

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Newcomers to the discipline of ethnic studies often ask, “What is ethnic studies?” Even for ethnic studies specialists, this question demands constant rethinking and reformulation because of the emerging nature of the discipline. This introductory chapter attempts to define ethnic studies and to describe its basics and essentials. A brief history of ethnic studies in the United States at the outset serves to provide the historical context for understanding and configuring the discipline. At the core of this chapter are a formal definition of ethnic studies, a description of its subfields, and a demarcation of the discipline in comparison with its neighboring fields. The final section of the chapter outlines the structure of the book.

BRIEF HISTORY OF ETHNIC STUDIES IN AMERICA

Although American scholars embarked on the study of ethnic groups and their interrelations a long time ago, ethnic studies as a discipline did not emerge until the late 1960s (Gutierrez 1994; Hu-DeHart 1993). Before then, there existed no ethnic studies programs and no ethnic studies faculty, and almost no ethnic studies courses were offered at universities and colleges. School curricula had remained unchanged since the beginning of the century and primarily reflected Eurocentric histories and views; they largely overlooked the histories, cultures, and perspectives of minor-

ity groups. Faculty and administrators of higher education were predominantly white males. Ethnic studies was not a concern of American society; ethnicity was viewed by the then-dominant paradigm of ethnic relations—assimilation theory—as a social problem that prevents the full assimilation of ethnic groups into the mainstream of society. The emphasis of American society at that time was on Americanization or assimilation into white Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture.

The turbulent 1960s witnessed waves of social movements and social unrest. The Civil Rights movement, which began in the 1950s, culminated in the mid-1960s, resulting in the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. More and more American people came to agree with the principle that all Americans, regardless of their race or ethnicity, should be treated equally, should have equal access to higher education, and should have their voices heard and their perspectives reflected in higher education. The women's movement arose in about the same period, adding its demand for equal rights and an equal voice to the foray. Anti-Vietnam War demonstrations erupted across the nation. Outside the United States, especially in Africa, Third World people were rising up against colonialism.

These movements inspired student activism on university campuses. In 1968, students at San Francisco State College (now San Francisco State University) formed a coalition of separate ethnic action groups known as the Third World Liberation Front. Students at UC Berkeley rallied for the creation of a Third World College. They rebelled against the status quo and denounced racism, sexism, and elitism. These events culminated in students' occupation of the administrative offices at both campuses, with a demand for fundamental changes in higher education (Hu-DeHart 1993). The movement soon spread to many other campuses throughout the country. Students of color, as well as their white supporters, demanded better access to higher education, changes in curricula to reflect their ethnic cultures and perspectives, recruitment of minority faculty, and establishment of ethnic studies programs.

As a result, ethnic studies programs were created in the late 1960s and the early 1970s as “fire insurance” to appease militant students (Hu-DeHart 1995). Among the pioneers were the School of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University and the Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley. Following their lead, black, Asian American, Chicano/Chicana, and Native American studies programs mushroomed across the nation. Scholars began to pay greater attention to ethnic issues. Ethnic groups, especially minority groups, started to emphasize ethnic consciousness, eth-

nic identity, and ethnic pride. Slogans such as “Black is beautiful” and “Yellow is mellow” partly reflected this shift. Hyphenated terms indicating ethnic identities, such as African-American, Japanese-American, Mexican-American, and Jewish-American became buzzwords. Societal emphasis gradually shifted from assimilation toward ethnic distinctiveness. Ethnic studies as a discipline grew out of this historical context.

Joining this emerging discipline was a renewed interest in the study of white ethnic groups, especially Catholic groups (e.g., the Italians, the Irish), Jews, and Eastern European groups (e.g., the Polish). Researchers who have written about this so-called “ethnic revival” (e.g., Alba 1990; Gans 1979; Kivisto 1989; Novak 1973; Waters 1990) found that even among white ethnic groups, ethnic identities and ethnic cultures did not die out, as evidenced by ethnic awareness, ethnic foods, ethnic languages, ethnic literatures, ethnic festivals, ethnic holidays, and ethnic customs, although they disagreed on the meanings and causes of this ethnic revival. By the late 1970s, a significant number of ethnic studies programs on European groups such as Armenians, Germans, Italians, Polish, Jewish, English, Welsh, Canadians, Czechs, Slavics, Ukrainians, Amish had appeared on the scene (see Washburn 1979). Hence, ethnic studies was not limited to the study of minority groups.

During the latter half of the 1970s, the demand for social justice that bred the Civil Rights movement waned significantly. Budgetary crises in the 1970s forced severe cutbacks in, and consolidation of, ethnic studies programs, and less than half of the existing programs survived into the 1980s. Furthermore, the politically inhospitable climate in the 1980s instigated a backlash against ethnic minority communities and a degradation of their concerns. On college and university campuses, racism was resurrected and racial tension intensified. Ethnic studies was at a low ebb.

Despite setbacks, the reorganization, reconceptualization, and redesign of ethnic studies programs revitalized the field. By the 1990s, ethnic studies as an academic discipline had grown stronger than ever before. One salient feature of this maturation has been the growing institutionalization of ethnic studies programs. Today, there are more than eight hundred ethnic studies programs and departments in the nation (Bataille, Carranza, and Lisa 1996, xiii). Several of the strongest comprehensive ethnic studies programs are housed in public research universities, especially in the West. The Comparative Ethnic Studies Department at UC Berkeley includes programs in Asian American studies, Chicano studies, and Native American studies and houses the first Ph.D. program in ethnic

studies in the United States. Founded in 1990, the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC San Diego takes a comparative approach with no ethnic-specific programs and started its Ph.D. program in ethnic studies in academic year 1996–97. The Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside offers a bachelor's degree in ethnic studies. The Department of American Ethnic Studies at the University of Washington, Seattle, was launched in 1985 by consolidating the existing programs in African American, Asian American, and Chicano studies. In a similar vein, the University of Colorado at Boulder created its Center for Studies of Ethnicity and Race in America (CSERA) in 1987 by merging the black studies and Chicano studies programs and adding new ones in Asian American and American Indian studies. In 1996 the Department of Ethnic Studies took the place of CSERA. Bowling Green State University has one of the oldest ethnic studies departments, founded in 1979 with a comprehensive and comparative orientation (Perry and Pauly 1988).

Many other research universities have departments, programs, or centers in one or more ethnic studies subfields. Examples include Harvard University, Brown University, Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Michigan, the University of Southern California, UCLA, and other UC campuses. In recent years, an increasing number of research universities outside the West have been making genuine efforts to establish ethnic studies programs, partly as a response to student demonstrations or demands. Many teaching universities have also installed ethnic studies departments or programs. Most notable is the twenty-three-campus California State University system. Almost all the Cal State campuses have either a comprehensive ethnic studies department or ethnic-specific departments or programs. Particularly, San Francisco State University houses the only College of Ethnic Studies in the country.

The institutionalization of ethnic studies programs has been accompanied by a growing number of faculty engaged in ethnic studies teaching and research. They are represented by several professional associations: The National Association for Ethnic Studies, the American Indian Studies Association, the National Association of African American Studies, the National Council for Black Studies, the Association for Asian American Studies, the National Association of Hispanic and Latin Studies, the National Association of Chicano Studies, and the Puerto Rican Studies Association.

The establishment of ethnic studies departments or programs and the recruitment of full-time faculty in ethnic studies have resulted in a prodigious amount of scholarship. Exemplary works encompass not only the well-known writings of Cornel West, Henry Louis Gates, and bell hooks, but also Ramon Guitierrez's highly original study of power and sexuality in colonial New Mexico; Michael Omi and Howard Winant's acclaimed book on racial formation; Ronald Takaki's and Sucheng Chan's outstanding narratives of Asian American history; and Ward Churchill's powerful defense of Native American sovereignty (Hu-DeHart 1993).

Increasingly, ethnic studies courses have become part of requirements for degree programs or an important portion of the curriculum. For example, successful completion of a number of ethnic studies courses is a graduation requirement for all undergraduate students at many UC and Cal State campuses, the University of Colorado at Boulder, Washington State University, etc. Enrollments in ethnic studies programs or courses have increased substantially. At UC Berkeley, the Ethnic Studies Department enrolls more than eight thousand students each year, and there are still about two thousand students on the waiting list (Hu-DeHart 1995).

Ethnic studies is gaining importance. This trend is likely to continue in the near future as American society becomes increasingly multiethnic and the ethnic composition of the college student population continues to diversify.

WHAT IS ETHNIC STUDIES?

Defining Ethnic Studies

Unlike well-established disciplines, there is a lack of consensus among ethnic studies scholars as to what ethnic studies is, or what constitutes the domain of ethnic studies. The National Association for Ethnic Studies defines ethnic studies as "an interdisciplinary voice for the continuing focused study of race and ethnicity," while others consider ethnic studies as the study of minority groups. Still others maintain that ethnic studies should focus on the intersection among race, ethnicity, gender, and class (Butler 1991).

In this book, I define *ethnic studies* as an interdisciplinary, multidisci-

plinary, and comparative study of ethnic groups and their interrelations, with an emphasis on groups that have historically been neglected. Elaboration of this definition is in order.

One important component of ethnic studies is the study of ethnic groups (defined in this chapter). Ethnic studies has profound interests in all social aspects of ethnic groups including their histories (e.g., origin, immigration, settlement, population changes, and socioeconomic transformations); cultures (e.g., languages, religions, customs, and popular cultures); institutions and organizations (e.g., family, school, economic institutions, political, social, and religious organizations); identities; experiences; and contributions to American culture and society.

Another vital component of ethnic studies is the study of intergroup relations, which include ethnic stratification; social, economic, and spatial interactions among ethnic groups; political power relations; cooperation and conflict between groups; ethnic prejudice and stereotype; ethnic discrimination; and so on. Individual ethnic groups may be better understood in comparison with and relationship to other ethnic groups. Ethnic studies seeks to capture the social, economic, cultural, and historical forces that shape the development of diverse ethnic groups and their interrelations.

Ethnic studies adopts interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and comparative approaches to knowledge. Ethnic studies scholars study ethnic groups and their interrelations through the combination and integration of perspectives of various disciplines, including anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology, and humanities (e.g., philosophy, literature, linguistics, arts). That is why ethnic studies scholars are of very diverse backgrounds, including social scientists and humanities specialists. Furthermore, ethnic studies emphasizes a comparative approach in order to understand the history, culture, and institutions of ethnic groups in comparison with others. It focuses on common trends and experiences of different ethnic groups. In addition, ethnic studies uses some discipline-based methodologies of the social sciences and humanities. The methodologies of ethnic studies will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 2.

Currently, the emphasis of ethnic studies is on those ethnic groups that have been neglected in the past. Ethnic studies is concerned about all ethnic groups but focuses on minority groups such as African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans. A prime reason is that traditional disciplines have largely omitted the history, cul-

ture, and experience of minority groups and their contributions to the shaping of U.S. culture and society. This partly explains why ethnic studies departments or programs are normally staffed with specialists in specific minority groups or in comparative studies of ethnic groups. Ethnic studies seeks to recover and reconstruct the history of minority groups, to identify and credit their contribution to American culture and institutions, to chronicle their protest and resistance, and to establish alternative values and visions, cultures and institutions (Hu-Dehart 1993, 52).

Ethnic Group

Since ethnic group comprises an important constituent of ethnic studies, an accurate grasp of this concept is a prerequisite for further discussions. Scholars have not yet reached an agreement on how to define this seemingly straightforward concept. Two definitions are often used: a narrow definition and a broad definition. In terms of the narrow definition, an *ethnic group* is a group socially distinguished, by others or by itself, on the basis of its unique culture or national origin (see, for example, Feagin and Feagin 1993).

According to this definition, ethnic group is defined by cultural characteristics (e.g., language, religion, customs) or by national origin. Note that one of the two conditions—a unique culture *or* a unique national origin—suffices to define an ethnic group. For example, Italians are an ethnic group because they have a distinctive culture (e.g., the Italian language and Catholicism) or a unique national origin (i.e., Italy). Similarly, Germans, the Irish, the English, and the Polish are ethnic groups since each group has a unique national origin and/or culture. This determination can be made by others or by the group itself.

However, according to this definition, whites are not an ethnic group, because they lack a distinctive national origin and do not have a uniform culture. Whites consist of many nationality and cultural groups. You may wonder, if whites are not an ethnic group, what are they? The answer is that whites are a racial group. A *racial group* is a group socially distinguished, by others or by itself, on the basis of its unique physical characteristics such as skin color, eye color, hair color, facial structure, etc. Based on this definition, racial groups are defined physically *and* socially. Physical characteristics are the basis, but social determination is also important.

It should be emphasized that racial group categorization is mainly determined by the larger society and by the group itself rather than deter-

mined by purely biological factors. The change of racial identity of Asian Indians (not to be confused with American Indians) provides a good example. In the 1950 to 1970 U.S. censuses, Asian Indians were classified as whites. The primary reason was that the bulk of their ancestors were Caucasians (Aryans) who migrated about four thousand years ago from Europe to India where they subdued and intermarried with the natives of the India subcontinent—the Dravidians. As a result of the intermarriage between the tall, light-skinned Caucasians and the short, darker-skinned Dravidians as well as India's close location to the Equator, their descendants today have Caucasian features but darker skin. However, Asian Indians did not like to be classified as whites partly because this classification would not enable them to obtain an accurate count of their group population and to receive benefits entitled to minority groups. During the 1970s, the Association of Indians in America (AIA) intensively lobbied Congress, pressing for their reclassification (Sheth 1995). They argued that their ancestors came from Asia rather than from Europe. The Census Bureau held many hearings. Finally, starting in the 1980 U.S. census Asian Indians were reclassified as Asian Americans (Sheth 1995). The social construction of race or ethnicity will be further elaborated in chapter 3.

Currently, the U.S. government defines white Americans, black or African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans as racial groups. However, the government does not define Hispanic Americans or Latinos as a racial group. Hispanics are defined solely in terms of the Spanish language rather than in terms of physical characteristics. Latinos are defined in terms of geographical origin—Latin America—rather than physical traits. In the 1980 and 1990 U.S. censuses, Hispanics were classified as culturally defined ethnic groups. As a result, they overlapped with whites, blacks, or Asians. For instance, some Cubans and Mexicans were also classified as whites, just as some Puerto Ricans were pigeonholed as blacks. Moreover, many people, as well as the federal government, use the terms *Latino* and *Hispanic* interchangeably.¹ A scrutiny of some basic facts reveals their nuance. Hispanics are to Americans who speak Spanish while Latinos refer to Americans whose origins can be traced back to Latin America. Note that not all people from Latin America speak Spanish; rather, a significant proportion of them speak English (e.g., those from Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, the Bahamas, and Grenada),

1. Since Latino is a more popular term in the western United States, the Clinton administration decided in October 1997 that, in lieu of the term "Hispanic," "Hispanic or Latino" will be used for the Hispanic origin question on the 2000 census.

French (e.g., Haitians), Portuguese (e.g., Brazilians), and Dutch (e.g., Surinamese). Hence, Hispanics and Latinos are not synonymous. They do overlap to a great extent though. For example, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans—the three largest Latino groups—are all Hispanics. In this book the term Latino is preferred over the term Hispanics. Neither, however, may fit the definition of racial group.

The *broad* definition of *ethnic group* defines ethnic group as a group socially distinguished, by others or by itself, on the basis of its unique culture, national origin, or racial characteristics.

The only difference between the broad definition and the narrow definition lies in that the broad definition includes racial or physical characteristics as a determining factor. In light of the broad definition, ethnic groups include racial groups. Not all the three conditions (culture, national origin, or race) are required, and an ethnic group can be identified as long as one of the conditions is met. Hence, Italians, Germans, Jewish, Irish, English, Polish, and other European groups are ethnic groups; whites are also an ethnic group because they can be defined in terms of their racial characteristics. To distinguish between the two categories of ethnic groups, one may consider white Americans, black Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans as *broad ethnic groups*, while Irish Americans, Chinese Americans, Mexican Americans, and so forth may be labeled *specific ethnic groups*.

Unless specified otherwise, this book uses the broad definition of ethnic group. The broad definition enables us to include both racial groups and culturally defined ethnic groups in our studies. Both racially defined ethnic groups and culturally defined ethnic groups are within the domain of ethnic studies. The broad definition can also help us understand the process of ethnic formation and thus avoid unnecessary altercation over the complex and sometimes overlapping boundaries between a culturally defined ethnic group and a racial group. For instance, African Americans are a racial group, but it can be argued that African Americans have also *become* an ethnic group through the creation of new African American culture, institutions, identity, and sense of peoplehood (Pitts 1982). Using the broad definition of ethnic group avoids the unneeded dispute over whether African Americans should be treated as a racial group or as an ethnic group. Furthermore, the broad definition is increasingly being used by scholars and the public. Although some researchers sense political overtones here, scholarly coherence and practical consideration probably overshadow the political tinge (see, for instance, Essed 1991, 28). Finally, the

use of the broad definition of ethnic group can be traced back to the writings of such important scholars as Max Weber (1961), Milton Gordon (1964, 27), Nathan Glazer (1971), and Thomas Sowell (1981), to name just a few. Despite the embrace of the broad definition of ethnic group in this book, the term racial group is also used from time to time in a context strictly related to racially defined ethnic groups.

SUBFIELDS OF ETHNIC STUDIES

In the United States, ethnic studies currently consists of several subfields: African American studies or black studies, Asian American studies, Hispanic and/or Latino studies, and Native American studies. All of these subfields share some common concerns, assumptions, and principles, but each subfield has its special interest in a particular minority group. African American studies, for instance, focuses on the experience of African Americans and their relations with other groups. The most organized fields within Latino studies are Chicano/a studies and Puerto Rican studies, the former having an emphasis on Americans of Mexican descent. There are further divisions within some of these subfields. Chinese American studies, Japanese American studies, Filipino American studies, and Korean American studies are some examples of such divisions within Asian American studies.

These subfields are relatively autonomous. Each has its own constituency. Each is represented by at least one national professional association, such as the American Indian Studies Association, the National Association of African American Studies, the National Council for Black Studies, the Association for Asian American Studies, and the National Association of Hispanic and Latin Studies.² Each organization convenes an annual meeting. All organizations have their own publications.

In the past three decades, the combination of the subfields has generated numerous volumes of commendable caliber on particular ethnic groups. The present book does not seek to duplicate this endeavor and therefore devotes no special chapters to particular ethnic groups. It does, however, use the experience of particular ethnic groups as illustrations. The reader interested in specific groups is referred to the following texts: John Franklin and Alfred Moss Jr.'s *From Slavery to Freedom*, and Alphonso Pinkney's *Black Americans* on African Americans;

2. These associations often proclaim their domains to be independent disciplines.

Takaki's *From a Different Shore* and Sucheng Chan's *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History* on Asian Americans; Joan Moore and Harry Pachon's *Hispanics in the United States*, Rodolfo Acuna's *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, Clara Rodriguez's *Puerto Ricans: Born in the U.S.A.*, and Jose Llanes's *Cuban Americans: Masters of Survival* on Latinos; and Annette Jaimes's *The State of Native America* and Matthew Snipp's *American Indians: The First of This Land* on Native Americans.

WHAT ETHNIC STUDIES IS NOT

Increasingly, traditional boundaries of disciplines are blurred. Nevertheless, certain confines do exist in order to define a discipline, at least until a greater integration of disciplines arrives. This section seeks to briefly demarcate ethnic studies from other disciplines where confusion about its boundaries often arises.

Ethnic studies is not international area studies. Often students and laymen mistake international area studies for ethnic studies. For instance, "Asian American studies" is often mixed up with "Asian studies." The Asian American Studies program at UC Berkeley had to post a note outside its office, proclaiming that "This is Asian American Studies Program, NOT Asian Studies Program." Similarly, distinctions between African American studies and African studies and between Latino studies and Latin America studies seem less palpable to outsiders. In general, area studies focuses on a particular region or country outside the United States and its relations with the United States, while ethnic studies centers on a particular group in America that originates from a region or country. The former is internationally oriented whereas the latter is domestic in orientation. Sharp distinctions notwithstanding, linkages and overlapping between the two fields do exist. For instance, ethnic studies pays attention to how conditions in the country of origin and its relations with the U.S. affect the status and experience of the ethnic group in America from that area, and area studies is also interested in the impact of the ethnic group in the U.S. on its country of origin. Because of the connections between countries of origin and experiences of ethnic groups in America as well as the need for cross-national comparison of ethnic relations, ethnic studies also demands an international component to its curriculum.

Ethnic studies does not equate with cultural studies, though the two disciplines do overlap to some extent. Emerging in the 1950s in Great

Britain, cultural studies is a field that has continuously shifted its interests and focus (During 1993, 1–25). A main difference is that cultural studies emphasizes the culture of a society, which may include ways of life, cultural forms, cultural industries, cultural markets, cultural products, cultural policies, and subcultures, whereas ethnic studies focuses on ethnic groups (including their cultures as well as their histories and social institutions) and intergroup relations.

Ethnic studies and women's studies should have different emphases. Both ethnic studies and women's studies grew out of the 1960s and share similar concerns of achieving equality between the sexes or among ethnic groups. Some ethnic studies scholars underscore the importance of researching the intersection of race, ethnicity, gender, and class. While this is legitimate, women's studies also places a great emphasis on the intersection among race, ethnicity, gender, and class. In spite of common interests, a division of labor between the two disciplines ought to be made. Naturally, ethnic studies should focus on the ethnic dimension while women's studies should devote more effort to the gender dimension, even when both deal with the junction of the multiple dimensions.

Ethnic studies differs from other disciplines of social sciences and humanities in its basic methodologies. Other disciplines of social sciences and humanities study issues that concern ethnic studies scholars, such as ethnic stratification, ethnic interactions, ethnic prejudice and discrimination, etc. However, ethnic studies differs from those disciplines in that it uses interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and comparative approaches while those disciplines mainly rely on discipline-bound methodologies.

Some people outside ethnic studies tend to equate ethnic studies with political activism. Undeniably, ethnic studies originated from student political movement. Nevertheless, as it has evolved, ethnic studies cannot and should not be characterized as political activism, demonstration, protest, or the like. Ethnic studies is a scientific inquiry of ethnic groups and their interrelations. It pursues knowledge that will advance the interests of traditionally underprivileged ethnic groups and will help achieve eventual equality among all ethnic groups.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

Ethnic Studies: Issues and Approaches consists of three parts and fifteen chapters. Part I, *Basics of Ethnic Studies*, includes two chapters. Fol-

lowing the current introductory chapter, chapter 2 acquaints the reader with methodologies of ethnic studies. To lay a foundation for the basic methodologies of ethnic studies, this chapter first introduces a number of important disciplinary methods used by ethnic studies researchers, such as field research, survey research, experiment, and content analysis. It then focuses on the overarching methodologies of ethnic studies—interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinary, and comparativeness—with an emphasis on their characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages in comparison to traditional disciplinary methodologies. The chapter also briefly discusses discourse analysis, which is gaining recognition in ethnic studies.

Part II, *Major Issues in Ethnic Studies*, comprises eleven chapters. Chapter 3 focuses on competing theoretical perspectives on the nature and basis of ethnicity. These theories are categorized into three schools of thought: the primordialist school, the constructionist school, and the instrumentalist school. Specific theories within each school are analyzed and evaluated. The emphasis of this chapter is the presentation of my own approach, which integrates the contesting theories of ethnicity.

Chapter 4 considers ethnic stratification, a very common phenomenon in societies consisting of different ethnic groups and a central issue in ethnic studies. This chapter defines some basic concepts relating to ethnic stratification, describes ethnic stratification among human societies, outlines preconditions for its emergence, and delves into its origins. Several theoretical perspectives on ethnic stratification including the social-Darwinian approach, the social-psychological approach, the functionalist approach, the conflict approach, and the Donald Noel hypothesis are reviewed. It also examines the genesis of ethnic stratification between blacks and whites, between Indians and whites, and between Chicanos and whites in the United States.

In an ethnically stratified society, how do different ethnic groups adapt to one another, or what are the processes and outcomes of ethnic interaction or adaptation? Chapter 5 seeks to answer this question in the context of the United States. The chapter sets the stage for discussion by briefly reviewing the history of immigration to the United States. The pivot then shifts to a discussion of various approaches to ethnic adaptation, including assimilation theory, melting-pot theory, cultural pluralism theory, the ethnogenesis perspective, the internal colonialism perspective, and the class approaches. Finally, the chapter addresses the issue of interethnic unity versus separation.

Chapter 6 discusses ethnic differences in socioeconomic achieve-

ment. The chapter first presents empirical evidence on ethnic differences in socioeconomic achievements and then explores the determinants of these differences. Two categories of explanations are assessed: (1) Internal explanations, such as the biological argument, the cultural explanation, the social class approach, and the immigrant argument; and (2) external or structural explanations, such as the discrimination argument, the economic restructuring perspective, and the contextual perspective. The final section seeks a synthesis of the existing approaches.

The next three chapters consider interrelated topics of ethnic prejudice, ethnic discrimination, and racism, which shape ethnic stratification, ethnic adaptation, and socioeconomic achievement. Ethnic prejudice is the topic of chapter 7. This chapter begins with defining the concept of ethnic prejudice and its three dimensions. It proceeds with a review of empirical evidence on changes in ethnic prejudice in America. The focus of the chapter then turns to the examination of theories of ethnic prejudice, such as biological explanations, psychological theories, social learning theory, and conflict theory. The chapter closes with a synthesis of competing theories.

As a continuation of the previous chapter, chapter 8 is devoted to ethnic discrimination. Discussions include the concept of ethnic discrimination; various types of ethnic discrimination; and explanations of ethnic discrimination, including the prejudice hypothesis, functional/gain theory, class conflict theory, and social pressure theory. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the relationship between ethnic prejudice and ethnic discrimination.

Chapter 9 centers on racism, which is overlapped with ethnic prejudice and discrimination. While ethnic prejudice and discrimination apply to circumstances involving broadly defined ethnic groups in general, racism appertains to contexts strictly involving racial groups. This chapter examines the evolution of the concept “racism,” presents a formal definition of this concept and its dimensions, analyzes racism in the English language and in American social institutions, and finally considers its effects on minorities and white Americans.

Chapter 10 analyzes ethnic segregation, an important dimension of ethnic interaction. The chapter provides an introduction to the concept and dimensions of ethnic segregation. The core of the chapter is residential segregation—the most common type of segregation that remains pervasive today. Discussions include measures, levels and trends, causes, and

consequences of residential segregation. School segregation, which is still significant in American society, is also examined.

Ethnic interaction may not always result in assimilation or integration, and oftentimes it leads to ethnic conflict. Chapter 11 considers this facet of ethnic relations. The chapter first proposes a definition of ethnic conflict and delineates its various forms. The emphasis then switches to major theories of ethnic conflict, including cultural-clash explanation, human ecology theory, competition theory, the ethnic inequality argument, and class theory. It also analyzes Korean-black conflict in order to shed light on the causes of interminority antagonism. Efforts are also made to outline a more inclusive theory of ethnic conflict. The chapter discusses the scope, trend, and causes of “hate crime” against minorities as well.

Chapter 12 addresses ethnicity and politics, a topic that is important but inadequately addressed in the existing literature. This chapter analyzes ethnic differentiation in political party affiliation, political ideology, voting behavior, and political representation in government, and factors that influence differential power across ethnic groups.

Chapter 13 attempts to synopsize the burgeoning literature on the intersections and workings of race, class, and gender. The chapter highlights analytical approaches to the relationships among race, class, and gender, how the tripolar dimensions interlock to affect gender roles, work, power status, and sexuality, and how the triplicity interacts with social institutions.

Part III, *Social Action Agendas and Future of Ethnic Studies*, contains two chapters. Chapter 14 discusses current issues in ethnic studies that demand social actions, such as affirmative action and Proposition 209, illegal immigration and Proposition 187, the immigration debate, bilingual education and Proposition 227, and the English-Only movement. The pros and cons of each of these issues are presented and assessed.

The final chapter explores issues that are vital for the future development of ethnic studies. These include institutionalization of ethnic studies, academization versus politicization of ethnic studies, multiculturalism and ethnic studies, the study of whiteness and ethnic studies, and ethnic diversity and national unity.