



A Model Minority? The Misrepresentation and Underrepresentation of Asian Pacific Americans in Introductory American Government Textbooks

Okiyoshi Takeda

To cite this article: Okiyoshi Takeda (2016) A Model Minority? The Misrepresentation and Underrepresentation of Asian Pacific Americans in Introductory American Government Textbooks, *Journal of Political Science Education*, 12:4, 387-402, DOI: [10.1080/15512169.2016.1142449](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2016.1142449)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2016.1142449>



Published online: 11 Apr 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 39



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

A Model Minority? The Misrepresentation and Underrepresentation of Asian Pacific Americans in Introductory American Government Textbooks

Okiyoshi Takeda

Aoyama Gakuin University

ABSTRACT

Asian Pacific Americans are a racial group that is often viewed in stereotypes, most notably, as a “model minority”—a view that this group is naturally hardworking and successful unlike “other” racial and ethnic groups. Quite often, they are also neglected as U.S. citizens, whose presence and influence in American politics are not acknowledged. This study of 28 college-level introductory American government textbooks investigates the extent to which and the ways in which Asian Pacific Americans are misrepresented and underrepresented. The findings show that many textbooks reproduce the model-minority stereotype of Asian Pacific Americans despite criticisms from scholars in Asian American Studies, although some textbooks caution against depicting them in this stereotype. In addition, this analysis reveals that textbooks fail to include important and appropriate information on Asian Pacific Americans and contain many questionable statements regarding historical facts about them. The study concludes that this situation is of concern and provides suggestions on how to improve current textbooks.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 May 2015

Accepted 11 December 2015

KEYWORDS

Asian Pacific Americans;
model minority;
misrepresentation;
textbooks;
underrepresentation

Introduction

Stereotyped portrayals of racial and ethnic groups and women in society are still disseminated. These social groups are misrepresented and underrepresented in books, television programs, films, the news, and social media. One group that is subjected to a significant degree of stereotyping is Asian Pacific Americans. Regardless of their ethnicity, they are viewed in certain stereotypes, most notably as a “model minority”—a stereotype typically applied to Asian Americans and that portrays them as a naturally hardworking and economically and socially successful group, despite being “nonwhite,” and without resorting to civil rights activism. Those who hold this stereotyped view often believe that the success of Asian Americans stems from their cultural and family tradition of emphasizing education (Junn 2007).

Since college may be a good place to correct such stereotyping in society, examining whether such correction in fact takes place is an important task. More specifically, revealing how Asian Pacific Americans are represented, misrepresented, and underrepresented in college-level introductory American government and politics textbooks (hereafter

“textbooks”) will shed light on how well the discipline does in teaching about their place in U.S. society. Such a task may “offer insight into the message students commonly receive about” their presence and influence in U.S. politics (Cassese and Bos 2013, 214). Doing so will also identify how depictions and written content on Asian Pacific Americans in textbooks can be improved and informed.

In this article, “proper representation” means that Asian Pacific Americans are depicted without bias in textbooks in factually accurate ways. Proper representation also means that Asian Pacific Americans appear to a degree that reflects their contribution to U.S. society. For example, if there is a politically important Asian American, he or she should be mentioned; if there are data on how Asian Americans voted, they should be correctly reported. Moreover, there should be some acknowledgement that in the 2010 census, Asian Americans comprised 4.8% (Asian alone) and 5.6% (multiracial Asian) of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau 2012a). Given their increasing population and growing influence, Asian Pacific Americans deserve substantial mentions of their importance in U.S. society. Failure to do so would constitute misrepresentation and underrepresentation.

The purpose of this study is to examine textbooks for the representation, misrepresentation, and underrepresentation of Asian Pacific Americans by addressing the following research questions: To what degree are Asian Pacific Americans properly represented? More specifically, to what degree are Asian Pacific Americans depicted in the model minority stereotype? What information that is important for reflecting the presence and influence of Asian Pacific Americans is omitted in textbooks? Are statements about Asian Pacific Americans factually correct?

Takeda (2015) looked at how many textbook pages included discussion of Asian Pacific Americans and revealed an average coverage of just 1.13 pages per book (0.19%). However, the present study goes further by investigating *to what extent* and *in which ways* Asian Pacific Americans are represented, misrepresented, or underrepresented in textbooks. Building on the extant literature on the representation, misrepresentation, and underrepresentation of other racial and ethnic groups and women in textbooks, this article shows that Asian Pacific Americans are indeed viewed as a model minority, are neglected in textbooks and are often explained with incorrect information.

Studies of racial and ethnic groups and women in textbooks

Introductory college textbooks are important materials for critical examination for at least two reasons. First, representation, misrepresentation, and underrepresentation of social groups occur because these textbooks are not a simple aggregation of neutral “facts” but rather products of political and social struggles. As Apple and Christian-Smith argue, textbooks “are at once the results of political, economic, and cultural activities, battles, and compromises. They are conceived, designed, and authored by real people with real interests. They are published within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources, and power” (1991, 1–2). Political and economic forces select information about a powerful group as “legitimate” knowledge of the discipline and publish it in textbooks, while they treat other information as irrelevant or interpret it to their advantage. Thus, textbooks, essentially, “appear as gatekeepers of ideas, values, and knowledge” (Foster 1999, 253). This is particularly true with minority racial and ethnic groups and women, whose marginal status in the U.S. system of power has often resulted in misrepresentation and underrepresentation.

Once published in textbooks, biased and stereotypical depictions of these groups “are presented to students as authoritative, objective, and factual representations; furthermore, students expect that their course material is truthful, factual, unbiased, and without stereotypical depictions” (Eisenstein and Clark 2013, 90). While this can be examined at various levels of college education, the most important place to begin is with introductory college textbooks, as “[i]t is intrinsically important and interesting to know what [college students] are taught in those textbooks and to think about how what they are taught may impact on their general view of citizenship” (Franke and Bagby 2005, 249).

Second, introductory college textbooks are the major source of information for students who have not declared their majors. Students often decide whether to major in a discipline after attending an introductory course, and political science is no exception. The contents of introductory textbooks play a crucial role in drawing students from diverse social groups into the field. When textbooks are written in a way “reinforcing stereotypes about social groups,” this may influence readers in the misrepresented groups to abandon the discipline, because “[s]tudents with marginalized identities are particularly attuned to these kinds of messages” (Cassese, Bos, and Schneider 2014, 254). As a result, “the content of courses ... can affect the demographic characteristics of students in the major” (Cassese and Bos 2013, 215). Thus, if Asian Pacific American students find little representation of Asian Pacific Americans in textbooks or perceive stereotypical portrayals, they may feel political science is not a relevant or desirable discipline in which to major. Relatedly, those students who do not major in political science will in time “go on to become professionals—including policymakers, lawyers, and judges in a position to influence” policies and laws that affect racial and ethnic groups and women (Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemski 1999, 59). These college graduates who only learn about diverse social groups through biased and limited misinformation may thereby come to form personal opinions and make policy and legal decisions that may prove detrimental to these social groups.

Portrayals of racial and ethnic groups and women in textbooks

Previous studies on the representation of diverse, social groups have generally concluded that textbooks were alike in their negligence of coverage (Stroup and Garriott 1997; but see Cassese and Bos 2013, 219). Mention of racial and ethnic groups was mostly confined to the chapter on civil rights, whether they were African Americans (Wallace and Allen 2008; Wallace and Clayton 2009), Latinos and Latinas (hereafter Latino/as) (Monforti and McGlynn 2010), women (Cassese and Bos 2013; Cassese, Bos, and Schneider 2014), and/or lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people (Novkov and Gossett 2007). Olivo (2012) reported that the percentage of women was higher in images, or in sidebars, tables, figures, and charts, than in the written text in textbooks, and that these mentions were mostly confined to white, middle-class women. Eksterowicz and Watson (2000) counted the number of references to U.S. first ladies in introductory American Government as well as more advanced presidency textbooks and concluded that the coverage was “sporadic, spotty, and sometimes nonexistent” (p. 589).

Moreover, previous studies have found that *misrepresented* images were often attached to racial and ethnic groups and women in textbooks. Monforti and McGlynn (2010, 311–312) noted that discussions of Latino/as were often made in the context of “illegal” immigration. Allen and Wallace (2010) found that most of the *positive* pictures of African Americans were

not linked to a role of decision makers at the federal government level. Ashley and Jarratt-Ziemski (1999) reported that Native Americans were ignored and received the least space among racial and ethnic groups along with Asian Americans. They also found that textbooks did not mention differences among American Indian nations, discussed the topic as if all Indian nations were engaged in gaming, and failed to recognize the sovereignty status of American Indian governments in federalism. Clawson and Kegler (2000) showed that textbooks treated poverty as if it was an African American problem by publishing a larger percentage of pictures of poor African Americans than reflected the truth. Cassese, Bos, and Schneider's (2014) digital content analysis textbooks found that there were few "[r]eferences to female candidate(s), woman/women candidate(s), women in leadership, and woman/women leader(s)" and that women were not seriously portrayed as political actors (p. 262; see also Cassese and Bos 2013). All of the studies suggest that these social groups are generally misrepresented or underrepresented in textbooks. The question to consider is the following: Does the same pattern hold for Asian Pacific Americans?

Portrayals of Asian Pacific Americans in textbooks

Research on the inclusion and depiction of Asian Pacific Americans in college-level textbooks has not been extensively conducted. Okihiro (1997) observed in his pedagogical pamphlet that in American history textbooks, Asian Americans appeared either "as objects of exclusion in the nineteenth-century anti-Chinese movement and as 'Americans betrayed' in the concentration camps of the twentieth century" or as those who contributed to white society through "American agriculture" and "work on the railroads" (p. 2). Okihiro also reported that when he gave students an exercise to "locate and survey U.S. history texts for depictions of Asian Americans," "[i]nvariably, they find that Asians are largely absent, and that when included, Asians are presented mainly as victims" (1997, 24–25). In a review of the treatment of the Trans-Mississippi West in American history textbooks, Limerick noted that "Asian Americans thus make brief appearances for the building of the Central Pacific Railroad, the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Japanese-American [*sic*] relocation camps, and the upsurge in Asian immigration in the last twenty-five years" (1992, 1390, Footnote 25).

Theory and hypotheses

Based on previous work, I theorize that textbooks misrepresent and underrepresent minority racial and ethnic groups and women in general. Most textbooks are written by mainstream scholars who are not familiar with the politics of minority racial and ethnic groups and women (but see Cassese, Bos, and Schneider 2014). In the case of Asian Pacific Americans, although their population is increasing rapidly (U.S. Census Bureau 2012a), textbook authors may not be sufficiently aware of their history and presence—partly due to their tendency to look at race relations through a biracial, black–white paradigm. Moreover, most textbooks are written in formats dictated by commercial markets (e.g., California or Texas). For example, it is customary to discuss African Americans' struggle in the chapter on civil rights, explaining the importance of *Brown vs. Board of Education* case and Martin Luther King Jr. (Wallace and Allen 2008); however, such issues are not discussed fully in relation to other minority racial and ethnic groups. Each textbook follows

the same structure to compete in the market; in such a situation, it is likely that textbook authors have little incentive to include depictions of Asian Pacific Americans.

Therefore, I hypothesize that textbook authors either underrepresent Asian Pacific Americans or, when they do discuss them, misrepresent them in the model-minority stereotype. Scholars in Asian American Studies have criticized the characterization of Asian Americans as the model minority for at least four reasons¹:

1. This stereotype is used to “discipline” other minority racial and ethnic groups, particularly African Americans and Latino/as, without mentioning them;
2. The power of this stereotype can refute the existence of some Asian Pacific American ethnic groups with low socioeconomic status, such as Cambodian, Laotian, and Hmong refugees;
3. The stereotype puts pressure and excessive burden on education among young Asian American students themselves; and
4. This stereotype uncritically “celebrates the American Dream and equalitarianism” while masking racism that creates additional “costs of assimilation” to Asian Americans (Larson 2006, 136).

Although Asian Americans have high median household incomes relative to other social groups, including non-Hispanic whites, it is important to understand this statistic in context. U.S. immigration policies have led to the selective recruitment of highly educated immigrants from Asia. Moreover, most Asian Americans reside in large metropolitan areas across the United States (especially in Hawaii), where the cost of living is much higher than the average. Another factor behind the U.S. median household income data is that, on average, Asian Pacific American (especially Southeastern Asian American) households include more members than other American households do (Aoki and Takeda 2008, 41–42).

Nevertheless, the model minority stereotype is widespread in U.S. society. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: The model-minority stereotype of Asian Pacific Americans is (re)produced in textbooks.

Although research on Asian Pacific American politics has grown significantly over the past two decades in terms of both volume and breadth, with quite a number of books and journal articles appearing almost every year (e.g., Aoki and Takeda 2008; Collet and Lien 2009; Kim 2000; Lai 2010; Lien 2001; Lien, Conway, and Wong 2004; Nakanishi and Lai 2014–2015; Saito 1998; Wong 2006; Wong et al. 2011). Despite this, I hypothesize that textbook authors fail to cite or do not incorporate such research because they have no incentive to familiarize themselves with these studies and therefore fail to include them:

Hypothesis 2: Information that is important for reflecting the presence and influence of Asian Pacific Americans in U.S. politics is often omitted from textbooks.

I also hypothesize that when textbook authors do not have access to reliable sources on historical events and political issues concerning Asian Pacific Americans, they may cite inaccurate information:

Hypothesis 3: Statements about Asian Pacific Americans are often factually inaccurate in textbooks.

Method and approach

The sample for this study is comprised of 28 textbooks. I selected later editions of the same textbooks as in Monforti and McGlynn (2010), who identified all textbooks from major textbook publishers. While this sample may exclude some new textbooks and those from smaller publishers, it covers a microcosm of the textbooks used in the market. References to Asian Pacific Americans were identified first by using indexes (Ferree and Hall 1996, 937), searching index categories such as “Asian American,” “Japanese American,” and “Chinese Americans.” After reading the pages denoted by these index categories, other mentions were identified by reading most of the textbook pages including chapters of civil rights, civil liberties, three branches of the government, and “behavior” (such as political opinion, interest groups, elections, and voting), skipping only pages where Asian Pacific Americans were unlikely to be found (the chapter on the Constitutional Convention, for example). Doing so increased the chances that most references to Asian Pacific Americans would be located.

The term “Asian Pacific Americans” denotes a combination of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. “Asian Americans” are immigrants and refugees or their descendants, “having origins in ... the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam” (U.S. Census Bureau 2012a, 2). “Pacific Islanders” are indigenous people who are categorized by the U.S. government as “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,” who have origins in “Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands” (U.S. Census Bureau 2012b, 2).

The ethnic diversity of Asian Pacific Americans is recognized in textbooks. For example, one textbook has a subheading “Diversity” in the “Asian Americans” section and states that “[l]ike Hispanics, the Asian American population is diverse” and refers readers to a pie chart of the Asian population divided by countries of origin (Barbour and Wright 2012, 217, emphasis added). Another textbook notes that “[t]he U.S. Census Bureau classifies Asian Americans together for statistical purposes, but like Hispanics, they show significant differences in culture, language, and political experience in the United States” (Magleby, Light, and Nemacheck 2011, 140, emphasis added). It is interesting that both citations acknowledge the diversity within Asian Americans but do so in comparison to that of Latino/as.

Results

Hypothesis 1: The model-minority stereotype of Asian Pacific American is (re) produced in textbooks

Examples of textbooks that perpetuate the model-minority stereotype were numerous, most often making reference to the high socioeconomic status or median family income of Asian Pacific Americans in relation to other social groups. For example, Tannahill (2012) states:

Whites and Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders are better off than Latinos and African Americans. In 2009, the median household income in the United States was \$49,777. Asian American/Pacific Islander households had the highest average income—\$65,469. The average income for white households was \$54,461. In contrast, the average household income for African Americans and Latino households was significantly lower—\$32,584 and \$38,039, respectively. (p. 23)

The textbook author repeats the statement in the chapter summary (p. 29) and reinforces the message in the practice test toward the end of the book (p. PT-4).

Furthermore, the stereotype is perpetuated in textbooks via subliminal comparisons to other racial and ethnic groups and by emphasizing the seemingly high rates of Asian Pacific Americans in professional jobs and among college students. For example:

Unlike Hispanics who have come to America to escape poverty, the recent influx of Asians, which began with the 1965 Immigration Act, has been driven by a new class of professional workers looking for greater opportunity. Indeed, the new Asian immigrants are the most highly skilled immigrant group in American history, and Asian Americans have often been called the superachievers of the emerging minority majority.... By far the worst off of America's minorities is its one indigenous minority, American Indians or Native Americans. (Edwards, Wattenberg, and Lineberry 2011, 171)

As another example, textbook author Patterson (2011) argues that "Asian Americans are an upwardly mobile group," explaining that Asian Americans "make up a disproportionate share of the students at California's leading public universities" (p. 142).

It is ironic that the cited references for statistics on Asian American socioeconomic achievement tend to be the very Asian American Studies scholars who strongly refute simple interpretation of the data.² These scholars stress that the growth of Asian Pacific Americans among professions with higher degrees is the result of provisions in the Immigration Act of 1965, which, while abolishing the national quotas that had been set extremely low for Asian countries, gave preferences to immigrants who were professionals of exceptional ability and skilled workers in short supply. In addition, it encouraged family reunification, allowing skilled workers to bring their families and relatives to the United States (Fong 2008, 27–29; Takaki 1989, 419–422). Few textbooks explain these points, one exception being the following: "[P]rovisions of federal law encouraging the immigration of professionals helped attract to the United States large numbers of educated and highly skilled Asian professionals" (Dautrich and Yalof 2012, 149). In other words, Asian Pacific Americans are not inherently "superachievers" or an "upwardly mobile group." They were able to immigrate to the United States in large numbers only after the Immigration Act of 1965, which is still the basis of today's preference system for U.S. immigration laws (Junn 2007).

However, some textbooks that refer to the high socioeconomic status of Asian Pacific Americans caution against viewing them in the model-minority stereotype. While Magleby, Light and Nemacheck (2011) mention that "[m]any Asian Americans have done well economically and educationally" (p. 140), they also note in another chapter that "[a]lthough Asian Americans are often considered a 'model minority' because of their successes in education and business, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission found in 1992 that 'Asian Americans do face widespread prejudice, discrimination, and barriers to equal opportunity' and that racially motivated violence against them 'occurs with disturbing frequency'" (p. 437). Similarly, Harrison and Harris (2011) state:

Asian Americans are also twice as likely as the population as a whole to earn a bachelor's degree or higher. Moreover, Asian Americans are better represented in professional and managerial positions than any other racial or ethnic group, including white Americans. Yet like women, Asian American citizens appear to hit a glass ceiling, for they are not represented in the very top positions in the numbers that their high levels of educational achievement would seem to predict. Therefore, those advocating for Asian American civil rights are increasingly concentrating their efforts on discrimination in employment. (p. 171)

How many textbooks depict Asian Americans in the model-minority stereotype, and how many caution against depicting them in this stereotype? In Table 1, I use the designation

“model-minority stereotype” to label those textbooks that refer to the high socioeconomic status of Asian Americans without including information concerning background, context (such as the Immigration Act of 1965), or counterevidence (such as discrimination). Textbooks that provide such information are labeled with the designation “cautions against the model-minority stereotype.” Table 1 ranks textbooks by the percentage of pages with specific mentions of Asian Pacific Americans. Only mentions that provide information uniquely about Asian Pacific Americans are counted; thus, mentions about minority racial and ethnic groups in general are not counted. Then, as explained above, textbooks are classified as “model-minority stereotype” or “cautions against the model-minority stereotype.”

Eight textbooks were classified as “model-minority stereotype” and five as “cautions against the model minority stereotype.” The rest of the textbooks did not mention the model-minority stereotype in either a positive or negative way. This means that almost twice as many textbooks portrayed Asian Pacific Americans in the model-minority stereotype as those that cautioned against depicting this stereotype. Although clear-cut patterns are difficult to perceive, there is a tendency for textbooks with a larger percentage of specific mentions of Asian Pacific Americans to be classified as “cautions against the model-minority stereotype,” and the opposite trend holds for “model-minority stereotype” textbooks. This suggests that textbook authors who devote more space to Asian Pacific Americans are more likely to view them from balanced viewpoints.

Hypothesis 2: Information that is important for reflecting the presence and influence of Asian Pacific Americans in U.S. politics is often omitted from textbooks

Failure to cite research on Asian Pacific Americans

The study finds that textbooks seldom cite recent research on Asian Pacific American politics, giving the false impression that very little scholarship has been produced on this subject. One area in which some textbooks provide false information concerns discussion of public opinions of Asian Pacific Americans. Wilson, Dilulio, and Bose (2013) state that “despite the country’s growing Asian population, there is as yet virtually no literature on Asian public opinion” (p. 172). Similarly, Losco and Baker (2011) note that “Asian Americans also display a wide variety of national origins, yet very little research is available about variation of political opinions among these groups” (p. 133).

These textbook authors fail to cite two large-scale public opinion polls that have been conducted on Asian Pacific Americans’ political behavior since 2000. The first study of its kind was the Pilot National Asian American Political Survey (PNAAPS)—conducted between November 2000 and January 2001—on “1,281 adults of Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Japanese, Filipino, and South Asian descent residing in the Los Angeles, New York, Honolulu, San Francisco, and Chicago metropolitan areas” (Lien, Conway, and Wong 2004, 25). Another was the National Asian American Survey (NAAS)—conducted between August and October 2008—on 5,159 adults of Chinese, Asian Indian, Vietnamese, Korean, Filipino, and Japanese descent (Wong et al. 2011, 13–15). Unlike PNAAPS, NAAS contacted Asian Americans across the country, oversampling immigrants in “new destinations” such as Texas and New Jersey.³

One textbook cites Lien, Conway, and Wong (2004) and notes that “[a] typical voting split for the Asian and Pacific Island American community runs about 60 percent

Table 1. Depictions of Asian Pacific Americans in textbooks in relation to the model-minority stereotype.

Textbook (author[s], year)	Percentage of pages with specific mentions of Asian Pacific American in textbook (rank order)	Whether Asian Pacific Americans are depicted in the "model-minority stereotype" or with "cautions against the model-minority stereotype"
1. O'Connor, Sabato, and Yanus (2011)	0.39%	
2. Dye, Zeigler, and Schubert (2012)	0.37%	
3. Barbour and Wright (2012)	0.36%	
4. Sidlow and Henschen (2012)	0.33%	model-minority stereotype
5. Harrison and Harris (with Michelle D. Deardorff) (2011)	0.32%	cautions against the model-minority stereotype
6. Magleby, Light, and Nemacheck (2011)	0.31%	cautions against the model-minority stereotype
7. Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir (2011)	0.29%	
8. Greenberg and Page (2011)	0.28%	model-minority stereotype
9. Patterson (2011)	0.27%	model-minority stereotype
10. Losco and Baker (2011)	0.27%	cautions against the model-minority stereotype
11. Florina, Peterson, Johnson, and Mayer (2011)	0.26%	
12. Coleman, Goldstein, and Howell (2011)	0.25%	
13. Bond and Smith (2012)	0.24%	
14. Tannahill (2012)	0.19%	model-minority stereotype
15. Lowi, Ginsberg, Shepsle, and Ansolabehere (2011)	0.18%	
16. Volkmer (2013)	0.17%	
17. Edwards, Wattenberg, and Lineberry (2011)	0.14%	model-minority stereotype
18. Kernell, Jacobson, and Kousser (2012)	0.13%	
19. Schmidt, Shelley, Bardes, and Ford (2012)	0.12%	
20. Dautrich and Yalof (2012)	0.11%	cautions against the model-minority stereotype
21. Berman and Murphy (2013)	0.10%	
22. Miroff, Seidelman, Swanstrom, and De Luca (2010)	0.09%	
23. Welch, Gruhl, Rigdon, and Thomas (2012)	0.08%	
24. Shea, Green, and Smith (2011)	0.03%	
25. Janda, Berry, and Goldman (2012)	0.02%	model-minority stereotype
26. Dye (2011)	0.02%	model-minority stereotype
27. Katznelson, Kesselman, and Draper (2011)	0.01%	model-minority stereotype
28. Wilson, Dilulio, and Bose (2013)	0.01%	model-minority stereotype

Democratic and 40 percent Republican, though it can reach the extreme of a 50–50 split, depending on the election” (O’Connor, Sabato, and Yanus 2011, 435). Another textbook makes extensive use of the 2008 NAAS demonstrating Asian Americans’ party affiliation for six national-origin groups: Japanese, Chinese, Indian Asians, Koreans, Vietnamese, and Filipinos (Harrison and Harris 2011, 191). Few other textbooks assess the political attitudes and behavior of Asian Pacific Americans and, if they do, fail to include supporting data. For example, Kernell, Jacobson, and Kousser (2012) argue that “Asian Americans tend to have higher incomes and so are economically more conservative and more Republican than Hispanics” (pp. 478–479), which is factually wrong. In 2012, national exit polls showed that Latino/as and Asian Americans supported the Democratic incumbent at about the same rates, 71% and 73%, respectively (NAAS 2013). Data from the 2012 NAAS support these general trends, revealing that a majority of Asian Pacific Americans (67%) favor raising taxes on the rich to reduce the deficit (*Hispanic Business* 2013).

Missed opportunities to include Asian Pacific Americans—interest group association and mobilization

As one textbook notes, “[t]he diversity of national backgrounds among Asian Americans has impeded the development of group-based political power” (Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir 2011, 283); yet, it is also important to acknowledge that “[h]istorically, these groups have united most effectively around common issues of ethnic discrimination or anti-Asian violence in the United States” (p. 284). Scholars in Asian American Studies have demonstrated the development of a “pan-ethnic” Asian American identity in recent decades, especially among young Asian Americans (Espiritu 1992; Jeung 2005; Kibria 2002). The textbook above acknowledges that the acronym CAUSE—a nonprofit organization based in the Greater Los Angeles area—used to stand for “Chinese Americans United for Self-Empowerment” but changed to “Center for Asian Americans United for Self-Empowerment” to seek out more pan-ethnic mobilization (Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir 2011, 284). However, mention of this political formation among Asian Pacific Americans is an exception rather than the rule.

Asian Pacific American organizations are seldom mentioned in textbook chapters on interest groups either. As exceptional cases, one textbook mentions the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) and the role it played during the redress of internment during World War II (Coleman, Goldstein, and Howell 2011, 214–215). Another textbook notes the creation of JACL “in the 1930s” (actually 1929) and describes the organization’s efforts to gain naturalization rights for Japanese immigrants, which materialized in 1952 (Harrison and Harris 2011, 170). Notably, JACL and the Organization for Chinese Americans (which changed its name to “OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates” to reflect a more pan-ethnic consciousness) represent a broad swath of the Asian Pacific American community these days despite their historical association with specific Asian American national-origin groups. Both have released statements on anti-Asian/Asian Pacific American speech and violence regardless of the ethnicity of the target group. Yet, OCA is not mentioned in any textbook surveyed.

This is not the case in the coverage of other racial and ethnic groups’ associated interest groups in textbooks. Virtually all textbooks mention the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and many mention the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF). Dye, Zeigler, and Schubert (2012, 164) list

a dozen “Civil Rights and Identity” interest groups including the aforementioned with the National Council of La Raza and the American Indian Movement (AIM) but do not include any organized group representing Asian Pacific Americans. Two exceptions mention the San Francisco-based Asian Law Caucus (Lowi et al. 2011, 153) and the Sacramento and Washington DC-based Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC) (Barbour and Wright 2012, 488). One textbook refers to the National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA), an umbrella group of Asian Pacific American organizations established in 1996 (Harrison and Harris 2011, 171).

Missed opportunities to include Asian Pacific Americans—notable government officials

With reference to the three branches of the government, only a small number of textbooks include the number or percentage of Asian Pacific American members of Congress (Takeda 2015), who are seldom identified or mentioned. One example is the Senate’s *president pro tempore*, a position held by Japanese American Senator Daniel Inouye from June 2010 to December 2012. Senator Inouye (D-Hawaii), a World War II veteran, was so well respected among the Japanese American community that before his death, he was considered “the most well-known and accomplished Japanese American alive” (Watanabe 2012, para 1). However, most textbooks fail to acknowledge him as the third in line of succession if the president were unable to serve (preceded only by the vice president and the Speaker of the House). Although Volkmer (2013) comments that “neither [the vice president nor *president pro tempore*] is a position of great importance in the Senate” (p. 188), the ascension of an Asian Pacific American to this position was quite historic. Only one textbook shows a picture of Inouye sworn in with his wife Irene Hirano Inouye (Kernell, Jacobson, and Kousser 2012, 272) and another mentions Inouye and his predecessor Robert Byrd (D-West Virginia) (Harrison and Harris 2011, 354).

In the executive branch, three members of President Obama’s cabinet were Asian Americans at the time the reviewed textbooks were written: Gary Locke (Secretary of Commerce), Steven Chu (Secretary of Energy), and Eric Shinseki (Secretary of Veterans Affairs). Again, only a few textbooks mention them by name, although one shows a picture of the swearing-in ceremony of Secretary Locke (Sidlow and Henschen 2012, 273).

Hypothesis 3: Statements about Asian Pacific Americans are often factually inaccurate in textbooks

The textbooks reviewed sometimes make questionable, if not inaccurate, statements of fact about Asian Pacific Americans, especially about their history in the pre-World War II period. To illustrate, Barbour and Wright (2012) state that “[t]here are Chinese and Japanese Americans whose families have lived here for nearly two centuries, arriving with the waves of immigrants in the early 1800s who came to work in the frontier West” (p. 217). The massive influx of Chinese into the West, however, did not begin until 1848 with the Gold Rush in California. The arrival of Japanese immigrants began unofficially in 1868 but it was in 1885 that the Japanese government signed a contract for laborers with the then-independent government of Hawaii (Chan 1991, 11).

Some textbooks deal inaccurately with Asian Pacific American ethnic history. For example, Sidlow and Henschen (2012) comment that “[t]he Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 prevented persons from China and Japan from coming to the United States to prospect for gold or to

work on the railroads or in factories in the West” (p. 107). The Chinese Exclusion Act did not prohibit the entry of laborers from Japan; in fact, Japanese immigrants filled the labor shortage brought about by the Chinese Exclusion Act. It was not until 1907 that the U.S. government signed a “Gentlemen’s Agreement” with the Japanese government to stop laborers from Japan (Chan 1991, 54–55). Similarly, Dye (2011) notes that “[i]t was not until 1882 that Congress passed the first legislation restricting entry into the United States of persons alleged to be ‘undesirable’ and virtually all Asians” (p. 36). While it is true that Congress passed legislation barring entry of Chinese laborers in 1882, it was the 1917 “Barred Zone Act” (and more completely, the Immigration Act of 1924) that restricted virtually all Asians (except Filipinos, whose entry was significantly reduced in 1934).

One textbook skips the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and abruptly states that “Congress in 1892 suspended Asian immigration on grounds that Asians were inferior” (Patterson 2011, 130). The author is likely referring to the Geary Act of 1892; however, the Geary Act was enacted to address the expiration of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (Chan 1991, 91). The textbook also suggests that seven years after 1923, “Congress completely blocked the entry of Japanese” (Patterson 2011, 130). However, it was with the Immigration Act of 1924 that entry from Japan was effectively barred (Chan 1991, 55). Similarly, Losco and Baker (2011) assert that, “[i]n 1930, Congress prohibited immigration from Japan altogether after the Japanese government protested a California law barring anyone of Japanese descent from buying property in that state” (p. 110). While it is true that the Japanese government protested the passage of Alien Land Act of 1920 in California, neither in 1920 nor 1930 was immigration from Japan prohibited altogether.

Misleading statements are also made with respect to the U.S. government’s internment of people of Japanese descent. O’Connor, Sabato, and Yanus (2011) comment that “Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066, which led to the internment of over 130,000 Japanese Americans, Italian Americans, and German Americans, some of whom were Jewish refugees” (p. 217). Although it is accurate that some Italian and German Americans were arrested along with some Japanese, only those of Japanese descent were sent on a mass scale (approximately 120,000) to what the government then called relocation centers, operated by the War Relocation Authority.

The U.S. government provided redress for the victims of internment through the passage of the Civil Liberties Act in 1988. The act included an official apology from the government and offered \$20,000 to each detainee. As Takeda (2015) revealed, half of the textbooks that mention Japanese internment cover this fact, and only a few mention the name of this act (e.g., O’Connor, Sabato, and Yanus 2011, 218). However, in a table entitled “Rights, Pathways, and Results in Advancing Equality of Opportunity,” Shea, Green, and Smith (2011, 137) imply that a much less robust, token attempt to compensate Japanese internees (“the American Japanese Claims Act of 1948” in the authors’ words) was as critical as the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. Under the provisions of the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, only 137 property claims filed by the Japanese were settled, “averaging \$450 each” (Chan 1991, 142). In addition, the law fell even further short of helping farmers who were renting their property, because much of what they had lost—their crop—was unlikely to be compensated.

On the post-World War II period, Patterson (2011) asserts that “Asian Americans were not politically active to any great extent during the 1960s” (p. 130). However, as another textbook correctly points out, the truth is that “[d]uring the 1960s, Asian Americans on college campuses organized and fostered a group consciousness about the need to protect

their civil rights” (Harrison and Harris 2011, 171). In fact, “many Asian American students ... marched in demonstration against the war in Vietnam, for civil rights, for racial pride, and for the establishment of ethnic studies courses and programs” (Chan 1991, 175). It is widely believed among Asian American Studies scholars that the pan-ethnic phrase “Asian American(s)” was born out of this student movement.

Conclusions and recommendations

This examination of 28-level introductory American government textbooks reveals that the coverage of Asian Pacific Americans tends to reinforce the model-minority stereotype (Hypothesis 1); moreover, these textbooks often fail to include important substantive information on Asian Pacific Americans (Hypothesis 2) and often include factually questionable statements (Hypothesis 3). Overall, the significant contribution of this study is the finding that Asian Pacific Americans are often misrepresented and underrepresented in textbooks, and the model-minority stereotype is prevalent.

This is of concern because textbooks are used as the main pedagogical tools in introductory courses. Instructors who teach these courses, who are often unfamiliar with Asian Pacific American politics, may take the portrayal in textbooks at face value. Without the appropriate adjustments, misguided information will then be transmitted to students, most of whom do not have the knowledge, capacity, or time to check the validity of that information. Improving the depictions of Asian Pacific Americans would lead to a better understanding of their presence and influence in American politics and would help create positive, informed inter-racial relations in an increasingly multiracial U.S. society.

Of the five recommendations made by Takeda (2015), the most salient concern is to invite scholars of Asian American politics (or more broadly, those on race and ethnicity politics) to coauthor and review textbooks. Such scholars could easily rectify many historically inaccurate details in textbooks by checking them against work such as Chan (1991), which is still an authoritative account of Asian American history.

This study may be complemented by pedagogical studies. For example, surveys of students taking introductory American government courses might examine whether and on what topics Asian Pacific American students feel greater dissatisfaction than students of other races. Such a survey would be useful for authors in updating their textbooks. This study is a first step in forging a link to these larger studies.

Notes

1. See, for example, Takaki (1989, 474–479), Aoki and Takeda (2008, 144–146), and Fong (2008, 62–72).
2. See the textbooks by Edwards, Wattenberg, and Lineberry (2011, 171, Note 8) who cite Takaki (1989), and Patterson (2011, 142, Note 57) who cites Fong (2008).
3. PNAAPS and NAAS data are publicly available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR, Study Nos. 3832 and 31481, respectively).

Acknowledgments

I thank three anonymous reviewers and Teruko Kumei, Kimberly Mealy, Kira Sanbonmatsu, Janelle Wong, and, particularly, Andrew L. Aoki and Sherri L. Wallace for their helpful comments. This article was originally written as a companion paper to Takeda (2015, *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48

[3]), which was commissioned by the APSA Committee of the Status of Asian Pacific Americans in the Profession. All remaining errors are mine.

Contributor

Okiyoshi (Oki) Takeda is an Associate Professor in the School of International Politics, Economics, and Communication (SIPEC), Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo. He earned his PhD at Princeton University in 2000. His research interests include Asian American politics, congressional studies, and minority representation in U.S. Congress and state legislatures. He is the coauthor (with Andrew L. Aoki) of *Asian American Politics* (Polity Press, 2008). His articles have been published in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, *Journal of Asian American Studies*, and several Japanese refereed journals. He teaches courses in American politics, comparative politics (Japan), and quantitative and qualitative research methods.

References

- Allen, Marcus D., and Sherri L. Wallace. 2010. "Teaching Introduction to American Government/Politics: What We Learn from the Visual Images in Textbooks." *Journal of Political Science Education* 6(1): 1–18.
- Aoki, Andrew L., and Okiyoshi Takeda. 2008. *Asian American Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Apple, Michael W., and Linda K. Christian-Smith. 1991. "The Politics of Textbook." In *The Politics of Textbook*, eds. Michael W. Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith. New York: Routledge, 1–21.
- Ashley, Jeffery S., and Karen Jarratt-Ziemski. 1999. "Superficiality and Bias: The (Mis)Treatment of Native Americans in U.S. Government Textbooks." *American Indian Quarterly* 23(3–4): 49–62.
- Barbour, Christine, and Gerald C. Wright. 2012. *Keeping the Republic: Power and Citizenship in American Politics*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Berman, Larry, and Bruce Allen Murphy. 2013. *Approaching Democracy*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Bond, Jon R., and Kevin B. Smith. 2012. *The Promise and Performance of American Democracy*. 10th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Cassese, Erin C., and Angela L. Bos. 2013. "A Hidden Curriculum?: Examining the Gender Context in Introductory-Level Political Science Textbooks." *Politics & Gender* 9(2): 214–222.
- Cassese, Erin C., Angela L. Bos, and Monica C. Schneider. 2014. "Whose American Government?: A Quantitative Analysis of Gender and Authorship in American Politics Texts." *Journal of Political Science Education* 10(3): 253–272.
- Chan, Sucheng. 1991. *Asian Americans: An Interpretative History*. New York: Twayne.
- Clawson, Rosalee A., and Elizabeth R. Kegler. 2000. "The 'Race Coding' of Poverty in American Government College Textbooks." *The Howard Journal of Communication* 11(3): 179–188.
- Coleman, John J., Kenneth M. Goldstein, and William G. Howell. 2011. *Understanding American Politics and Government*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.
- Collet, Christian, and Pei-te Lien eds. 2009. *The Transnational Politics of Asian Americans*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Dautrich, Kenneth, and David A. Yalof. 2012. *American Government: Historical, Popular and Global Perspectives*. 2nd ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Dye, Thomas R. 2011. *Politics in America*. 9th ed. Boston: Longman.
- Dye, Thomas R., Harmon Zeigler, and Louis Schubert. 2012. *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*. 15th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Edwards, George C., III, Martin P. Wattenberg, and Robert L. Lineberry. 2011. *Government in America: People, Politics, and Policy*. 15th ed. Boston: Longman.
- Eisenstein, Marie A., and April K. Clark. 2013. "Portraits of Religion in Introductory American Government Textbooks: Images of Tolerance and Intolerance." *Journal of Political Science Education* 9(1): 89–107.

- Eksterowicz, Anthony J., and Robert P. Watson. 2000. "Treatment of First Ladies in American Government and Presidency Textbooks: Overlooked, Yet Influential Voices." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33(3): 589–595.
- Espiritu, Yen Le. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Elaine J. Hall. 1996. "Rethinking Stratification from a Feminist Perspective: Gender, Race, and Class in Mainstream Textbooks." *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 929–950.
- Fiorina, Morris P., Paul E. Peterson, Bertram Johnson, and William G. Mayer. 2011. *The New American Democracy*. 7th ed. Boston: Longman.
- Fong, Timothy P. 2008. *Contemporary Asian American Experience: Beyond Minority*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Foster, Stuart J. 1999. "The Struggle for American Identity: Treatment of Ethnic Groups in United States History Textbooks." *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society* 28(3): 251–278.
- Franke, Jim, and Laurie M. Johnson Bagby. 2005. "The American Founding, American Government Textbooks, and Civic Education." *Journal of Political Science Education* 1(2): 249–271.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin, Theodore J. Lowi, and Margaret Weir. 2011. *We the People: An Introduction to American Politics*. 8th ed. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Greenberg, Edward S., and Benjamin I. Page. 2011. *The Struggle for Democracy*. 10th ed. Boston: Longman.
- Harrison, Brigid Callahan, and Jean Wahl Harris (with Michelle D. Deardorff). 2011. *American Democracy Now*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hispanic Business. 2013. "GOP Tries to Get in With Asian-American Voters." April 12. http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/2013/4/12/gop_tries_to_get_in_with.htm (October 22, 2014).
- Janda, Kenneth, Jeffrey M. Berry, and Jerry Goldman. 2012. *The Challenge of Democracy: American Government in Global Politics*. 11th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Jeung, Russell. 2005. *Faithful Generations: Race and New Asian American Churches*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Junn, Jane. 2007. "From Coolie to Model Minority: U.S. Immigration Policy and the Construction of Racial Identity." *Du Bois Review* 4(2): 355–373.
- Katznelson, Ira, Mark Kesselman, and Alan Draper. 2011. *The Politics of Power: A Critical Introduction to American Government*. 6th ed. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Kernell, Samuel, Gary C. Jacobson, and Thad Kousser. 2012. *The Logic of American Politics*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Kibria, Nazia. 2002. *Becoming Asian American: Second-Generation Chinese and Korean American Identities*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kim, Claire Jean. 2000. *Bitter Fruit: The Politics of Black-Korean Conflicts in New York City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lai, James S. 2011. *Asian American Political Action: Suburban Transformation*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Larson, Stephanie Greco. 2006. *Media & Minorities: The Politics of Race in News and Entertainment*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lien, Pei-te. 2001. *The Making of Asian America through Political Participation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lien, Pei-te, M. Margaret Conway, and Janelle Wong. 2004. *The Politics of Asian Americans: Diversity and Community*. New York: Routledge.
- Limerick, Patrick Nelson. 1992. "The Case for the Premature Departure: The Trans-Mississippi West and American History Textbooks." *The Journal of American History* 78(4): 1380–1394.
- Losco, Joseph, and Ralph Baker. 2011. *AM GOV 2011*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lowi, Theodore J., Benjamin Ginsberg, Kenneth A. Shepsle, and Stephen Ansolabehere. 2011. *American Government: Power and Purpose*. 11th ed. 2010 Election Update. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Magleby, David B., Paul C. Light, and Christine L. Nemacheck. 2011. *Government by the People*. 2011 National, State, and Local ed. Boston: Longman.
- Miroff, Bruce, Raymond Seidelman, Todd Swanson, and Tom De Luca. 2010. *The Democratic Debate: American Politics in an Age of Change*. 5th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

- Monforti, Jessica Lavariega, and Adam McGlynn. 2010. "Aquí Estamos?: A Survey of Latino Portrayal in Introductory U.S. Government and Politics Textbooks." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(2): 309–315.
- Nakanishi, Don T., and James Lai eds. 2014–2015. *National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac*. 15th ed. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- National Asian American Survey (NAAS). 2013. "Behind the Numbers: Post-Election Survey of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders Voters in 2012" April. <http://www.naasurvey.com/resources/Presentations/2012-aapipes-national.pdf> (October 22, 2014).
- Novkov, Julie, and Charles Gossett. 2007. "Survey of Textbooks for Teaching Introduction to U.S. Politics: (How) Do They See Us?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40(2): 393–398.
- O'Connor, Karen, Larry J. Sabato, and Alixandra B. Yanus. 2011. *American Government: Roots and Reform*. 2011 National ed. Boston: Longman.
- Okihiro, Gary Y. 1997. *Teaching Asian American History*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association.
- Olivo, Christiane. 2012. "Bringing Women In: Gender and American Government and Politics Textbooks." *Journal of Political Science Education* 8(2): 131–146.
- Patterson, Thomas E. 2011. *The American Democracy*. 10th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saito, Leland T. 1998. *Race and Politics: Asian Americans, Latinos, and Whites in a Los Angeles Suburb*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Schmidt, Steffen W., Mack C. Shelley, II, Barbara A. Bardes, and Lynne E. Ford. 2012. *American Government and Politics Today*. 2011–2012 ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Shea, Daniel M., Joanne Connor Green, and Christopher E. Smith. 2011. *Living Democracy*. 3rd ed., National ed. Boston: Longman.
- Sidlow, Edward, and Beth Henschen. 2012. *Govt3*. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Stroup, Daniel G., and William Garriott. 1997. "Teaching American Government: An Alternative to Ogg and Ray." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(1): 73–77.
- Takaki, Ronald. 1989. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. New York: Penguin.
- Takeda, Okiyoshi. 2015. "A Forgotten Minority?: A Content Analysis of Asian Pacific Americans in Introductory American Government Textbooks." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48(3): 430–439.
- Tannahill, Neal. 2012. *American Government: Policy and Politics*. 11th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2012a. "The Asian Population: 2010. 2010 Census Briefs" March. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf> (March 16, 2015).
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2012b. "The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population: 2010. 2010 Census Briefs" May. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-12.pdf> (March 16, 2015).
- Volkmer, Walter E. 2013. *American Government*. 14th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Wallace, Sherri L., and Marcus D. Allen. 2008. "Survey of African American Portrayal in Introductory Textbooks in American Government/Politics: A Report of the APSA Standing Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41(1): 153–159.
- Wallace, Sherri L., and Dewey M. Clayton. 2009. "Introductory Political Science Textbooks: Are They Inclusive of African American Politics?" *National Political Science Review* 12: 247–264.
- Watanabe, Paul. 2012. "Remembrance: Daniel Inouye Was My Role Model." December 20. <http://cognoscenti.wbur.org/2012/12/20/daniel-inouye-paul-watanabe> (May 6, 2014).
- Welch, Susan, John Gruhl, Susan M. Rigdon, and Sue Thomas. 2012. *Understanding American Government*. 13th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Wilson, James Q., John J. Dilulio, Jr., and Meena Bose. 2013. *American Government: Institutions and Policies*. 13th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Wong, Janelle S. 2006. *Democracy's Promise: Immigrants and American Civic Institutions*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wong, Janelle, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, Taeku Lee, and Jane Junn. 2011. *Asian American Political Participation: Emerging Constituents and Their Political Identities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.