially minoritized populations.

Yi et al.

RIKKA J. VENTURANZA is a doctoral student in the Social Science & Comparative Education program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, 2043 Moore Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521; email: rikka@ucla.edu. She serves as a research associate for UCLA's Institute for Immigration, Globalization, and Education. Her research aims to understand the role of immigration status among students of color with a focus on Asian American Pacific Islander students.

SAMUEL D. MUSEUS, PhD, is a professor of education studies at the University of California, San Diego, Pepper Canyon Hall 327, 9500 Gilman Dr. La Jolla, CA 92093; email: smuseus@ucsd.edu. He is also Founding Director of the National Institute for Transformation and Equity. His research agenda is focused on diversity and equity, transforming systems to be more inclusive and equitable, and college student outcomes.

TRACY LACHICA BUENAVISTA, PhD, is a professor of Asian American studies, a core faculty member of the doctoral program in educational leadership, and a faculty mentor for the EOP DREAM Center at California State University, Northridge, University Student Union-Building C, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330-8453; email: tracy.buenavista@csun.edu. In her research, she uses critical race theory to examine the intersection of race, immigration, and carcerality in higher education.

SUMUN L. PENDAKUR, EdD, is chief learning officer and director of the University of Southern California (USC) Equity Institutes at the USC Race and Equity Center, 635 Downey Way, Suite 214, Los Angeles, CA California 90089-333; email: pendakur@rossier.usc.edu. A scholar-practitioner, Sumi held prior roles as assistant vice president for diversity and inclusion at Harvey Mudd College and as the director for USC Asian Pacific American Student Services.