UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Asian American and Pacific Islander Principals in K-12 LAUSD: Then and Now

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6f65d94v

Author

Kim, Jina

Publication Date

2012

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Asian American and Pacific Islander Principals in K-12

LAUSD: Then and Now

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Jina Kim-Qvale

2012

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Asian American and Pacific Islander Principals in K-12

LAUSD: Then and Now

by

Jina Kim-Qvale

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor Mitchell Chang, Co-Chair

Professor Linda Rose, Co-Chair

This study examined the change in conditions over time for Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) principals as they pursued a career as principals in the K-12 system in Los Angeles Unified School District. I compared the perceptions, motivations, and aspirations of AAPIs who became principals from 1970-1989 and from 2000-2011 to explore the change over time in the reasons as well as factors that supported or hindered them as they negotiated their career from teachers to principals. It was hoped that the findings from this research would assist policy makers and administrative leaders in better supporting the next generation of AAPI principals in order to maintain equal representation of AAPI students to AAPI principals. The sample was comprised of five principals from 1970-1989 and 15 principals from 2000-2011. Using a

qualitative research design, I collected data using a short demographic survey, writing prompts, and face-to-face interviews. My findings showed that some reasons and factors stayed the same regardless of time, some manifested themselves stronger in one group over the other, and some existed in one group while being absent in the other. Themes that emerged for reasons they pursued a career as principals included high respect and satisfaction of pay in the teaching profession, preference for humanities related majors in college, and personal confidence. Factors that were considered for either supporting or hindering their process of becoming a principal included cultural values, homophily, environment of their time, availability of resources, and pressures of family care. The findings of this study led to recommendations for supporting AAPIs in the future to maintain their representation in the district.

The dissertation of Jina Kim-Qvale is approved.

John Rogers

Min Zhou

Mitchell Chang, Committee Co-Chair

Linda Rose, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2012

DEDICATION PAGE

I dedicate this manuscript to my parents, Tae Kon Kim and Grace Kim, who have made many sacrifices to better my life by immigrating to the United States in the early 1980s with three children in tow. As they navigated the foreign U.S. school system in their quest to ensure the best education for their children, they taught me that everything is possible through education. My desire to promote social justice and to give the same access to the children in our society is a reflection of the experiences I had growing up under my parents' care.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1996	B.A. Sociology University of California, Los Angeles Los, Angeles, California
1997	Teacher Los Angeles Unified School District Los Angeles, California
1998	M.Ed. UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies Los Angeles, California
1999	Teacher Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
2001	Teacher Burbank Unified School District Burbank, California
2004	MSA Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology Los Angeles, California
2004	Teacher Specialist Glendale Unified School District Glendale, California
2005	Assistant Principal, Elementary Instructional Specialist Los Angeles Unified School District Los Angeles, California
2010	Principal Ambassador School of Global Education Los Angeles Unified School District Los, Angeles, California

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

At the time of this study, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) were one of the fastest growing minority groups in the U.S. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). At present, 13.5 million Asian Americans live in the U.S., which represents 4.7% of the total population. By 2050, this population will grow five times. In line with the percentage of the general population, according to Aud, Fox, and KewalRamani (2010) in 2008-2009, Asian American students made up 5% of the US student population.

History of the Problem Nationally and in Local Context

As the AAPI population has grown and become more visible in the United States, and especially in California, representative staffing of principals in the K-12 school system has not kept pace with this growth. Data reveal that the AAPI group was underrepresented in positions of administrative leadership in both the elementary and secondary schools (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2009). In line with their growth, Asian American students could benefit from engaging with culturally representative role models who understand their unique needs in the school setting. The lack of participation by AAPIs in principal leadership roles may negatively impact the provision of culturally sensitive services and programs for AAPI student (Matsuura, 1996).

In the context of K-12 schooling, K-5 students' develop their sense of identity and vision of their future selves. In the 6th through 12th grades, they will make choices that influence their lives, such as whether or not they will take classes required to get into college, and whether to go to college, university, occupational school, industry, or drop out. During this time, educators must ensure that there are opportunities for AAPI youths to interact with role models, including

culturally and racially representative leaders who may have some insight about AAPI students and can guide them in their decision-making process. In addition to the potential benefits from programming initiatives of the AAPI administrators, students can also profit from engaging with culturally representative role models. This assertion is supported by research that demonstrates the importance of mentoring in choosing career direction and in success (Adrian, 2004; Allen et. al, 1995). In addition, the availability of AAPI educator role models may offer an alternative to the historical trend of AAPIs leaning heavily towards the science and medical fields (Cheng, 1997; Song & Glick, 2004; Woo, 1995). Without role models to encourage AAPI students' career path into school administration, the chances of broadening the pipeline for AAPI students may be negatively impacted.

The pipeline to principal positions in schools has typically included working as a teacher, acquisition of an administrative credential, working as an administrative support staff outside the classroom such as a Dean or Coordinator, and working as an assistant principal before gaining approval for a principal position. Studying this pipeline is important in understanding the reasons for AAPIs' underrepresentation in K-12 school principal positions. Upon close examination, the statistics revealed an underrepresentation of AAPI teachers in the K-5 school system, which helps to explain why K-12 AAPI principals are underrepresented as well. In the United States, less than 2% of K-12 principals and teachers were of AAPI descent. These statistics are not much higher in California, where 5% of teachers and 4.7% of principals are of AAPI heritage (NCES, 2008). According to a study by the U.S. Department of Labor, the representation of AAPIs in administrative positions is lower in education than in any other sector of employment. AAPIs are less likely to be in educational management than any other kind of management; AAPIs made up 3% of educational management, versus 19% in management-related jobs in

other fields (Woo, 1994). Based on these statistics, the K-12 leadership pipeline needs our attention in order to address the adequate representation of AAPI principals to match the growing number of AAPI students.

In order to increase the representation of AAPI school principals, we must understand why AAPIs pursue a career as K-12 principals and the factors that support or hinder their career path along the way as they successfully negotiate their environment. It would be valuable to understand how, if at all, factors that supported or hindered AAPIs from pursuing principal positions had changed since the 1970s to the present time as we try to identify ways to support incoming principals. Looking at the changes over time in supporting and hindering factors in areas such as social network, identity, role models, and policy may allow us to determine if the principalship is now more accessible for AAPIs. How have changes over time made a difference, if at all, in AAPIs becoming principals? What factors have continued to be relevant? What factors are no longer in the way? What new factors have emerged? Have changes in discriminatory laws made a difference in giving access to AAPIs? Knowing this will help us identify supports for aspiring principals. Looking at the successful AAPI principals at the end of the pipeline from the 1970s through 2011 to identify ways to support incoming principals could also help increase the number of AAPI principals.

Research Questions

In order to address issues regarding the change in conditions over time of AAPIs' leadership in the K-12 leadership pipeline and to better understand what supports AAPIs need, I proposed to study the perceptions, motivations, and aspirations of AAPIs who became principals between 1970-1989 and between 2000-2011. The following research questions were explored: for AAPI principals from 1970-1989 and 2000-2011,

1. Do AAPI principals from different time periods offer distinctive explanations for why they became principals?

2. What factors supported and what factors posed challenges for AAPI educators who wished to become principals? Does this differ for AAPI educators across two periods of time?

Research Design

Nationally, the Hawaii Department of Education had the highest number of AAPI students with 14%. Dallas Independent School District has the least with 1% (NCES, 2008). I studied the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), with an AAPI student percentage of 6.4%. Unlike the national underrepresentation of AAPI school principals, AAPIs made up 6% of the Los Angeles Unified School District school principals (LAUSD Human Resources Division, 2010). Studying a successful group can lend insight regarding how to assist others throughout the nation. In order to answer the research questions addressing aspirations, perceptions, and motivations of AAPI school principals, I used a qualitative methods approach with purposeful sampling targeting 5-10 AAPI school principals who held principal positions in LAUSD from 1970-1989 and 12-15 AAPIs who held principal positions in LAUSD from 2000-2011. I sent out a recruitment flyer designed to identify AAPI participants through a professional administrative group, the Asian and Pacific Educators Association (APEA). Prior to conducting interviews, I sent out a short demographic survey with two writing prompts requesting stories to highlight a moment that encapsulated their experiences as a principal as related to their AAPI background. I then conducted in-depth interviews with 15 current AAPI principals and five AAPIs who were principals in the 1970s and 1980s. Data from the interviews were analyzed and the findings were

distilled in vignettes that answer the research questions and that communicate real-life examples of important factors in the AAPI principals' pathway to principalship.

Theoretical Framework

U.S. public schools play an important role in attempting to assimilate culturally and linguistically diverse students through structures, policies, and practices. The school system typically values Anglocentric middle-class norms. This has resulted in schools "failing to recognize and affirm the knowledge, experience, and assets of culturally diverse populations…which has contributed to marginalization and disengagement of students of color…even as ethnic minorities are on the cusp of becoming the nation's majority" (Cooper, 2009, p. 699). Changing needs related to shifting demographics have called for educational leaders who see cultural and linguistic diversity as resources (Riehl, 200l; Shields & Sayani, 2005).

I drew on Critical Race Theory (Lopez, 2003) and Social Reproduction Theory (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) to examine the findings from my study, which explored issues of AAPI representation in the K-12 principal positions and difficulties matching their representation to demographically changing schools in the United States. I do not claim that it is necessary for a principal to be of Asian descent to understand the needs of the AAPI student population; rather, AAPI principals may have greater insight into the lives of AAPI students and their presence may provide AAPI students with culturally relevant role models.

Additionally, I conducted this study through the lens of a behavioral theory called Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964), which explains the relationship between the career aspirations of AAPI educators, their behaviors, and their ability to

acquire positions as K-12 principals. I looked at the roles of supporting and deterring factors in AAPI educators' achievement of principal positions. I described the perceptions of AAPI educators as related to the role of principalship and the attractiveness of the rewards of the position.

Lastly, I explored the successful negotiation of AAPIs into principal positions through the lens of Distinctiveness Theory (McGuire, 1984) as they found ways to compensate for the lack of like-race role models and peers.

Significance

Explorations of ways to enlarge the Latino and African American administrative pipeline (Allen, 1995; Arias, 2005; Bloom & Erlandson, 2003; Cooper, 2009; Young & Castaneda, 2008) have increased over time. My study attempted to do similar research for the AAPI administrative pipeline. With the increasing national AAPI population, issues of access and equity in education and administrative positions are highly pertinent for the AAPI population. As stated in a report commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor,

> Unlike other spheres of employment, academic institutions, given their educational mission, have a direct and longstanding influence on the availability pool itself. The skewed distribution of Asian American faculty into a narrow range of disciplines or fields is likely to persist, precisely because policies for recruitment are for the most part based on the existing availability pools. Breaking this cycle would mean committing resources towards raining the next generation of students in areas where Asian Americans are largely underrepresented, thereby creating a pool of candidates from which a more diverse faculty might be recruited. (Woo, 1994, p. 99)

Ultimately, I hope that this dissertation will help to enhance AAPIs' access to principal positions. In addition, I hope that this study will provide helpful information to educational leaders and policy makers about the supports necessary to help AAPIs access principal positions in the current K-12 setting.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

As described in the previous chapter, data show that the AAPI group is underrepresented in positions of administrative leadership in both elementary and secondary schools (NCES, 2009). In order to investigate the reasons for this underrepresentation, I proposed to study the perceptions, motivations, and aspirations of AAPI principals in K-12 education system. Specifically, I studied the change, over time, of reasons and factors that supported and hindered AAPIs in gaining K-12 principal positions from the 1970s to 2011. In this literature review, I will begin by describing statistics related to AAPI students and K-12 principals. Then, I will define which ethnic groups make up the AAPI group. Next, I will frame the problem through Social Reproduction Theory (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) and Lopez's (2003) Critical Race Theory, as the U.S. school system mainly values and promotes Anglocentric middle-class norms. I will examine my research through a behavioral theory called Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964), which will explain the relationships between the career aspirations of AAPI educators, their behaviors, and their ability to achieve positions as K-12 principals. Following, I will discuss how the successful AAPI principals compensated for lack of like-ethnic peers through using the lens of Distinctiveness Theory (McGuire, 1984). Next, I will give a brief overview of the discrimination AAPIs experienced during their history to provide a context for their current position in society. I will then address literature that explores issues AAPIs may be dealing with today in regards to discrimination and how their identity may shape their negotiation into principal positions. Finally, I will conclude with literature that lends insight into

possible cultural factors hindering AAPIs' career advancement as well as their career choice tendencies.

K-12 AAPI Principal Pipeline Data

Nationally and in the state of California, there are a disproportionately low number of Asian Americans going into school principal positions (NCES, 2009). This lack of proportional representation is visible throughout the K-12 grades. Nationally, Asians make up 5% of the student population and less than 2% of AAPI principals at the K-12 level. In the state of California, which has one of the highest percentages of Asian students in the country, Asian students make up 11.7% of the student population but less than 4.7% of AAPI school principals. Table 2.1, with statistics readily available compiled from U.S. Census Bureau 2007, NCES 2008 and 2009, as well as the State Department of Education Management Information Center's R-30 Enrollment Data, shows the underrepresentation of AAPI principals with respect to AAPI students at the national and state levels. One can also see that while there was underrepresentation of AAPI principals in the 1970-80s in LAUSD, they were adequately represented by 2011.

Table 2.1

National, State, and LAUSD's AAPI Student, Teacher, and Principal Representation From 1970-2011

	U.S.			California			LAUSD		
	Student	Teacher	Principal	Student	Teacher	Principal	Student	Teacher	Principal
1970-89	____	____	____	____	0.2%	0.6%	4.9%	6.3%	1.6%
2000-11	5%	___	2%	11.7%	5%	4.7%	6.4%	___	6%

Note. Adapted from *The American community-Asians: 2004, American community survey reports* (Publication No. CENSR-ACS-05), by the U.S. Census Bureau, 2007. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

It is noteworthy that the National Center for Education Statistics (2009) reports that White administrators make up 80.9% of principals nationally and 73% in California, while White students make up only 54.9% nationally and 27.9% in California. The need to investigate AAPIs' underrepresentation in K-12 principal positions and how to support AAPIs in pursuing a career as a principal becomes more pressing since the AAPI population is projected to grow five times its current size by 2050 for a total of 62 million (U.S. Census, 2004). It is important to ensure that there are opportunities for AAPI youths to interact with educators that can serve as culturally and racially representative role models who may have some insight about AAPI students and can guide them in their decision-making. Culturally representative leadership may allow these students to benefit from program initiatives, as AAPI principals may be more acutely aware of the needs of AAPI students. Although I do not claim that it is necessary for a principal to be of Asian descent to understand the needs of the AAPI student population, I believe that AAPI principals may have greater insight into the population of which they are a part.

One of many factors that influence the under-representation of AAPI principals can be seen directly in the low numbers of AAPIs going into teaching (Rong & Preissle, 1997), which is a prerequisite to becoming a principal. Rong and Preissle (1997) looked at 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s decennial census data to look for patterns of underrepresentation of AAPI teachers as compared to patterns of underrepresentation of Hispanic and African-American teachers. They concluded that since the 1970s, the disparity in AAPI teacher underrepresentation has grown rather than shrunk from 3.2% AAPI students to 1.2% AAPI teachers in 1990. They found that although all three groups faced teacher shortages, AAPIs did not have a shortage in professional occupations unlike the other two groups. The shortage of people in professional occupations may

explain the overall shortage in teaching for the Hispanic and African American groups, but the AAPI group was simply not pursuing teaching careers. The researchers reported, "In 1990, Asians constituted 2.8% of the labor force, 3.7% of all professionals, 5.1% of college professors but only 1.2% of precollegiate teachers" (p. 276). The causes Rong and Preissle report for the AAPI teacher shortage include immigration status, salary and occupation prestige, ethnic role models (ethnic-enclave professions), historical discrimination, job specific discrimination, and parental influence leaning against a teaching career. These causes are similar to the possible factors I explored in this research study.

In order to understand the possible factors associated with the disproportionate representation of the AAPI population in K-12 principal positions and find ways to widen the principal pipeline, we need to understand how changes over time have impacted factors that support or hinder AAPIs in their process. To do so, we must first delve deeper into the history of AAPIs' status and place in the United States. It is important to first consider how AAPI is defined.

Definition of "Asian American and Pacific Islander"

According to the American Community Survey (ACS), which is a part of the U.S. Census Bureau's nationwide survey designed to provide information on changes in local communities,

> in the federal government, the category "Asian" refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent. It includes people who indicated their race or races as "Asian Indian," "Chinese," "Filipino," "Korean," "Japanese," "Vietnamese," or "Other Asian," or wrote in entries such as Burmese, Hmong, Pakistani, or Thai. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004, p. 2)

Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) refers to United States residents who identify with the following nationalities: Asian Indian, Bangladeshi, Cambodian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Malaysian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Taiwanese, Thai,

Vietnamese Bhutanese, Burmese, Indochinese, Iwo Jiman, Madagascar, Maldivian, Nepalese,

Okinawan, Singaporean, and other Asian not specified (U.S. Census, 2007). Thus, the AAPI

group is composed of people from more than 25 different countries.

Grouping these various cultures, traditions, languages, and histories has challenges as

well as benefits. Combining these diverse groups of people can lead one to overlook the

differences and the differing needs of these groups. In fact, the AAPI groups are culturally and

experientially diverse. Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, and Hong (2001) argue that "lumping these

unique ethnic groups…of over 25 ethnic subgroups that reside in the United States into one

group blurs important differences" (p. 345). For example, socioeconomic levels vary greatly in

the AAPI category, with Hmong Americans earning less than a third of what Japanese

Americans made in 1990. Ten times as many Japanese and Chinese Americans held

baccalaureate degrees than Laotian and Hmong Americans in the late 1980s. In addition, Kim et

al. conclude that even though Asian cultures share many values, each culture differs in how

much they endorse each of those shared values. The benefit of combining these various groups

can be found in an enhancement of political power as a larger pan-Asian group, a historical trend

found among African Americans and Latinos (Espiritu, 1992). Karin Aguilar-San Juan (1994)

writes in *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s*, that by creating a

pan-ethnic Asian American community, AAPIs put aside the differences of "ethnicity,

immigration status, education, occupation, income, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and

politics" (p. 7), which were previously obstacles to unified action against racism and racist policy.

Historian Ronald Takaki (1998) writes that throughout history, Asian Americans have struggled

to determine their future together through political actions such as forming labor unions and

strikes against worker exploitation, organized campaigns against the 1790 Naturalization Law,

11

joining the U.S. army to fight as "one people" (p. 508) in WWII even as some were segregated into camps, creating Asian-American studies curriculums in universities to educate, and much more.

Despite the many differences within the AAPI group, they share some cultural and personality characteristics (which will be outlined in more detail later in this chapter) in the areas of cultural values, experiences of organizational as well as personal discrimination in the United States, and language barriers. The use of the singular pan-Asian grouping of these diverse ethnic groups for the purposes of political advocacy is fitting for this study since this is a study of a lack of overall AAPI representation in K-12 school leadership positions. Additionally, desegregated data for students and K-12 principals are not available based on individual groups that comprise the AAPI group, which makes it difficult to study each ethnic group on its own.

Guiding Theories

I will draw on both Social Reproduction Theory and Critical Race Theory to analyze my findings, which will explore issues of AAPI underrepresentation in the K-12 principal positions and difficulties in matching their representation to our demographically changing schools. Additionally, I will examine this study through the lens of Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964) to explore the relationships between the career aspirations of AAPI educators, their behaviors, and their ability to achieve positions as K-12 principals. I will look at the roles of supporting and hindering factors' change over time in AAPI educators becoming K-12 principals. I will also explain the reasons AAPI educators become principals and the attractiveness of the rewards of the position.

Social Reproduction Theory maintains that the existing class structure and social inequalities of individuals in society are reproduced by that society, and that cultural capital,

social assets, is the instrument (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). In the U.S., public schools have played a role in attempting to assimilate culturally and linguistically diverse students through structures, policies, and practices. The school system has mostly valued Anglocentric middle-class norms, which has resulted in "schools failing to recognize and affirm the knowledge, experience, and assets of culturally diverse populations…which has contributed to marginalization and disengagement of students of color…even as ethnic minorities are on the cusp of becoming the nation's majority" (Cooper, 2009, p. 699). I hold that Social Reproduction Theory can be applied to the situation of AAPI principals' underrepresentation. Apple (2004) writes that "hegemony acts to 'saturate' our very consciousness, so that the educational, economic and social world we see and interact with…becomes the only world" (p. 4). As hegemony oppresses and controls our minority students, I maintain that it also affects the promotion of AAPIs into principal positions. Apple argues that a possible relationship may exist between schools as institutions and the reproduction of societal inequities within. Literature on AAPIs related to racial discrimination, social status, and difficulties in acculturation may explain their underrepresentation in the principalship.

Lopez's (2003) Critical Race Theory (CRT) promotes the recognition of inequities by making them explicit, promoting collective action, trying to empower oppressed groups, and advocating for openness to new ideas and critique. For educational leaders, this can mean supporting public education and the democracy upon which it was founded while recognizing inequities and developing inclusive and reform-minded school communities (Cooper, 2009). In order to have an AAPI voice in roles that can help make decisions that affect AAPI students and their success in our education system, we must have representation in all areas of the K-12 education, including in principal positions. According to Lopez (2003), the democratic process

fails to address the political fact that White, middle-class men largely dominate power and influence in this country. The situation of underrepresentation of AAPIs in principal positions can be best related to CRT when we note that the majority of K-12 principals are White. Lopez writes, "to suggest that all individuals have equal rights under the law…is disingenuous…it suggests the public space is racially neutral and contextual factors do not matter in the larger …arena" (p. 76). Along the same line, I argue that the underrepresentation of AAPIs in K-12 principal positions must be viewed in the context of racial discrimination and the diminished status of members of racial/ethnic minorities in society.

Expectancy theory deals with the process of motivation and linking rewards (intrinsic and extrinsic) to behavior (Herzberg, 1966; Vroom, 1964). Expectancy theorists believe that the more attractive a reward is to a person, the more effort s/he will put in to obtain it. However, s/he will increase his/her effort only if s/he can see the connection between his/her actions and the likelihood of obtaining the reward (Vroom, 1964). I believe that the AAPIs' willingness and desire to pursue a career as a K-12 principal is tied closely to their perception of the amount of effort needed to acquire the position as well as their perceptions and beliefs about the payoffs (rewards). This idea is consistent with research findings about AAPIs' career choice tendencies.

Distinctiveness Theory (McGuire, 1984) supports the idea that people in social contexts identify with others with whom they share relatively rare characteristics. I believe that the successful AAPI principals found a way to negotiate their challenging environment by surrounding themselves with other minorities to gain social networking support. This may have helped them gain the needed work and emotional support to become principals. Consistent with the claims of Distinctiveness Theory, a recent study designed to further test this theory found that

members of a smaller ethnic group tended to identify and form friendships within a larger social group (Leonard et al., 2008).

AAPIs' History of Discrimination

Factors that underlie the underrepresentation of AAPIs, including understanding the changes over time of the supporting and hindering factors for AAPIs pursuing principal positions, cannot be explained without understanding the long history of discrimination AAPIs faced from their initial immigration to the United States. The history of individual as well as institutionalized discrimination faced by AAPIs may have had a great deal of influence on their current underrepresentation in the K-12 pipeline. We must examine institutionalized discrimination through the CRT lens and understand that the inequities established and tolerated by the general population is not acceptable. To relay AAPIs' history in as accurate and reliable a manner as possible, I have triangulated information from books by three respected and often-cited AAPI historians. Ronald Takaki, a fellow of the Society of American Historians, is a professor of Ethnic Studies of University of California, Berkeley. Gary Okihiro, the director of the Center for Study of Ethnicity and Race and professor of international and public affairs at Columbia University, has authored numerous award-winning books. The third is Timothy Fong, Director of Asian American Studies Program at California State University, Sacramento.

AAPIs represent a diverse population, with origins tracing back to China, Japan, Korea, Philippines, India, Vietnam, Cambodia, and other countries. Some are newly immigrated, some have U.S. roots going back over 160 years, some work in the kitchens of Chinatowns, some attend universities for post secondary degrees. The history of AAPI immigration is punctuated with racist laws and discrimination that affected the status of AAPIs' citizenship and rights in the U.S.

There were numerous waves of AAPI immigration from the 1780s through the present (Okihiro, 2001). The first large wave of AAPI immigration took place from 1848-1924. This group consisted of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Korean, and Asian Indians looking for a better life. A large group of 52,000 Chinese arrived in 1852 after the Gold Rush and more were recruited in the 1860s to assist with the transcontinental railroad (Fong, 2002). Hostilities against the Chinese were perpetuated through various newspapers and literature. The Chinese Exclusion Act was put into place in 1882 to stop Chinese immigration (Fong, 2002; Okihiro, 2001; Takaki, 1998). Through the CRT lens, we can note that AAPIs lived under anti-AAPI laws such as this for at least 83 years before they were changed.

Unlike the Chinese, Japanese arrived first in Hawaii in large numbers then moved to the U.S. mainland in mass between 1902 and 1907. They worked in the agricultural niche that the Chinese had started. As Japan's international military power grew, the U.S. made a compromise with Japan in 1907; this "Gentleman's Agreement" allowed Japanese laborers and women to continue to enter the U.S. and start families and communities (Fong, 2002).

Koreans and Asian Indians began to immigrate in small numbers before the Filipinos in the 1880s. Koreans came as students, farm workers, and picture brides. Koreans, like other Asians that immigrated before them, were seen as "strangers from a different shore" (Takaki, 1998, p. 271). In addition to experiencing anti-Asian sentiments, the law included them in the systematic discrimination; the Chinese Exclusion Act and the Alien Land Act of 1913 applied to Koreans as well. Between 1904 and 1911, the first noticeable number of Asian Indians arrived to work as farm workers in California. They too experienced racism and discrimination from White farm workers who organized to force them out of the country, as well as from immigration laws specifically targeting them to deny further entry into the U.S. (Takaki, 1998).

Filipinos started their immigration into the U.S. in 1898 after the Spanish-American War. Like the Japanese, Filipinos first arrived in Hawaii before coming to the U.S. mainland. Filipinos were actively recruited to work in the sugar plantations in Hawaii. After the Immigration Act of 1924 was passed to limit Asian immigration, Filipinos emigrated from Hawaii to the mainland in large numbers to fill labor needs in agriculture, where they worked as farm workers and as labor union organizers (Fong, 2002). On the mainland, Filipinos encountered as much discrimination as the other Asian groups (Takaki, 1998).

For the AAPI groups, immigration, naturalization, and equal treatment in the United States has been a struggle from the beginning, based on anti-Asian laws and sentiments that pre-date the first wave of immigration in 1848. In 1790, Congress passed the first naturalization law that excluded Asians from receiving citizenship rights and labeling them non-free White persons (Fong, 2001). In 1850s, institutionalized racism persisted with the addition of the Foreign Miners Tax, which required additional taxes from foreign miners, including Chinese workers who could not receive citizenship. Additionally, a California Supreme Court ruling, *People v. Hall* (1854), decided that Chinese people could not testify in court against a White person. Even as citizens' rights were reconsidered and granted to African Americans in 1870s, Asians were specifically excluded from this policy change. As the U.S. economy struggled in 1870s, anti-Chinese sentiment grew and mob violence erupted in several areas, resulting in the murders of over 49 Chinese. During this time, the U.S. passed the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which prohibited immigration from China (Fong, 2002; Takaki, 1998).

The anti-Chinese sentiment grew into a broader anti-Asian sentiment, as the other Asian population, including the Japanese population, grew. In 1913, the Alien Land Law prohibited people ineligible for citizenship from owning or leasing land. New immigration laws were

passed that continued to discriminate against Asians. In 1917, a provision was made in the Immigration Act to bar Asians (except Filipinos and Japanese) from immigrating to the U.S. Finally, in 1924, another provision was added to the Immigration Act to stop all immigration of people who were ineligible for citizenship (Fong, 2002).

During World War II, the status of various Asian groups within the U.S. shifted. After the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 by Japan, 112,000 Japanese Americans on the U.S. mainland were rounded up and placed into internment camps. This action that was prompted and supported by anti-Japanese sentiment, but went counter to government reports advising against detention (Fong, 2002; Okihiro, 2001; Takaki, 1998). During this time, the status of Chinese Americans rose. The Chinese Exclusion Law was repealed in 1943 and citizenship was granted to Filipinos and Asian Indians. The War Bride's Act of 1945 allowed war veterans to bring Chinese and Filipino wives into the country. Following WWII, the Cold War era of the 1950s brought in many Chinese from the educated elite class. In addition, Korean and Japanese women arrived in large numbers following their American soldier husbands (Fong, 2002).

With the next wave of immigration, selective admittance was given to people with professional skills and education (Fong, 2002; Takaki, 1998; Woo, 1994). Over 90% of Filipino, Asian Indian, Korean, and Vietnamese immigrants came to the U.S. after 1971 according to the 1998 Statistical Yearbook of Immigration and Naturalization Service (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2000). With a history of discrimination and challenges from immigration laws, we may question how the U.S. came to have such a large AAPI population today. As CRT calls for, collective actions in an effort to empower the oppressed groups brought about the civil rights movement of the 1960 that led to the passage of the 1965 Immigration Reform Act. This act increased the immigration quota for each Asian country to 20,000 per year (Fong, 2002). In

addition, it allowed for unlimited immigration of families of U.S. citizens to support family unification. Following the Immigration Reform Act, waves of Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, and Hmong immigrated in the aftermath of the Vietnam War in 1975 (Fong, 2002; Takaki, 1998).

According to Fong (2002), a high percentage of the Asian immigrants in this second immigration wave came with high levels of education due to the restructuring of the global economy. As the U.S. moved to export low-skilled labor to other countries and import individuals with advanced skills to meet our country's shifting economic needs, the number of highly educated foreigners increased. This is evidenced by increasing the number of foreign-born students studying in U.S. colleges (Ong & Blumberg, 1994) and laws such as the Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989 that were passed to fill needs specifically addressing inadequate numbers of skilled people to fill needed positions.

In summary, the different circumstances under which the waves of AAPI groups immigrated to the U.S. are linked to the varied educational and socio-economic statuses within the AAPI group. What holds true is that each subgroup of the pan-Asian AAPI group is linked by race to those who came before them. Thus, each group suffered personal as well as institutionalized discrimination and anti-AAPI sentiment. In addition, the AAPI group continues to be subjected to stereotypes and discrimination, even after institutional discrimination, in the form of various laws, was reformed. However, the pan-ethnic label has been used by AAPIs for political activism and mobilization (Zhou, 2004). In alignment with CRT, public space is not neutral and AAPIs do not have the same rights under the law as they continue to face discrimination, which I will explain in the following sections.

Continuing Issues faced by AAPI Population

       Model minority image. The idea of AAPI as a "model minority" group that has

overcome past barriers of discrimination to become socio-economically successful and high-

achieving through hard work, family values, and investment in education fails to take into

account the realities of the contributing factors of AAPIs' "success." In fact, when this idea of

model minority was being propagated in the 1960s, it negatively affected the AAPI group.

According to Suzuki (1977), Asian activists of the time

> charged that the actual status of Asian Americans was being deliberately distorted to fit
> the "model minority" image in an attempt to discredit the protests and demands for social
> justice of the other minority groups by admonishing them to follow the "shining example"
> set by Asian Americans. (p. 114)

In line with CRT and Social Reproduction Theory, AAPIs were used to promote the notion that

members of minorities can be like Whites and that the playing field is equal. As discussed

previously, Min (1995) suggests that the success of some AAPI groups can be attributed to the

selective immigration laws that allowed educated and professional Asian immigrants to enter in

high numbers. The illusion of the AAPI as the "model minority" hides the fact that AAPIs

received lower wage per average household than Whites with similar educational levels

(Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). This will be further discussed in the section regarding the glass

ceiling.

       Another negative consequence of labeling AAPIs as model minorities meant that the

needs of struggling AAPI students were not addressed until recently. Astin's (1982) *Minorities in*

Higher Education and Ogbu's (1978) *Minority Education and Caste* argued that AAPIs were not

educationally disadvantaged and excluded them from their studies. It has been long documented

that racial and ethnic minority students in low SES urban schools feel powerless when their

school perpetuates a norm where class, culture, and language differences are seen as deficits

(Cummins, 1986; Noguera, 2001). This includes the AAPI population. According to Lew (2007), ignoring important structural or class issues "pit[s] Asian Americans against other minority groups, and ignore children who are poor, failing, or dropping out of school" (p. 372). In his study, Lew examined how class impacts parental strategies, access to schooling resources, and accumulation of social capital among Korean youths in urban New York high schools. After studying two groups of Korean youths (72 total), one low and one higher socioeconomic status, Lew found that the economic resources and parental strategies used in helping their children negotiate through the education system made a difference in terms of whether the students successfully graduated or not. Eighty percent of the 72 Korean American students who dropped out qualified for free and reduced lunch as opposed to 36% who stayed in school. This confirms the findings of Lew's (2004) previous study on Korean American dropouts, which revealed that

> children who live in poor, isolated neighborhoods without the protection of strong
> familial networks and social capital are likely to assimilate the cultures and norms of their
> poor minority peers and adopt an oppositional cultural frame of reference that may not be
> conducive to school success. (p. 315)

In another example of ignoring the struggles of AAPI students in need, Ngo and Lee (2007) wrote of Southeast Asian Americans,

> Vietnamese Americans, Hmong Americans, Cambodian Americans, and Lao
> Americans—occupy a unique position in relation to this discourse of Asian American
> success. On one hand, they are positioned inside this discourse and viewed as
> hardworking, high achievers. On the other hand, they are positioned outside this
> discourse of success and portrayed as high school dropouts, gangsters, and welfare
> dependents (Ngo, 2006). The experiences of Southeast Asian Americans in U.S. schools
> and society are thus reduced to binary extremes. One consequence of such categorization
> is the denial of attention and support to Southeast Asian students and families based on
> dual, contradictory assumptions that they have no problems or are dysfunctional and do
> not deserve assistance. (p. 416)

It is noteworthy that, according to U.S. census data, Cambodian, Hmong, and Laotians in America have the highest percentage of people over the age of 25 with less than a high school

21

education as compared to other groups (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). This translates to economic disparities.

Acculturation. The United States, as a nation of immigrants, has been referred to as a "melting pot" where immigrants are expected to "melt" into the majority group and assimilate into the dominant culture by acquiring the language, behaviors, and characteristics of the majority group (Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). As a Social Reproduction Theorist may point out, Anglocentric middle-class norms will be valued for the melting pot (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). This strategy may have worked for European immigrant groups, however, for the AAPI group, even if they desired to "melt," it was not possible due to their physical features, language, and cultural norms that were greatly different from the dominant American culture (Takaki, 1989; Okihiro, 2001; Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). Throughout AAPI history, Whites made it clear to AAPIs that they would not be accepted into the dominant culture. Even as the AAPI population settled down in the United States, their children as well as the generations to follow continued to experience exclusion through blatant discrimination on an individual as well as on a group level. Social Reproduction Theorists may point out that through the promotion of the dominant American culture, AAPI children were historically marginalized and disengaged. Okihiro (2001) writes,

> the racial divide was ensured by the impossibility of Japanese assimilation. As the San Francisco Chronicle declared in February 1906: "The Asiatic can never be other than an Asiatic, however much he may imitate the dress of the white man, learn his language and spend his wages for him" (p. 105)

Second and third generation AAPIs born in the United States continue to struggle against individual discrimination in all aspects of society, including the education system, job market, and social circles (Okihiro, 2001; Takaki, 1989). Takaki (1989) relates the Nisei experience in this way: "Changing their names would not have opened employment opportunities to the

Nisei…Kelly Ohara…His Japanese family name might have seemed and sounded Irish, but Ohara did not look Irish" (p. 219). In response to being made a perpetual stranger in the United States, AAPI parents reared their children by preparing them to face discrimination and lack of acceptance by the dominant culture (Okihiro, 2001; Takaki, 1989). Methods of preparing their children to face discrimination included keeping ties to their mother county by preserving language and customs as well urging their children to do well in school to prove their intelligence (Takaki, 1989). The injustice and inequity within the education system during this time would not surprise Social Reproduction Theorist such as Apple (2004), as they believe that societal inequities are recreated in schools.

Although AAPI as a pan-ethnic group is "a meaningful analytical category…[as] race overrides many major socioeconomic and cultural factors" (Lee & Zhou, 2004, p. 11), most AAPIs (the majority of which are first generation) identify themselves by their specific countries of origin (Lee & Zhou, 2004). Zhou's (2001) study of Vietnamese youth in San Diego as well as a survey research conducted by Lien et al. (2003) support the notion that most Asian Americans do not use the pan-ethnic label as a self-identifier. However, Lee and Zhou (2004) write that ethnicities based on national origin will diminish with pressures of assimilation while not underplaying ethnic distinctiveness, but may instead move more toward a pan-minority identity. Park (2008) supports this claim by arguing that unlike their first generation parents, the second generation has largely been raised in an environment where the term "Asian" is normally applied to them. The experience of being collectively identified as such in daily life may have supported their acceptance of the pan-ethnic identifier. For AAPIs successful in becoming a principal in the challenging environment, using the pan-ethnic identifier as a way to politically mobilize may have played a role in their success.

Lower returns on education. With AAPIs' known investment in academics, we may expect them to do well in the occupational arena. In a report published by the U.S. Department of Labor called *The Glass Ceiling and Asian Americans*, Woo (1994) reflects that although a body of evidence shows that structural barriers to mobility or institutional sources of inequity exist, people still hold onto the conventional wisdom in the United States that AAPIs are a "highly educated, upwardly mobile, and culturally resourceful group" (p. 17). The fact of the matter is that AAPIs are doing well. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2004), in 2000, AAPIs had the highest percentage of any group in terms of level of education, median household income, and managerial positions. However, when we look closer at the data, we see that the amount of education the AAPI received is not reflected in their occupational attainment. Takaki (1989) reported that in 1980, the mean personal income for White and Japanese men as comparable. However, Japanese men did so by acquiring more education and by working more hours. For other AAPIs such as Chinese, Korean, and Filipino, the disparity was even greater. Woo concludes that although various studies have documented lower returns on education for the AAPI population, there is no consensus on the reasons for this barrier. A 1988 report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (as cited in Woo, 1994) reported that education did not reward Asian Americans with the same opportunities for career advancement as it did for White males even after controlling for work experience, English ability, industry of employment, marital status, and disability. Barriers for upward mobility into higher positions may include personal, cultural, organizational, institutional, or other factors. The glass ceiling effect is not surprising when viewed through the lens of CRT since it holds that the public space is not racially neutral. Whether implicitly or explicitly, all individuals do not have the equal power under the same laws.

The subjective nature of job promotion for principal positions may lend itself to discrimination against AAPIs.

Cultural Values and Behaviors

Many AAPI groups share cultural values. Kim, Atkinson, and Yang (1999) identified these values in the process of developing a tool to measure Asian American acculturation. The Asian Values Scale (AVS) was developed following an extensive literature review of Asian cultural values, a survey of 103 Asian Americans from the community of Asian American psychologists, and three focus group discussions with Asian American psychology doctoral students. One hundred twelve Asian traits were generated and tested by a survey administered to 303 Asian Americans (of which 83 were first generation) and 63 European Americans. Kim et al. define AAPIs' shared cultural values through the AVS as collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition through achievement, filial piety, and humility. Kim et al. specifically define each of the values as follows:

- Collectivism: importance of thinking about one's group before oneself, and considering the needs of others before considering one's own needs.

- Conformity to Norms: importance of conforming to familial and social expectations, following role expectations (gender, hierarchy), and not deviating from social norms.

- Emotional self-control: importance of having the ability to control one's emotions, having sufficient inner resources to resolve emotional problems, and implicitly understanding and not openly expressing emotions.

- Family Recognition through achievement: importance of not bringing shame to the family by avoiding occupational or educational failures and by achieving academically.

- Filial Piety: importance of taking care of one's parents when parents become unable to take care of themselves, and knowing that elders have more wisdom than younger people.
- Humility: importance of being humble, not being boastful, and having modesty.

Although the degree to which each AAPI group shares AAPI cultural values differs from group to group, and with only 10 out of 26 groups considered AAPI participating in the study (Kim et al., 2001), this remains a good reference point in looking at culture in relation to career advancement. The 10 representative groups in the study were some of the larger AAPI groups and most of research participants in this study came from these 10 groups.

AAPIs' culturally driven conservative behaviors could have affected their mobility in their move into principal positions. In a study of 144 publicly employed AAPI middle managers and 100 of their immediate supervisors, Xin (2004) found that the supervisors reported high-quality relationships with the subordinates who engaged with them personally about their personal lives. Not necessarily on a conscious level, the supervisors consistently perceived a higher quality relationship and work when they had personally engaging subordinates. AAPIs in this study worked longer hours and had greater productivity while maintaining a formal relationship with their supervisors, which resulted in undervalued status and less frequent promotions (Xin, 2004). AAPIs are more likely to be underrepresented in fields that were more "subjective," where they have to deal with politics, social networking, and manipulation of language such as education, law, administration, and social services (Cheng, 1997). Perhaps AAPIs' cultural emphasis on conformity and emotional self-control plays a role in the above-described phenomenon as AAPI managers value emotional self-control through minimal expression and conformity through honoring the hierarchy by not deviating from cultural norms.

The cultural emphasis on collectivism and humility may also hinder promotions as some AAPIs strive to not stand out, put others' needs ahead of theirs, and not boast about their accomplishments (Kim et al., 1999). Viewed through Social Reproduction Theory and the idea of hegemony, the tendency to value the dominant culture oppresses and controls the AAPI group. From this point of view, the dominant society should put forth effort to learn about minority cultures such as AAPIs and promote individuals based on their ability to do the job well rather than differences in cultural tendencies.

AAPIs' Career Choice Tendencies

In alignment with Social Reproduction Theory, another factor that may have contributed to the AAPI underrepresentation in the K-12 principal positions is homophily, which is the tendency for people to interact and develop relationships with those who are like themselves "based on greater ease of communication, acceptance, trust, and predictability among those who are similar" (Friedman & Krackhardt, 1997, p. 321). In addition, there is the lack of existing role models in the area of K-12 principal positions. As mentioned previously, there are a relatively high number of AAPIs in managerial positions. However, coupled with the fact that AAPIs are more likely to pursue technical occupations rather than "subjective" occupations (Cheng, 1997; Song & Glick, 2004; Woo, 1994), AAPIs may be less likely to pursue principal positions, which require social networking, manipulation of language, and struggles with internal politics.

After all is said and done, as Expectancy Theorist believe, AAPIs simply may not find that the rewards of becoming a principal is worth the effort needed to become one. Given the fact that becoming a low-status teacher is the prerequisite to becoming a principal, this pursuit may seem less appealing. Studies in career choices support the fact that AAPIs value extrinsic motivators such as earning power, status, prestige, and job security when compared to

Caucasians (Leong, 1991; Kelly, Gunsalus, & Gunsalus, 2009). In fact, if more AAPIs are in the

technical fields rather than in subjective and perceived low-status fields such as education, they

may develop a higher interest in pursuing careers in the technical fields in accordance with their

perception of prestige. The status of an occupation may be determined by the prestige, wealth,

and authority the worker is given. The field of education has been viewed as low status in U.S.

society, also highlighting issues of gender inequality in the workforce that have accompanied the

"feminization" of teaching. Low pay has been associated with the predominance of women in

teaching (Johnson, 2008; Spencer, 1996). According to Johnson (2008), teachers have been paid

low wages, at times barely subsistence levels, and females are often paid less. This is confirmed

by a report by Auguste, Kihn, and Miller (2010), which stated that teachers' average salary have

fallen significantly in the percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), market value, per capita

over the last 30 years and does not compare favorably to other professions such as doctors,

lawyers, and engineers. Additionally, the status of teaching is affected by the fact that they work

with children. Johnson (2008) states,

> Teaching is certainly not esteemed for its financial benefits…earnings of men in
> education [compared] to other occupations in various professional categories [show] low
> salary relative to these occupations. [This] may be one important reason why the non-
> pecuniary rewards of teaching are emphasized, such as interpersonal relationships with
> children and connection to one's community. (p. 5)

Due to the perceived low status and prestige of teaching, AAPIs may be less likely to pursue

teaching, which is the first step in the pipeline to becoming a K-12 principal. Although data on

number of teachers by gender and ethnicity is not available, if the number of higher degrees in

education is an indicator, the National Center for Education statistics for 2007-2008 reveal that

of the 4,553 persons granted a master's degree in education, 930 were male and 3,623 were

female.

Secondly, without many AAPI mentors in the K-12 principal positions, AAPIs may be less likely to pursue it as a career (Rong & Preissle, 1997). Additionally, even non-AAPIs may have assisted in perpetuating this homophily behavior. Chun (1995) states in *The Asian American Educational Experience: A Source Book for Teachers and Students:*

> Teachers and occupational counselors may come to believe that the existing pattern is a reflection of Asian Americans' aptitudes and preferences and they may unknowingly steer Asian American youths into those fields where there are role models and proof of occupational attainability. (p. 107)

Chun also asserts that if Asian Americans are viewed as only fit to work in staff positions for certain occupations, they will continue to be deprived of ethnic networks and support systems if they choose to pursue careers in underrepresented fields.

AAPIs who successfully became principals with few AAPI role models or peers may have found a social network support by seeking out members of other minorities to establish identities and friendships within their environment to compensate for the lack of same-ethnicity peers. In line with Distinctiveness Theory (Leonard et al., 2008; McGuire, 1984), people in social contexts identify with others with whom they share a relatively rare characteristic, getting access to informal networks in order to achieve goals in an organization, an individual must draw on both work-related resources as well as emotional resources (Ibarra, 1993). Mehra et al. (1998) support the idea of AAPIs welcoming members of other minorities into their social network to support themselves. Their research showed that scarcity of a group in a social context promoted members' use of that group as a basis for shared identity and social interaction. Specifically, they studied 181 2nd year M.B.A candidates in a nationally ranked M.B.A program. Women and minority students in this business administrative cohort were more likely to make friendships within group. They found that the exclusionary pressures from the main group rather than their preference supported within-group bonding. Mehra et al. (1998) conclude that "it is the

proportions of people within a specific context (such as work site) that are important even if these proportions are different from those of the surrounding society" (p. 447).

K-12 Principal Pipeline

The U.S. Department of Labor (2012) describes the training and qualifications of an education administrator in the *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. According to the handbook, most education administrators start their careers as teachers and advance their education by acquiring a master's or doctoral degree. Some teachers move directly from teaching positions into principal positions while others first become assistant principals or hold quasi-administrative positions such as department heads, curriculum specialists, or advisors. In many public schools, principals must have a master's degree in educational administration or educational leadership and state certification. There seems to be no set requirement consistent across all schools in all states throughout the United States to become a K-12 principal, with the exception of having an advanced degree or certificate in the area of education or leadership. States can adopt their own standards for qualities or characteristics of a good school administrator and their own certification process.

According to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2008), in the state of California, the certification process for Tier I Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Tier II Professional Administrative Services Credential include the following: having a California teaching credential; three years of successful, full time teaching service; passing the California Basic Educational Skills Test; holding an administrative position; and completion of an approved university program, internship, or passing of the School Leadership Licensure Assessment.

According to National Center for Education Statistics in 2007-2008, there were 90,470 principals in public schools in the nation. Of these, 62,340 were in the elementary level, 21,550 were in the secondary level, and 6,580 were in span schools composed of both elementary and secondary schools. In the state of California, there were a total of 9,170 K-12 principals. Of all principals, 49% were male and 51% are female. It is interesting to note that in the elementary level, 40% were male and 60% were female while at the secondary level, 70% were male and 29% were female.

End of the Pipeline for AAPI Principals

Looking back at the history of discrimination and underrepresentation of AAPIs in principal roles leads us to wonder how the AAPIs at the end of the pipeline successfully negotiated their position as principals. Despite the presence of barriers and restraining forces, AAPIs from the 1970s to the present have become principals. At the conclusion of the Civil Rights Movement, what discriminatory policies did AAPIs encounter as they pursued a career as a principal? What impact did AAPIs' identities have on their career choices as they faced the model minority image, acculturation, lower returns for education, and cultural values? What role models influenced them as they pursued their careers? In times were few AAPIs were in the position as role models or peers, with whom did the AAPIs surround themselves in their social network? Despite the challenges for AAPIs described in this chapter, some AAPIs have successfully become principals.

Summary

In this chapter, I have described some of the issues related to underrepresentation of the AAPI population in K-12 principal positions in the United States. I began by presenting the basic statistics of AAPI students and K-12 principals. Then, I discussed how the AAPI group is

defined for this study. Next, I framed the problem through the lenses of Social Reproduction Theory and Critical Race Theory to relay how the school system values and promotes Anglocentric middle-class norms and how we need to address the needs of minority groups. Additionally, I discussed the role of Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964), which explains the relationships between the career aspirations of AAPI educators, their behaviors, and their ability to achieve positions as K-12 principals. Lastly, I discussed the possibility that AAPI principals may have sought out the social network support of other minority peers and role models in absence of same-ethnicity peers, which is consistent with Distinctiveness Theory. This was followed by a discussion of the history, laws, and events of discrimination experienced by AAPIs in the United States in order to add to our understanding of possible factors that influenced their current state of their underrepresentation. I then discussed issues AAPIs continue to face, including the effects of their image as model minority, issues with acculturation, and lower returns in education. Additionally, I provided information on the cultural values and behaviors of AAPIs, including the lack of role models, as possible factors hindering their advancement through the pipeline. I shared literature that provides insight into the career choice tendencies of the AAPI population. Finally, I briefly described the K-12 principalship pipeline.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the research design I used to guide my data collection and data analysis. The objective was to identify the changes, if any, in reasons AAPIs pursued a career as K-12 principals and change over time of factors that supported or hindered the principals in pursuing their career during 1970-1989 and 2000-2011.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

At the time of this study, AAPIs were underrepresented in leadership positions in K-12, specifically in principal positions. As discussed in the first two chapters, in seeking to understand how to address the disproportionate AAPI representation in K-12 principal positions nationally, I examined the change over time of reasons and factors that supported or hindered AAPIs as they pursued principal positions during two time periods: 1970-1989 and 2000-2011. It is important to understand how, if at all, factors that supported or hindered AAPIs pursuing principal positions have changed from the 1970s to the present as we try to identify ways to support incoming principals. Looking at the changes in supporting and hindering factors as well as changes in reasons that AAPI teachers pursued a principal career may allow us to determine if the principalship became more accessible for AAPIs over time. What factors are still relevant? What factors are no longer barriers? What new factors have emerged? Have changes in the law, such as the 1965 Immigration Reform Act, made a difference in giving access to AAPIs? Have reasons for pursuing principal positions changed with the times? Exploring these ideas by looking at AAPI principals at the end of the pipeline from the 1970s through 2011 in a school district with representative numbers of AAPI principals will help us identify ways to support incoming principals and could help to increase the number of AAPI principals. This will provide mentors, prospective AAPI principals, other researchers, and policymakers with valuable information on growing the number of AAPIs in the K-12 principal pipeline.

Research Questions

To address the issues regarding the underrepresentation of AAPIs in the K-12 principal positions, the following research questions guided this study. For AAPI principals from 1970-1989 and AAPI principals from 2000-2011,

1. Do AAPI principals from different time periods offer distinctive explanations for why they became principals?

2. What factors supported and what factors posed challenges for AAPI educators who wished to become principals? Does this differ for AAPI educators across two periods of time?

Research Design

Using a qualitative research design, I investigated the perceptions, motivations, and aspirations of K-12 AAPI principals who worked from 1970-1989 and K-12 AAPI principals who worked from 2000-2011. These two timeframes were chosen due to the fact that AAPI principals from the 1970s may be the oldest still living group and the AAPI principals from 2000-2011 may include principals from the second wave of immigration in the 1970s who grew up in the United States. Using a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach made it possible to elicit deeper thought and insight into individual motivation of the AAPI principals (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). I developed theories about AAPI principals from 1970-1989 and 2000-2011 from the rich data I gathered from the principals themselves. Using qualitative methods made it possible to construct meaningful explanations for principals' experiences in regards to the factors contributing to AAPIs pursuing careers as K-12 principals. This methodological approach also made it possible to explore factors that hindered or supported their pursuit of a career as a K-12 principal back in the 1970-1989 and how, if at all, these factors have changed

for current principals. Numerous factors were uncovered within the context of the AAPI principals' lives. Factors related to cultural tendencies, discrimination, family beliefs, social networks, identity, role models, policy, and life experiences have influenced their perceptions, motivations, and aspirations for a K-12 principal career. Using qualitative methods allowed me to look for commonalities and themes across the two study groups (Maxwell, 2005; Yin, 1994).

Target population. I used purposeful sampling to identify five -10 K-12 AAPI principals from 1970-1989 and 12-15 AAPI principals from 2000-2011 in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Fewer principals from the 1970-1989 era were interviewed because fewer of them may be living today. The study of the two groups provided information on any changes in the profile of AAPI administrators as well as perspectives from two different generations of AAPI principals regarding internal and external factors that supported or hindered them in pursuing a principalship. AAPI principals in both elementary and secondary levels were interviewed. Some principals from the earlier group were retired.

Research population. I looked at AAPI principals in LAUSD. As LAUSD has a high percentage of AAPIs, it was possible to get a sufficient sample size. LAUSD had higher AAPI representation in K-12 principal positions as compared to the state and national rates of representation. LAUSD is located in Southern California, incorporating areas from San Pedro to Thousand Oaks. This region has the largest population of AAPIs at 4,861,007 or 13% of the total population (Hoeffel, Rastogi, Ouk Kim, & Shahid, 2012). LAUSD is the largest public school system in California, with more than 730 schools that serve approximately 690,000 K-12 students. In 2010, LAUSD was composed of 33% English learners with 96 primary languages reported. Spanish as a primary language made up 94% of the English learners, with Armenian, Korean, Filipino, Cantonese, and Farsi making up the top five languages to follow (LAUSD,

2004). Unlike the national and state underrepresentation of AAPI K-12 principals as related to the percentage of AAPI students, in LAUSD AAPI students made up 6.4% of the total population and AAPI principals made up a representative 6% of the LAUSD school principals (LAUSD Human Resources Division, 2010). Studying the end of the pipeline of a district that is successful in this respect allowed me to identify the supports that were helpful as they changed with the times in increasing the number of AAPI principals. My interest in this study was to discover what factors supported the development of AAPI principals so that these concrete findings can be applied to support incoming AAPI principals.

Access to population. My study samples were recruited using advertisements through the APEA. Additionally, as there may be a smaller number of AAPI principals from 1970-1989, I used the snowball sampling method, asking participants to refer other AAPI principals they know of from 1970-1989 in order to recruit former LAUSD principals who may have retired and no longer receive district-related emails. Participants were selected on a voluntary basis. I gained access to the targeted principal population by first speaking with the leaders of the APEA to explain the focus of my research. I first made contact through email and then followed up with in person meetings. I placed ads through their members contact list via email blasts. When AAPI principals interested in participating in the study emailed me in response to the recruitment flyer, I responded to them via email. Interested participants were invited to fill out a demographic survey to determine if they fit the selection criteria and to determine if they would be willing to participate an interview. Since LAUSD had a representative AAPI representation in K-12 principal positions as compared to the state and national rates of representation, it was possible to get a sufficient sample size.

Each subject's participation began with a short five-minute demographic online survey and two 10-minute (optional) writing prompts to give him/her an opportunity to provide examples of an event or situation related to the research questions using his/her own words. Following this, I conducted an approximately 60 minutes interview with each participant. These interviews were conducted before or after working hours. Additionally, all study participants were advised that all data collection activities would take place outside of working hours. Short follow up calls and conversations occurred if clarification or expansion was needed to a response. The total time requirement for each participant was approximately 1.5 to 2.5 hours. Initial participants were compensated with a raffle for a $20 gift card. Principals who completed the interview were given a $15 gift card as a token of appreciation for their time. I also appealed to the benefit of their contribution for the purposes of supporting new AAPIs in principal positions.

Data Collection

Interviews and writing prompts. First, I sent out a brief email to solicit volunteers to participate in a research study on AAPI principals. I thanked them for volunteering and provided a link to complete a five-minute demographic survey (Appendix A) to confirm that they were part of the AAPI population and to gather basic demographic information. I emailed respondents to set up an interview time and place. A few days prior to the interview, I emailed the participants a reminder about the interview time and place and asked them to respond to two optional writing prompts (Appendix B) in the same email. The first prompt asked them to write about an event or situation that encapsulated their experiences becoming a principal related to why/how they became a principal. The second writing prompt asked them to write about what supported or held them back in the process. I asked them to email their responses to me by the

day before our scheduled interview. The response to the writing prompt allowed me to ask them questions relating to their own subjective experiences during the interview.

Using portraiture as an interview method that "seeks to record and interpret the perspectives and experiences of the people they are studying, documenting their voices and their visions-their knowledge and wisdom" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Hoffman Davis, 1997, p. xv), I elicited firsthand accounts of stories about AAPI principals' experiences through the use of the writing prompt. Portraiture supported my effort to co-create the vignettes with the participants and helped me to create a positive and empowering experience for the participants. As described in Chapter 2, AAPIs have historically been marginalized in U.S. society. Giving the AAPI principals voice and authority over their own experience shifted the approach from being portrayed to having an active hand in portraying (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Hoffman Davis, 1997). Using interviews allowed me to uncover some of their beliefs, values, motivations, and perceptions related to becoming a principal. I used narrative analysis to analyze stories of life experiences of the AAPI principals. Stories or narratives are the "oldest and most natural form of sense making" (Jonassen-Bailey & Hernandez-Serrano, 2002, p. 66). The vignettes I created for highlighted principals using their stories from the interview and the writing prompts were designed to "capture the richness, complexity, and dimensionality of human experience in social and cultural context…conveying the perspectives of the people who are negotiating those experiences" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 3). The vignettes for each principal were used to anchor and enrich my findings with real-life examples of what is important to AAPI principals by including their own voices to weave in the themes that emerged from their shared stories though interviews.

In person, I conducted semi-structured interviews using an interview protocol (Appendix C) generated based on themes that emerged from the literature. The interview protocol included a set of questions that related to the writing prompt for each participant. The interview protocol was field tested on a small group of experienced principals prior to use for data collection and revised for reliability. The in-depth interviews provided an understanding of the lived experiences and the meaning the AAPI principal made of their experiences in school districts (Seidman, 2006). By using a retrospective inquiry approach with a semi-structured interview protocol, I was able to capture rich data on the perceptions, motivation, and aspirations of individuals in these groups as to why and how they pursued K-12 principal position. The interview protocols contained questions regarding the participants' perceptions about the reasons they became principals and factors that supported or hindered their decision to pursue principal positions. Since I was interested in past events that cannot be replicated, I used interviews in place of observations to capture the feelings of how the AAPI principals interpret the world around them as well as to gather historical data (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). Using this flexible and open-ended interview method allowed me to delve into the participants' thinking as they reflected about their life experiences as related to their professional role as principals. Interviews were approximately 60 minutes long and were conducted at locations preferred by the participants. Each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed. I gave each participant a transcript of his/her interview to confirm the accuracy of the information s/he provided. I was able to strengthen my findings through "member checks" (Maxwell, 2005; Morgan, 1993). The summary of data collection methods I used is as charted in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Summary of Data Collection

Research Question	Data Collection	Participants	Possible Themes
1. Do AAPI principals from different time periods offer distinctive explanations for why they became principals?	Demographic Survey Two stories written by participants following Writing Prompts Transcripts of interviews with semi-structured protocol	AAPI principals from 1970-1989 AAPI principals from 2000-2011	-Asian cultural values: collectivism, conformity to norm emotional self-control family recognition through achievement filial piety, humility -Desire for status -Family pressures -Desire for money -Role model to others -Desire to make a difference -Career tendency/interest -Other
2. What factors supported and what factors posed challenges for AAPI educators who wished to become principals? Does this differ for AAPI educators across two periods of time?	Two stories written by participants following Writing Prompts Transcripts of interviews with semi-structured protocol	AAPI principals from 1970-1989 AAPI principals from 2000-2011	-Asian cultural values: collectivism, conformity to norm emotional self-control family recognition through achievement filial piety, humility -Belief in status of education -Specific skills: interpersonal, language, public speaking -Family pressure -Glass ceiling -Model minority -Discrimination -Policy -Access to resources: organizational support, mentor, homophily, knowledge of system -Social capital: social network - Identity: self and imposed -Other

Data analysis. I analyzed data collected from interviews and writing prompts (Miles & Huberman, 1994) by organizing them and looking for patterns and themes for each of the two groups. First, using Microsoft Word, I analyzed the data collected from interviews and writing prompts using a coding process and displayed to highlight the extracted themes. I used codes, which are "tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56), to dissect my data for meaning. Initially, I attached predetermined initial codes (see Table 3.2) based on my literature review that referred to themes such as Asian cultural values, desire for status, family pressure, language,

career tendencies, glass ceiling, discrimination, access to mentor, etc. These codes were used to

identify "chunks" of words, phrases, sentences, or paragraphs and categorize them so that I could

extract themes related to my research questions. These codes helped me to organize data around

reasons AAPIs became principals, factors that hindered or supported them in pursuing a career as

a principal, and various influential factors.

Table 3.2

Start List of Codes

Research Question	Descriptive label for categories	Codes
Reason for pursuing principal career	R: Asian Cultural Value	R-AC
	R: desire for status	R-S
	R: family pressures	R-F
	R: desire for money	R-M
	R: role model to others	R-RM
	R: desire to make a difference	R-D
	R: career tendency/interest	R-CT
	R: Other	R-O
Factors that supported or hindered	F: Asian cultural values (collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition through achievement, filial piety, humility)	F-AC
	F: belief in status of education	F-S
	F: specific skills:	F-SK
	interpersonal	F-SK-I
	language	F-SK-L
	public speaking	F-SK-S
	F: family pressure	F-F
	F: glass ceiling	F-G
	F: model minority	F-MM
	F: policy	F-P
	F: discrimination	F-D
	F: access to resources:	F-AR
	organizational support	F-AR-OS
	mentor	F-AR-M
	homophily	F-AR-H
	knowledge of system	F-AR-KS
	F: Social capital: social network	F-SC
	F: Identity – self	F-IS
	F: Identity – imposed	F-II
	F: Other	F-O

I coded my data after each interview since engaging in an immediate coding process drove my ongoing data collection. I developed a separate definition/description for each code. This early and continual analysis was crucial in uncovering potential bias so that I could interpret the data accurately. In order to continually analyze gathered data, after each email of the writing prompt response I received from the participants, I organized the document by filling out a Document Summary Form (Appendix D). Additionally, after each interview was conducted, I followed up by filling out a Contact Summary Sheet (Appendix E) to develop a brief summary of the main points. These summary forms assisted me later in (a) guiding my next interview, (b) revising or adding new codes, (c) reorienting myself when I revisited the data, and (d) facilitating further data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

As I continued to gather data, I revised and added new codes as they emerged. Revising, deleting, and adding new codes is a natural part of the coding process since there is more happening in the nature of the phenomenon being studied than the initial frames from my literature review could have suggested (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I used coding procedures described as: (a) "filling in:" adding new codes; (b) "extension:" returning to an earlier code to revise it; (c) "bridging:" reconfiguring categories; and (d) "surfacing:" identifying new categories (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to classify and categorize all incidents to the point of saturation in which a sufficient number of incidences had emerged for each category (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

I used diagramming as a way to visually represent the findings. Specifically, I reduced my data and presented it in the form of a spreadsheet (see Table 3.2) that described the reasons AAPIs pursued principal positions, and the internal and external factors that supported or hindered their process. The first descriptive chart presented data of principal participants from

1970-1989, and a second descriptive chart showed data about principal participants from 2000-2011.

Table 3.2

Summary Table

Principal Group	Themes	1970-1989 Quote and Participant Source	Themes in Research	Themes	2000-2011 Quotes and Participant Sources	Themes in Research
Reason for pursuing principal career						
Factors that supported or hindered – Social Network						
Factors that supported or hindered – Identity						
Factors that supported or hindered – Role Model						
Factors that supported or hindered – Policy						

After the data analysis was complete for both groups, I then conducted an analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) across the vignettes looking for common and divergent themes for principals from the two different time periods studied. I looked at the patterns and themes from the 1970-1989 participants and compared them to see if those patterns were absent, weaker, or stronger in the 2000-2011 group. Then, I looked at patterns and themes from the 2000-2011 participants and compared them to see if those patterns were absent, weaker, or stronger in the 1970-1989 participants. Finally, I looked for themes and variables that both groups shared. Each of the data sets regarding the reasons for pursuing principal positions, the internal factors that supported or hindered, and external factors that supported or hindered the participants was subsequently displayed in a matrix. As I explained the findings, I used vignettes created using "rich 'pockets' of especially representative, meaningful data" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 81) from either the interview or the writing prompts to use as an anchor and give life to my theories.

Establishing Credibility and Trustworthiness Through Triangulation and Member Checks

This study used three methods of data collection: demographic questionnaire, face-to-face interview, and a writing prompt. While triangulation alone is not a foolproof strategy for ensuring validity in any study, it reduces the risks incurred by drawing upon only one source of data (Maxwell, 2005). The questionnaire provided data on the participants' background, whereas the interview and the writing prompt were designed to dig deeper than a questionnaire in order to produce rich data to be used to construct the participants' stories. Demonstrating internal validity involves the use of multiple methods of data collection, and data analysis was designed to support triangulation of data by using multiple sources and member checks. When analyzing data, I looked for the presence of similar themes in data from all three methods. When similar themes and patterns emerged from the different data sets, this triangulation added validity to the findings. Participants were involved in co-constructing their stories around their pursuit of a career as a K-12 principal. They were encouraged to review the transcriptions of interviews and asked to provide feedback to verify the authenticity of the data. In addition, giving an account of their experience as a principal through their own writing (writing prompt) was designed to be a critical part of ensuring their role as co-creators of their stories.

One main challenge to the credibility and trustworthiness of this research was my small sample size, which may limit generalizability of the findings to other school districts and AAPI populations. Due to the small number of AAPI principals, I needed to have a high response rate in order to yield an adequate sample size for the study. Additionally, I planned to use standardized protocols with systematic data coding procedures to increase the possibility of making my study replicable. I also established an audit trail by recording all interviews and documenting all interactions. I transcribed all recorded data, and documented all coding

44

techniques in a detailed, concrete and chronological manner. Lastly, I disclosed limitations within the text of my dissertation related to the sample size and discussed to what degree my findings could be generalized.

Ethical Issues

This research was conducted by following all criteria outlined in the Federal Policy for the protection of Human Subjects. It was also subject to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UCLA, which was submitted in September 2011. All data obtained in this project were coded to ensure confidentiality, and all code keys were destroyed upon the completion of the study. No participants' names, including those of retired principals, were attached to individual data. All hard copies of interview transcripts were destroyed to ensure confidentiality.

Participation in this study was completely voluntary. Information was provided for participant consent (Appendix F). In order to uphold the highest ethical responses when performing research, I ensured that each participant was aware of the intent of my study and each participant received a consent form. I also shared my findings with the participants. Lastly, I worked with the IRB to guide my work with my participants in an ethical manner. In preparation for data gathering, I completed the Human Research Curriculum training through CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (Appendix G).

One potential issue I faced in terms of reliability of the data was the possibility of the participants not openly and honestly sharing their thoughts with me due to the fact that I am a fellow LAUSD principal. This meant that in addition to being aware of my own biases in interpreting the data, I had to also be aware of how I may have influenced the participants. I needed to be careful to be as neutral as possible when introducing myself and posing interview questions. I was able to address this potential issue by establishing trust as a fellow AAPI

principal and as a graduate student who was willing to learn. Sharing the transcripts after the

interview also assisted in building trust. An additional measure I took to build reliability was

field-testing the interview questions with a group of experienced principals prior to administering

them to the research participants.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the research design and data collection methods and analysis I

used to study the factors that contributed to and hindered AAPIs in pursuing a career in K-12

principal positions. I included my proposed research questions, justification for using a

qualitative research, proposed research site and participants, data collection methods, and

trustworthiness of the findings. In the next chapter, I discuss the findings based on the data

gathered from this population guided by the research questions within the scope of the study.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

Introduction

Based on a brief demographic online survey and face-to-face interviews, each about an hour long, I was able to collect rich information about the background, family stories, and reasons the AAPI principals from 1970-1989 and 2000-2011 first became teachers and then principals. Their stories described the supports and challenges they faced as they worked within the LAUSD system to become principals in K-12 schools. Evident in each of their stories were the strong presence of life experiences, cultural values, as well as key people who played an active role in shaping their path toward becoming a principal.

As discussed in the review of the literature, the underrepresentation of AAPIs in principal positions may be related to the history of organizational discrimination including homophily, the negative impact of Asian cultural values, and career tendencies of AAPIs toward more technical jobs with higher prestige and ethnic role models. This study found that the AAPI principals of LAUSD from 1970-1989 and 2000-2011 did not report the low status of teachers as a reason that prevented them from pursuing a career in education. In fact, teaching was seen as an honorable profession. Additionally, neither group reported organizational discrimination, homophily, nor lack of ethnic role models as obstacles as they pursued principal positions in LAUSD. With regard to Asian cultural values, they viewed them for the most part as factors that supported rather than got in the way of their acquiring a position as a principal.

This chapter took a close look at the principals' stories collectively as well as on an individual level and examined the categories and themes that have emerged over time from

47

1970-1989 to 2000-2011 as the AAPI principals negotiated their careers. The following research questions guided the exploration of the themes:

1. Do AAPI principals from different time periods offer distinctive explanations for why they became principals?

2. What factors supported and what factors posed challenges for AAPI educators who wished to become principals? Does this differ for AAPI educators across two periods of time?

The findings in this chapter are organized under broader categories that were predefined by the research questions as well as categories that emerged from exploration during the interview process. There were two main categories with corresponding themes: (a) reasons for pursuing a career as a principal (family background, family values, interest in subject matter in college, status of teachers and principals, personal belief system), and (b) conditions that supported or hindered AAPIs' advancement into principal position (Asian cultural values, personal skills, environment of the times, organizational discrimination, availability of support resources, having a family, other Asians as support system). The findings from this study are presented in four sections. The first section will provide an overview of the profile and characteristics of the 20 AAPI principals that were interviewed. The second section will describe the reasons the AAPI principals pursued careers as principals, specifically looking at the themes that cut across the two groups and then themes that differed between the two groups. The next section will describe the factors that supported or hindered the process of acquiring principal positions, focusing on themes that cut across the two groups and themes that differed between the two groups. The final section offers a summary of the findings.

Principal Profile

Fifteen principals from 2000-2011 and five principals from 1970-1989 participated in this study. The principals took a brief online demographic survey and agreed to be interviewed by the researcher. Initially, 16 principals from 2000-2011 and six principals from 1970-1989 responded, but one member of each group was not available for the face-to-face interview. Of the 2000-2011 principals, 10 were female and five were male and of the 1970-1989 principals, one was male and four were female. The participants self reported the AAPI group they identified with from a list of 26 groups, including "other" as a choice. The participants were also asked to indicate the generation they identified with based on the following choices: 1.5 (born outside of, but mostly raised in the U.S.), First (born and raised outside of the U.S.), Second (born in the U.S. with at least one parent born outside), Third and higher (self and parents born and raised in the U.S.), and other. Table 4.1 provides the demographic profile of the participants as reported in the initial online survey.

Table 4.1

AAPI Principals' Demographic Profile

Time frame	Pseudonym	Gender	AAPI group	Generation
2000-2011	1.AB	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	2. LD	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	3. DE	Male	Chinese	1.5
2000-2011	4. FG	Male	Japanese	Other
2000-2011	5. GH	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	6. HI	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	7. JI	Male	Vietnamese	1.5
2000-2011	8. JK	Male	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	9. KL	Female	Filipino	First
2000-2011	10. LM	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	11.MN	Male	Filipino	Second
2000-2011	12. NS	Female	Chinese	Second
2000-2011	13. PO	Female	Chinese	Other
2000-2011	14. PR	Female	Korean	1.5
2000-2011	15. RS	Female	Korean	1.5
1970-1989	1. TW	Female	Japanese	Second
1970-1989	2. LW	Female	Japanese	Third

1970-1989	3. CA	Female	Japanese	Other
1970-1989	4. JC	Male	Chinese	Second
1970-1989	5. RZ	Female	Chinese	First

Based on the demographic survey, the 1970-1989 group was composed of AAPIs of Japanese and Chinese descent while the 2000-2011 group included other AAPI groups including Korean (eight), Filipino (two), and Vietnamese (one). This reflects the more recent immigrant AAPI groups as discussed in Chapter 2. Additionally, more than half of the 2000-2011 principals were from the 1.5 generation, which indicates that they were born in a different country and immigrated to the United States at a young age.

According to the demographic survey, we can also see a snapshot of the principals' educational background. The great majority of principals in both the 1970-1989 group as well as the 2000-2011 group interviewed majored in humanities-related areas as well as completing a Master's degree. Two of the principals from the 1970-1989 era held degrees higher than a Master's, which they acquired after they became principals. The principals' educational backgrounds are illustrated in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

AAPI Principals' Educational Background

Time frame	Pseudonym	Undergraduate Major	Highest Degree Earned	Advanced degree Subject
2000-2011	1. AB	Economics	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	2. LD	History	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	3. DE	Japanese Linguistics	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	4. FG	Liberal Studies	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	5. GH	Elementary Ed	Master's	English and Administration
2000-2011	6. HI	Liberal Studies	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	7. JI	History	Master's	Educational Administration
2000-2011	8. JK	History, Ethnic Studies	Master's	Administrative Leadership
2000-2011	9. KL	General studies	Master's	Counseling
2000-2011	10. LM	Psychology	Master's	Educational Leadership
2000-2011	11.MN	Psychobiology	Master's	School Counseling
2000-2011	12. NS	Sociology	Master's	Education
2000-2011	13. PO	Sociology	Mater's	Reading
2000-2011	14. PR	Radio TV Film	Master's	Educational Leadership

2000-2011	15. RS	Child Development	Master's	Educational Leadership
1970-1989	1. TW	Interdepartmental	Master's	Education
1970-1989	2. LW	Speech	Master's	Education
1970-1989	3. CA	Sociology	Master's	Administration
1970-1989	4. JC	History & English	Ph.D.	Educational Administration
1970-1989	5. RZ	French & Spanish	Ed.D.	Special Education

When the study participants first began to acquire principal positions in LAUSD, all but three were placed in elementary schools. Additionally, the age ranges at which both groups were first placed as principals are mostly between 30-39 and 40-49. The main difference we can observe between the two groups in the promotional process leading to a principalship is that the 1970-1989 principals were all placed into their position without panel interviews whereas the majority (11 out of 15) of the 2000-2011 group had to go through an interview process, which reflects changes in the LAUSD hiring process. Regardless of this difference, both groups of principals had to go through the district's promotional exam process either before or after they found a principal position. Table 4.3 gives a snapshot of their placement into the K-12 principal system as a principal and the promotional process.

Table 4.3

AAPI Principals' Promotional Process and Placement

Time frame	Pseudonym	Grade Level of First Principalship	Age Range at Start of Principalship	Promotional Process
2000-2011	1. AB	K-5	30-39	Exam, interview
2000-2011	2. LD	K-5	40-49	Exam, panel interview
2000-2011	3. DE	K-5	40-49	Exam, interview
2000-2011	4. FG	K-6	40-49	Exam after placement, placed
2000-2011	5. GH	K	30-39	Exam, panel interview
2000-2011	6. HI	6-8	40-49	Exam, panel interview
2000-2011	7. JI	K-5	30-39	Exam, panel interview
2000-2011	8. JK	K-5	40-49	Exam after placement, panel interview
2000-2011	9. KL	9-12	30-39	Exam, placed
2000-2011	10. LM	K-5	30-39	Exam after placement, panel interview
2000-2011	11. MN	K-5	30-39	Exam after placement, placed
2000-2011	12. NS	K-5	40-49	Exam, panel interview

2000-2011	13. PO	K-5	60-69	Exam, placed
2000-2011	14. PR	K-5	30-39	Exam, interview
2000-2011	15. RS	K-5	40-49	Exam, panel interview
1970-1989	1. TW	K-5	30-39	Exam, placed
1970-1989	2. LW	K-5	40-49	Exam, placed
1970-1989	3. CA	K-5	30-39	Exam, placed
1970-1989	4. JC	K-5	40-49	Exam, placed
1970-1989	5. RZ	Middle	40-49	Exam after placement, placed

In addition to the demographic information gathered through the survey, which provided a snapshot view of the participants' backgrounds, face to face interviews allowed me to collect rich data that offer a deeper look into the reasons the AAPI principals pursued their careers as well as the changes over time of factors that supported them or hindered them in their pursuit.

Reasons for Pursuing a Career as a School Principal

Some reasons for pursuing a career as a school principal were the same regardless of the time frame, while other reasons differed between the two groups. One main reason that cut across the two groups was the idea that the teaching career was an honorable profession with a steady income. Many of the AAPI principals from both groups came from families of low socio-economic status and reported that going into teaching was viewed in a positive light. As for reasons that changed over time, although there was a negative shift in the view of the status and pay of teachers from the 1970-1989 to the 2000-2011 group, and contrary to the review of existing literature, the low status of teaching was not a huge deterrent for either group. Although existing literature also points to AAPIs' tendencies toward pursuing technical jobs, almost all of the AAPIs in this study majored in humanities, with an increase of the 2000-2011 group reporting a love of the humanities as the reason they pursued a career in education. Finally, there was a shift in the personal reasons given for pursing the principal position, with the 1970-1989 group reporting a higher degree of confidence in their ability to do better than existing principals of their time as one of their reasons for pursing the position.

Reasons that cut across the two groups regardless of time. Reasons that stayed the same regardless of time frame included the immigrant status and low socio-economic status of the AAPI principals' families as well as personal beliefs about their ability.

Family's immigration status and low socio-economic status. Approximately half of the AAPIs in both the 1970-1989 and 2000-2011 groups were born into middle class, lower middle class, or poverty level families as self reported by the participants. Three out of five 1970-1989 principals and seven out of 15 of the 2000-2011 principals reported struggling for money while growing up. In the 1970-1989 group, the principals came from families where parents struggled for money while working in blue collar or manual labor jobs due to their low education level. This situation stemmed from their recent immigrant status or from their experience in Japanese internment camps during World War II. One principal of Chinese descent reported that his father "came from China and he was a plantation worker. He started when he was 14. He came from China as a laborer…and he started peddling." Another reported that in China, "you only think about survival. The only job you want is probably working in a factory and earn enough to feed yourself…my parents were not educated. [They were] peddlers in China." One principal of Japanese descent responded that her father was a gardener and mother a seamstress, while another reported that after 1945, they were released from the an internment camp, after which her father worked as a gardener.

The low socio-economic status of the family in society and their experiences mattered in the life of one principal who was in an internment camp while growing up during WWII. TW grew up in the Los Angeles area with her parents and three younger siblings. Her father sold wholesale produce and her mother was a homemaker. Their family was placed in an internment center and released in 1945, after which her father worked as a gardener. TW reports that due to

their experience in the camp and the poverty they faced after their release, it fueled her desire to

become a teacher. She shared:

> I think one reason why my parents were so adamant about having a profession, what happened after December seventh, my father's background and working for a commercial place, he didn't have a license and his work was just gone and he couldn't' do anything after the war and that's how he became a gardener because he didn't have any type of certificate…I just looked around and I wanted to earn money and not be pushed around by the government and I was only nine got there and saw that life was very difficult and then I began to realize what sacrifices my parents made and what they had to do to keep life "normal" in camp and what sacrifices they both made after my mom was realized in 1945 in November and my father had to start from scratch and had absolutely nothing. But our lifestyle was very – well poverty level but still a happy life and they never told me that I had to do this and I would end up like that again. But if he had a profession it would've been an easier transition.

TW saw teaching as respectable profession that would bring in a steady income. Additionally,

her experience with teachers in the camps as well as outside the camps motivated her to pursue

teaching. In her words:

> During the early years, most of the teachers were Caucasian and were fair minded and didn't express any prejudice because we were Japanese and my school years were very pleasant and productive…and the same thing happened after we left Manzanar. I came in August of 1945. Although there is much hostility towards the Japanese Americans, all the schools that I went to the teachers were fair-minded and the students were open and fair-minded.

After working as a teacher for 10 years, TW supported beginning teachers as a consultant advisor,

then moved on to work in the local district office, supporting regional administrators working

under the superintendent. With the support of her husband and assistance from her mentors, TW

was able to become an effective principal in a school with mostly African American students

once she was called to serve in the position. She has since retired and is enjoying an active

retired life.

About half of the 2000-2011 group's family struggled for money, however, the majority

(11 out of 15) of their parents were college educated. This stands in contrast to the 1970-1989

group; only with one out of five had college educated parents. For the principals in the more recent group, their blue collar or poverty status was mostly associated with their immigrant status and having to relocate to another country. Some were from single parent homes where the parent worked in a minimum wage job such as waitresses or cook, or blue-collar jobs such as electrician or machinist. Some even owned their own business. However, in the country they immigrated from, many were college educated and had a high-level profession such as teacher, nursing instructor, principal, or criminologist. In this recent group with higher number of parents with college education, there was a slight increase of incidents of attempts to dissuade their child from going into the teaching field. Of the 11 college educated parents, one tried to actively dissuade their child from becoming a teacher and persuade her into going into the medical field. Another parent was not exactly opposed to her son pursuing a teaching career but had to be convinced that the career was good enough and that it was what he wanted. Lastly, another respondent had an older sibling who tried to convince him not to pursue a teaching career due to the idea that teaching was a "female" profession. Overall, even though there were a few reports of parents/siblings, trying to dissuade the respondents from pursuing a career in education, all of the family members eventually came around in support of the respondents' decision.

Personal reasons for choosing to become a principal. I observed little change between principals of the two time periods in terms of the personal reasons for APPI principals' desire to become principals. Both groups reported work ethic (1970-1989: three out of five, 2000-2011: six out of 15), or seeing the principalship as a next step in the career process (1970-1989: two out of five, 2000-2011: six out of 15) as reasons they pursued a career as a principal.

Reasons that differed between the two groups. Reasons that AAPI principals pursued a career as a principal that differed between the two groups included the change in focus of

individual family values such as the emergence of a focus on serving the community and promoting social justice, higher reporting of the love for humanities as a reason to pursue a career in education, the negative shift of pay and status of careers as teachers and principals, and personal beliefs about individual abilities.

Values specific to the family. Although more commonalities were found between the groups in the areas of general Asian cultural values emphasized in their families, values specific to some families played a role in influencing the principals to pursue a career in education and eventually as a principal. For example, in both groups, one set of parents encouraged their children to pursue any career related to their children's interests. In the 1970-1989 group, two sets of parents urged their children to be self-reliant and an additional one encouraged their child to become a professional based on their experience in the United States.

Present in the 2000-2011 group but absent in the 1970-1989 group, two sets of parents emphasized the importance of promoting social justice and serving the community. Principal RS, relayed a story about how she was brought up to serve the community at a young age:

> So when I was young, I would say probably even from elementary school, at the time when people immigrated, there were not a lot of Korean translators in places like social security and DMV and all of those places that people have to go to as new immigrants. So my parents would make me on Saturday mornings go with families, so seven o'clock in the morning, I'm in line with the family in social security or I'm in line at the DMV. And back then, social security and DMV were, you stand in line at seven and you get out at five…What they told me is, you know, these families that come, they don't have resources and they can't hire interpreters and I don't even know, I'm sure there were some, but these people don't have money to do that. That's what we did. We were there for them to help them, interpret, make sure they filled out their forms correctly, make sure they got their licenses and social security cards and anything they needed.

Tendencies toward interest in humanities subject matter. Although most of the AAPI principals from both groups majored in humanities, there was a sharp increase in the reporting of interest in humanities in college for the 2000-2011 group as a reason to pursue a career in

education. Both groups cited time to raise family, a stable job, teachers inspiring them, enjoying

working with children, and family or friends influencing them as reasons why they pursued a

teaching career, the first step in becoming a principal. However, 12 out of the 15 APPIs in the

2000-2011 group emphasized their innate tendencies toward humanities and people-oriented

subjects in college as a reason for pursuing teaching. Some sample responses included:

> FG: When I started undergrad, I was kind of leaning towards…I liked writing…I was going to change my major and do liberal studies so I can become a teacher. Well, I mean in high school, okay, one, going back to the Asian stereotype, one, I didn't like math and I was definitely not musical and here were my parents and I definitely didn't like science. My mom was a microbiology major. My dad was a math major...And then here I was, and all I wanted to do was play baseball and football and drive cars really fast. I was trying to do everything I could to break the Asian stereotype.

> MN: So I knew I wanted to be in the human aspect...Because of the pressure from home and the Philippine background, there are a lot of nurses and a lot of medical field professionals and my cousin is a doctor, my mom is a nursing instructor and so there was a point in my undergrad that I wanted to go into either medicine or pharmacy…but during the course of my undergrad I really just did a lot of soul searching and I realized I wanted to get back to school so I majored in psychobiology. I was very into sciences, but more of the behavioral sciences and so I said I want to be a counselor.

> NS: I had originally thought about being a doctor, so I started in biomedical engineering as my first major. My mom was a teacher though so I always had education sort of as a, in my back pocket, and it did turn out that I wasn't enjoying my engineering major, or it was a biomedical engineering major. After two years with that, I switched over to a liberal arts major and my teacher credential.

> JI: So I went to a professor that I was…the only professor I developed a relationships with was a Asian American studies professor. And he told me just to get out of school. Just graduate and then you'll find out what you want to do. So I studied history and I graduated.

The entire 1970-1989 group majored in non-science areas during their college years. However,

only one out of five mentioned that it was his love of humanities that led him to pursue a

teaching career.

   Belief in the status and adequacy of pay of teachers and principals. The belief in the

status and adequacy of pay of teachers and principals has shifted from high to low from the

1970-1989 group to the 2000-2011 group as the two groups made sense of the rewards of the

profession differently. The majority, four out of five, of the 1970-1989 group agreed that when

they started as teachers and then became principals, the status of teachers, as well as the status of

principals, was high, and both teachers and principals were paid enough. Principal LW from the

1970-1989 group described the status of the teaching profession thusly:

> I think it was much more professional. We always had to wear stockings and a dress and
> we were always dressed. I mean sometimes, I see these teachers in t-shirts and jeans and
> really doesn't go well with me because of my generation. I guess now it's okay. In my
> days, we always dressed and never pants…Dress properly. We always addressed
> everyone as Mr. or Mrs. or Dr. It was the respect thing, which I think is no longer
> prevalent in the field of education. I think when initially, it was still there. I never called
> my principal by their first name. It's always Mrs. Nixon, Dr. Lingo. It was very proper.

In contrast, the majority with 10 out of 15 of the 2000-2011 group perceived the rewards

of the profession differently and said that the pay and status of teachers were low when they

started teaching. They used words and phrases such as "undervalued," "less respected," "needs

improvement," "needs to be uplifted," and "blue collar" to describe how others view teachers.

Some cited reasons such as general loss of respect for others in society, the view of teaching as a

job anyone can do, and the view of teaching as a profession for women. JK stated:

> My brother thought that at first, it was, you know…actually he's much older than me…he
> thought that it was like a female woman's kind of profession. He was, "Are you sure
> that's something that's going to make you happy for a long long long time?" He thought
> that I should pursue more like business, something little more, I don't know, something
> little more that I'll end up liking, he said, because there's going to be a lot more women
> in the field, he said, which he's kind of right, I guess. And then my sisters, they thought
> the same thing.

In agreement with the 1970-1989 principals, the majority (10 out of 15) of the principals

in the 2000-2011 group agreed that the status of principals is still pretty high. They used words

and phrases such as "highly respected," "pretty solid," "pretty well intact," "pretty good," and

"figure of authority" to describe how others view principals. Despite their belief that the status of

principals is high, unlike the 1970-1989 group, nine out of 15 believed that the pay of principals

was too low for their responsibilities. Principal FG expressed this view by stating:

> I think we're underpaid. I think after the principal position, that anything after a principal is highly underpaid. Any principals, they're underpaid but they're not non-competitive. In the sense, for the amount of work and the amount of education we have and the ability to work with both public, non-public everything, I think it's really an underpaid profession. Part of me says that I don't know anybody who'd be managing over a 100 adults on any given day in dealing with another indirectly or directly 700 clients and their families, so your total affect for a school of 700 kids is closer to 2000-2011 or 3000 and be a bridge for the community - would make $100. To even be like a superintendent and only make $225,000, you have 10,000 employees, I mean, what private sector company would have a 100,000 employees, 10,000 certificated doing whatever, psychologists, nurses and only make $225,000? It's kind of ridiculous.

The belief about principals being underpaid is related to the high workload and responsibilities,

as well as the salary cap that exists for principals in LAUSD where they do not accrue salary

increases after a certain number of years. KL stated:

> My husband is an attorney, for example, and he just recently changed jobs and I guess there's an entry-level position – and what they make is not what we make. And I'm not moving any further along the scale and that will be the case so when we discuss things like contributing to our son's college fund, it's going to be different from mine and his. So amount of work we do, I do feel that maybe – because we are in a manager position…we are undercompensated.

Personal reasons for choosing to become a principal. There was a marked difference in

the decrease in principals from three out of five in 1970-1989 to two out of 15 in 2000-2011

reporting that they can do better than the previous generation of principals or principals already

in place. There was also a decrease in the principals wanting to make more of an impact or to

challenge themselves by taking on principal role, from three out of five in 1970-1989 to four out

of 15 in 2000-2011. It is also noteworthy that all principals in the 1970-1989 group were placed

into their positions as principals by superiors, whereas this was true for only four out of 15

members of the 2000-2011 group.

Summary. Some reasons for pursuing a career as a school principal were the same regardless of time period while other reasons differed between the two groups. Many of the AAPI principals from both groups came from families of low socio-economic status and/or immigrant background and reported that teaching was not viewed negatively by themselves or by their families. Although there was a negative shift in the view of the status and pay of teachers from the 1970-1989 group to the 2000-2011 group, the low status of teaching was not a major deterrent for pursuing a career in education for either group. Additionally, almost all of the AAPIs in this study majored in humanities, with an increase among the 2000-2011 group in terms of reported love of humanities as the reason they pursued a career in education. Finally, there was a shift in the personal reasons given for pursuing the principal position, with the 1970-1989 group reporting a high degree of confidence in their ability to do better than existing principals of their time as one of the reasons for pursing the position. Next, I will describe the findings related to factors that supported or hindered their process.

Factors That Supported or Hindered the Process of Becoming a Principal

Some factors that supported or hindered AAPIs' process of becoming a principal stayed the same regardless of time period, while others were expressed differently or in varying degrees with change over time. Some factors that stayed the same for both groups with regard to support of their career were cultural values such as the value of education, high academic expectations, and family recognition through achievement. In addition, both groups reported that homophily and pressures of caring for their family did not interfere with their career pursuits to a great degree. Factors that differed between groups included cultural values such as collectivism, subservience, work ethics, and parents' trust that their children will succeed. Some values were emphasized more in one group than the other, while some were absent altogether. Other

60

supporting factors that differed between the two groups included their beliefs about why they were chosen to be a principal, whether based on their personal ability, the political environment of the times, or a combination of the two. Another set of factors that differed between the groups was the availability of resources such as mentors, organizational support, social network, and supportive superiors. Both groups differed in the type and degree of support they received from these resources. Finally, there was an increase in AAPI principals from the 2000-2011 group who did not identify with or feel like they belonged to an Asian group and thus did not use Asian groups for support.

Factors that cut across the two groups regardless of time. Some factors that both groups felt supported their career were cultural values such as value of education, high academic expectations, and family recognition through achievement. In addition, in contrast to the review of literature which points to the possibility of homophily as a factor that may hinder the AAPIs from becoming principals when there were few AAPI role models and superiors to begin with, both groups reported that their process of acquiring a position as a principal was not inhibited by homophily. Finally, both groups also reported that the challenges of taking care of their family did not get in the way of pursuing their careers regardless of the fact the majority of the participants were female.

Values viewed as important to becoming a principal.

In looking at the values viewed as important to becoming a principal, the respondents suggested the interplay of race and culture by themselves making connections between values often associated with Asian cultures such as the value of education, high academic expectations, and family recognition through achievement. Some respondents from both groups, made comments such as "It was the old Japanese way", " You know Asians, we have to prove

ourselves", " Korean moms, you know. You have to make your parents proud", etc. to suggest that the values that assisted them in becoming principals were cultural in nature.

Value of education: Going to college is mandatory. There was no perceptible change in how the two groups valued education. The parents of a majority of participants (1970-1989: four out of five, and 2000-2011: 11 out of 15) emphasized the importance of education. As LW from the 1970-1989 group shared, "I just knew that I came from a family that from the time we could walk, it's not where or what you're going to do but what college are you going to go to. So you know, it was understood." Echoing LW's thoughts, PR from 2000-2011 gave a typical response from her group, stating, "In our family, everybody went to college...All of my family members do very well so it's an unspoken thing, I think, with Asians that the number one thing is education and it's your ticket no matter what."

High academic expectations. Consistent with their value of education, the majority from both groups experienced high academic expectations (1970-1989: three out of five, and 2000-2011: 10 out of 15). LW recalled how much academics was emphasized in her family:

> Oh, the other thing is, we never got Bs. If we did, we had to explain why because my dad came here as a kid speaking only Japanese and was a houseboy when he went to Hollywood High. He was like 14 when he came… High, high expectations. College before you could even walk, it seems like. Where are you going to go? What college do you want to go to? All As, you shouldn't get Bs. So those are the things, I think that typical of an Asian family in those days.

Along the same lines, this story told by JI in the 2000-2011 group demonstrated how important it was for him and his brothers to meet high academic expectations while growing up:

> School is the most important thing in life. If you don't get an A, you get spanked. It's true…My parents brought us up…My brothers, three of us, were real rowdy and all three of us were about the same age. Basically, if your brother didn't do well, you all got spanked. So it's kind of like a team. You better watch out for your brothers. If you didn't get straight As, you all got spanked. And it was pretty funny because we would…it wasn't terrible or anything like that but it was that kind of pressure. I remember walking home with my brothers in elementary and my older brother, we got our report card, and

we were shaking our heads like oh my god because he got three Bs. My younger brother and I got straight As so we were like oh my god.

Family recognition through achievement. The cultural value of family recognition through achievement was acknowledged highly by both groups (1970-1989: three out of five, and 2000-2011: 11 out of 15). As most participants stated, they experienced the need to make their families proud by achieving first at school and then in their work life. Some typical sample responses were as follows:

- 1970-1989 (LW): They would say little things to their friends. Well, my daughter is the principal. Little things but never telling me, but I knew.

- 1970-1989 (CA): My parents were obviously very proud of what I was doing. I think in Japan, being a Principal of a school is supposed to be very prestigious so she always used to think it was great.

- 2000-2011 (LD): I really want her to be proud of me and make her proud…then when I became an assistant principal, she was so proud that I'm an assistant principal. And she'll brag to her friends, "My daughter. This is my daughter, she's an assistant principal." I said, "It's okay, Mom, you don't have to..." Now, whenever we go, "She's my daughter. She's a principal now!"

- 2000-2011 (HI): At first, they were mad that I left home. We didn't talk for years. And then I got married, I was very young. I was 19 when I left home so they were shocked. Then, again, I got my degree, credential, they were very proud of me when I did it. They had this different respect for me even though I wasn't in that norm. But there was something in me that always wanted to prove that I can … I want them to be proud of me. There was that side of me that meant a lot.

- 2000-2011 (AB): So to them, it's a great sense of joy and pride and I think with that

  kind of, that enthusiasm, I think I wanted it even more for them as well as for myself

  because I knew that would bring a great sense of accomplishment to our family in

  that sense.

Homophily. Neither group reported homophily as a factor in pursuing and securing a

principal position. In fact, both the 1970-1989 group and 2000-2011 group concurred that they

had an ethnically diverse group of people either mentoring them or promoting them from higher

positions. While Asians in higher positions who specifically helped them acquire their principal

positions were absent, both groups reported a relatively high number of White mentors and

superiors who facilitated their promotion (76% of the 1970-1989 and 40% of the 2000-2011).

Both groups reported a mix of African Americans and Latinos as their mentors (20% of the

1970-1989 group and 28% of the 2000-2011).

Family care: Support by spouse or parents. None of the 1970-1989 principals and the

majority of the 2000-2011 principals said that having a family did not hold them back from

ultimately becoming a principal. One fifth of the principals did mention that having children and

wanting to take care of their needs first influenced them to refrain from seeking out or accepting

principal positions. However, both the 1970-1989 (five out of five) and 2000-2011 (11 out of 15)

groups acknowledged that they received assistance with household and childcare needs from

either their spouses or parents. Both groups mirrored each other in their descriptions of the

support they received. Sample responses regarding assistance in childcare and homecare from

their parents were:

- 1970-1989 (TW): when I had children and I was young, [my parents] were very

  helpful and babysitting and taking care of my children if there was a need or illness or

anything…in that way they were very supportive...I always had my parents and my grandmother that always cared for my children in case there was an emergency.

- 2000-2011 (MN): Yes, she was an active nurse throughout my life. When I got married and started having children I offered her an early retirement and take care of her. In our culture we take care of our elderly so I was very fortunate to be able to have my mom support in the values of taking care of my children while I worked. My wife and I are both professionals.

- 2000-2011 (RS): My father passed away so my mom and my husband totally support anything I decide, whether it's teacher or administrator. They're completely supportive. My mom lives at home with me, so she's able to help me with my kids, because I have three kids. And so she's able to do a lot of the house things for me, so I'm able to focus on my work

Mirrored sample responses regarding childcare and homecare from their spouses were:

- 1970-1989 (CA): Obviously my husband had to be supportive. I don't even cook, but he had to really support all my efforts.

- 1970-1989 (TW): He had his own business to run and he was a wholesale produce business but he was very supportive when I had evening meetings or if I had a Saturday workshop, he never complained. He just had to know ahead of time. Well his encouragement was more subtle. He just supported me by not expressing any concern with the time being away from the family or the home

- 2000-2011 (NS): And my husband is very very supportive. He really helps out around the house and with the kids.

- 2000-2011 (RS): He supports me really well. He allows me to spend my nights at

    school. He's not happy about it, but he doesn't give me grief over it, because I'm here

    at midnight. He takes care of the kids and he knows that the first couple years in this

    position is going to be crazy sacrifice to the home and family, and he allows it. And

    he picks up a lot of the things I can't do.

Factors That Differed Between the Two Groups

Factors that supported or hindered the AAPI principals that differed over time included

cultural values such as collectivism, subservience, work ethics, and parents' trust that their

children would succeed. There was an increase in collectivism (sacrifice for children's success)

reported by the 2000-2011 group, which is composed of a majority of 1.5 generation immigrants.

Contrary to speculations based on the review of literature, which point to the possible negative

impact of cultural values such as humility, the 2000-2011 group reported an increase in

subservience as a value that assisted them in promoting up. Finally, while the 2000-2011 group

reports that their parents unconditionally trusted them to succeed, the 1970-1989 group

unanimously reported work ethics as the value that facilitated their success. Other supporting

factors that differed between the two groups included their beliefs related to the reasons they

were chosen to be a principal. The 1970-1989 group reported their content knowledge and the

political environment of the 1970s and 1980s as supportive factors while the 2000-2011 reported

people skills as supportive factors. Interestingly, the 2000-2011 group reported at a higher level

their lack of Spanish language skills as a barrier. The two groups experienced the promotional

process differently as all members of the 1970-1989 group were placed in the position by their

superiors, which was the customary practice, whereas the 2000-2011 group had to go through an

interview process. While there was a slight increase in reports of discrimination by the 2000-

2011 group, neither group reported that organizational discrimination significantly got in the way of them promoting up. Availability of resources such as mentors, organizational support, social network, and superiors supported the two groups but in different ways. While both groups benefited from mentor support, the 2000-2011 group reported an increase in emphasis on mentor support in the areas of encouragement and modeled behavior. The 1970-1989 group had very little organizational support, and the 2000-2011 group reported an increase in organizational support in the area of promotional exam preparation. Finally, in the area of looking to other Asians as a support system, more 2000-2011 AAPI principals reported that they did not feel that they belonged or looked to other Asians for support. In fact, the 2000-2011 group reported more sentiments related to not feeling like they were a part of the Asian group.

Values viewed as important to becoming a principal.

As with values that remained the same between the two groups, when speaking of the emphasis of values that changed over time, the respondents continued to suggest the interplay of race and culture by themselves making connections between values often associated with Asian cultures such as collectivism, subservience, and work ethics with being Asian. Comments such as " You know how Korean parents ", " It was the old Japanese way", " You know Asians, they gotta keep going up and keep working hard", etc. to suggest that the values that assisted them in becoming principals were cultural in nature.

Collectivism (parents sacrifice for the children). RZ, a principal from the 1970-1989 group, recalled her experience coming to the United States where all of her relatives pitched in what little they had to help her succeed.

> We all come from big extended families in China. Even though they were poor, my uncles, aunts, cousins, brother, sisters all chipped in $100 when I left for the US. They all lived in housing projects and they all chipped in and bought me an Olympia typewriter and that's all I had. Not that much clothes, just the typewriter, the medicine that I was

able to sell and get good money in San Francisco, and that framed my future. So they know that I wasn't going there to be a poor lowly worker or a maid.

Although collectivism in the sense of parents sacrificing for the benefit of their children was present in both groups, as immigrants, over half of the principals from the 2000-2011 group (seven out of 15) had parents who made sacrifices for the betterment of their children. One principal, LD, recalled what her single mother who worked as a waitress to support the family used to do and say to help her to understand how much she was sacrificing for her children's success.

> She put one-fourth of her earning to my education, so she sent me to a private school, she sent me to a Catholic school, which was really great…Even if I had these opportunities or temptations, I was able to get over it, because I couldn't disappoint my mom. And the other part of is that she's working really hard and I can't disappoint her. And she said, "I'm doing this for you, I'm living for you, if you do anything wrong, I'll kill myself." You know, those things. Hahaha, does that sound familiar? "I would die, you'll find me in the Waikiki ocean tomorrow morning if you don't do what..."

Principal RS from the 2000-2011 group described the modest life her family led while her parents spared no expense related to her development as a student.

> We lived actually pretty modestly…but [my father] made sure, we didn't get a lot of material things, but when it came to school things, when it came to anything related to school, there was never an amount that he wouldn't spend. So when I started learning violin at school because I joined the orchestra, I didn't want to bring a violin home, carry it everyday, he bought me a violin. I didn't want to carry books, he bought me the same books so that I can have a set at home and then I don't have to carry books at school.

Subservience: Humility/compliance/loyalty. There was a change over time in the value of humility/compliance/loyalty from the 1970-1989 group to the 2000-2011 group, with an increase on its emphasis in the more recent group. While it was present in the 1970-1989 group (two out of five), more than half of the 2000-2011 group (nine out of 15) identified humility/compliance/loyalty as a value that facilitated their becoming a principal. Principals from the 2000-2011 group expressed thoughts similar to LD when she stated:

And also, subordinance, that we have a great subordinance. We follow, we're very submissive, or not, I don't like that word, submissive. Compliant. I think that's really cultural and loyalty to your boss and to your company. That really helped me, too, because even with American or traditional American bosses, they see that as a value, that my work ethic and loyalty and really supporting them and looking up to them as my boss and whatever they sell, I'll jump and my answer will be, "How high?" is my answer. So I think that helped me.

Others stated that being humble, letting your achievements speak for themselves without boasting, never showing arrogance, giving away credit to others, and trusting the decisions of their superiors helped them to become a principal.

As high as humility/compliance/loyalty was rated as a cultural value for the 2000-2011 group, in a few instances, it appeared to serve as a factor that hindered the AAPIs in their process of becoming principals. One of the 2000-2011 principals reported a painful experience of being victimized in a sexual harassment situation in the workplace; in this situation, her cultural value of compliance and loyalty had a negative affect on her situation. HI stated,

Yes. I would have to say at one point in my career because I was young, single parent, there were some discrimination…harassment around by men and I had to fight that. That was the most difficult thing that I faced…that was really tough because people saw me as the villain…[It was] not so much my race, but maybe my upbringing. Like respect your elders, respect someone with authority. Don't talk back. All those submissive things that I was told to do as a female that people saw that as me giving in and so that's probably my heritage. I think people perceive you a certain way. So I think race has something to do with that. I also felt from that incident it was kind of like high profiled incident, that other Asian educators might see me as somebody that… that perceived me some other way because it was kind of political.

Principal FG, confirmed HI's sentiments by stating:

Yes. I think generally speaking, Asians tend to frown on other Asians that are very self-promoting. Most Asian cultures ask you to be humble and they're very good at promoting others ahead of themselves and…as an administrator, a lot of times I'd rather have the news media come and see everything that's happening in the classrooms and with the teachers than see what I'm doing. I tend to highlight a lot of our programs and speak in terms of we did this and we did that, as opposed to I did this, I implemented this, I did that. I really didn't but the staff did it and so we tend to give credit away from us and put it on other people or institutions.

FG also affirmed HI's belief about the lack of support she felt from other Asians while she was

going through the sexual harassment ordeal, stating:

> Asians don't tend to promote Asians, I think it's harder for them to move up. I think Hispanics are very good at supporting Hispanics. I think our Black administrators are very good at promoting our Black administrators, Jewish educators, same thing. I think all the other groups are very good at promoting their own. I think the Asians are the only ones aren't good at promoting their own because they still expect you to be better than everybody else.

Work ethics. Although both perceived the importance of work ethic as a factor that

supported them in becoming a principal with nine out of 15 2000-2011 principals in agreement,

the 1970-1989 group unanimously identified work ethic as one of the factors that supported them.

They described their work ethics by repeatedly mentioning that they were always at work early

and were always the last to leave, putting in long hours, working hard, and doing the best job

they could. One principal in this group even described her belief in how much sacrifice goes into

doing the best job as a principal. CA shared:

> I know that your family is very important, but I think that you should examine how much your family is going to suffer and make a choice. I don't think you should evict your family but also think that you could have both. I think you could be really hard working, spend time at your school, do things, and at the same time have a good family life because you could include your family in a lot of things. I've always told all my APs that your family comes first but you can't neglect your job too.

Parents trusting children to achieve. Lastly, the value of their parents simply trusting

them to achieve was not mentioned by the 1970-1989 group, but surfaced in the 2000-2011

group when seven out of 15 principals acknowledged its presence in their upbringing. Examples

of their responses included, "but she never had to worry that I wouldn't do well in school," "She

never said, get home by this time or where you going…she had that, I trust you, I believe in you.

I know I trust that you wouldn't do anything wrong or foolish," and "my family gave me…the

can do attitude that anything you set your mind to that you want to…it can absolutely be done."

Belief in why they were selected to become principals.

Personal skills: Knowledge of specific content. The majority of the 1970-1989 principals (four out of five) believed that their expertise in content-specific areas contributed to their promotion into principal positions, whereas the 2000-2011 principals did not mention this factor. Two principals cited their background as literacy specialists, another cited her special education credentialing, and yet another cited her multiple credentials as contributing to their promotion to their principalship.

In contrast to the 1970-1989 group (two out of five), nine out of the 15 2000-2011 principals found that their people skills and their ability to work well with others facilitated their promotion into principal positions. More than half of the 2000-2011 principals reflected that people skills such as their ability to work with people beyond the Asian population, ability to network, bring people of different backgrounds together, bonding with parent groups, building and sustaining relationships, and ability to deal with outside the classroom environment facilitated their becoming a principal.

Personal skills: Foreign language ability. Two of five principals from 1970-1989 stated that their knowledge of a foreign language, one Spanish and one Japanese, assisted them in acquiring principal positions. Principal RZ clearly recalled how she acquired her first principal position:

> My language ability, not the Mandarin Chinese but the Spanish. They really needed somebody that was Spanish speaking. I came here at age 17 with not knowing much English and only $100 in my pocket and no relatives trying to make it on my own. I went to Fresno first and picked fruits to survive and wore myself out because Disneyland was such a glory to me and I wanted to see why people wanted to spin in cups that there must be some magic to it. I said look, with all this opportunity, you don't see that as a deficit. Although I was sweating in the fields in Fresno, I didn't see that as a problem; I saw it as an opportunity to learn Spanish so I learned Spanish in that 1 year. I was totally immersed.

Although none of the 1970-1989 principals reported that not knowing a foreign language

hindered them from becoming principals, a small number, four out of 15 principals in the 2000-

2011 group reported that not knowing how to speak Spanish specifically got in the way as they

tried to become a principal. DE described his experience in this way:

> Funny thing is, you know how the districts shift? I was in local district Z, then it was
> shifted to district X and X is heavily Latino and I didn't speak Spanish so I was always,
> top one, two, or three in the selection and never got to be principal until I went to Local
> District X. They hired me as principal.

Personal skills: People skills. There was a noticeable increase in citing people skills, the

ability to communicate and work with a diverse group of people, as a factor that supported them

in becoming a principal. While only two out of five principals from the 1970-1989 group stated

that their people skills helped them become a principal, nine out of 15 principals from the 2000-

2011 group reported people skills as a supporting factor.

Political environment of the times (race as a factor). For the 1970-1989 group, the

political environment of their times had a direct effect on their promotion into principal positions.

With a high consciousness of race as a supportive factor, almost all (four out of five) of the

principals from the 1970-1989 group mentioned that during the time they were promoted into

principal positions, there was a political emphasis placed on encouraging integration of ethnic

groups. They spoke about people in higher positions such as superintendents and school board

members pushing for integration of ethnic students as well as racial representation of

administrators. During their time, magnet schools were established to promote integration, and

race-based organizations such as the Asian American Commission, Mexican American

Commission, and the Black Commission were formed to advocate for racial representation for

administrators. Three out of five members of the 1970-1989 group stated that their promotion

was directly due to the combination of their knowledge of content matter and their race. A

typical response to whether their race had a direct relationship to their promotion into principal

positions was "both my race and my skills." An example of how the environment of the times

affected the promotion of an AAPI to principal was demonstrated by LW, who was chosen to

work on a committee to assist in writing an integration plan for magnet schools. From there, she

made long-lasting connections with colleagues and mentors. Based on this experience she was

asked to join the integration staff at the central office and, with hard work, was "flagged" by

people in higher positions as a strong candidate for a principal position. Soon after, she was

placed by the district as a principal of a school that serves a predominantly White and Japanese

population.

The climate of the 1970s-1980s mattered in the life of JC as he became a principal. JC

grew up in a family with both parents, two older brothers, and a younger brother. His father came

from China to Honolulu as a plantation worker at the age of 14. JC's father started peddling

produce and married JC's mother at the age of 14. JC was raised with the values of hard work

and the importance of education. Combining his interest in humanities with the desire for a

secure job with steady pay, JC chose teaching as a profession. After teaching, he became a

counselor, then a head counselor at a secondary school. From there, he moved up to work in the

Reading Task Force at the central office to support principals at school sites in their efforts to

raise literacy levels. This opportunity allowed him to get acquainted with administrators in the

central office. During this time, the district was going through a period where integration was

emphasized. JC described the environment of this time thusly:

> It was across the board at that time, when I was going through there in the 50s, 60s, in the
> 60s and the 70s, there weren't many Asian administrators. In fact, I was the only Chinese
> in those positions. There were few Japanese, not many administrators. In fact, these
> programs encouraged integration of ethnic groups, ethnic administrators, ethnic teachers.
> They encouraged them to apply for these positions and to, to raise their own goals, you
> know, in the district…I didn't have any direct support from ethnic groups, now, except at

that time also, I was involved in…an Asian education commission. Asian Education Commission's one of the priorities was to elevate ethnic, meaning Asian, teachers, admin, teachers and coordinators from schools into higher positions. That was one of their goals. I mean the Mexican American commission did a lot for Mexican Americans because they were advising the board…They established the Black Commission, so the Black Commission pushed for Black administrators...even though your purpose is to improve the welfare, the educational achievement of students, your high priority is to develop administrators in the district. That was, to me, it was the hidden agenda, although it was well known that your commission helped to elevate ethnic people to be administrators… in fact…some were appointed directly from schools to the Central Office, you know, directly, I mean, they just picked them because of their ethnic background… but there was a lot of community support… because the community had a lot to do with the ethnic promotions, the community, they pushed board members, you know, board members represent different districts so they pushed board members into recognizing ethnic because in those communities, predominantly black, predominantly Spanish-speaking, they pushed for role models so they wanted a role model of a Japanese, no, not a Japanese, a Black or a Black, Spanish-speaking and Asian and I think that was the reason I got in.

According to JC, who is Chinese-American, in 1973, he was chosen based on his ethnic background as well as his knowledge of literacy, to become the principal of Hills Academy, a school mainly composed of Chinese-speaking students. Although he was chosen for and placed into the position by the local district superintendent, working with students, their parents, and the community appealed to him. He worked at Hills Academy for many years, after which he retired.

The political environment differed for the 2000-2011 group. According to more than half of the principals in this group (eight out of 15), when they became principal, the district was going through a severe budget crisis and supports for principals were cut drastically. RS shared the following experience:

What was LAUSD like? Tough. I came in at a time when budget was horrific. I came in at a time when they're cutting and slashing everything, and the supports that a school is used to have were being cut. Your assistant principals were being cut, custodial staff was being cut, office support cut, teachers being cut, everything's being cut. So I think I came in at probably what I see as the worst time to be a principal and a lot of mandates from the district, a lot of things due, and I just think it's a crazy time.

There was no mention of political drive to have racial representation, except perhaps by the principal who mentioned that he had difficulty as an AAPI promoting up in a mainly Latino district. The budget crisis led to massive retirements for principals, which opened up opportunities for one third of the AAPIs in this group to gain principal positions.

Promotional process. Although the 2000-2011 group reported more discrimination in the promotional process, neither group identified organizational discrimination as a major factor that hindered their promotion into principal positions.

Placement, interview, promotional exam. All five of the 1970-1989 group were placed in principal positions by superiors. None of the principals interviewed with a panel for their position, and only one out of the five principals was placed in his/her position prior to taking the required promotional exam. It seemed that it was a common practice in the 1970s-1980s for principals to be placed based on the schools' racial and language needs and the principals' promotional exam scores. A typical recollection was, "I never asked for it. They just told you, 'you are going,' so I went," or "They just plucked me out of Central and placed me."

In contrast, the majority of the principals in the 2000-2011 group (11 out of 15) had to interview with a panel before being hired as a principal; only four out of 15 were placed into their position by a person in a higher position. As with the 1970-1989 group, four out of 15 of the 2000-2011 principals took the required promotional exam after securing their position. Unlike the common practice of the 1970s-1980s, it seemed that going through the process of being selected through the interview process validates the candidate's qualifications. JK recalled:

> I'm glad that I went through the whole interview process because one thing that John Montana, the first principal told me, that even if you get placed, you take the test no matter what, first time it comes up. Because you have to go through all the hoops and loops, if they ask you to do all this and you don't want to hear afterwards that he got

75

placed and he did this and that. That's why I'm so happy I went through that whole interview process out of 37 applicants, then they got four, and out of four, I was chosen.

Racial discrimination: Policy. The 1970-1989 principals concurred that they felt no discrimination based on race from LAUSD. There was a very slight rise in the perception of an increase in discrimination reported by the 2000-2011 group, with three out of 15 principals who felt discriminated against. One principal reported that he felt discriminated against due to his Asian appearance. He stated that it was difficult to establish immediate presence due to his height and he felt that he had to always prove that he was qualified. DE reported that in one particular local district of LAUSD, he felt that only Latinos were promoted to principals:

> They were Latinos, so, you know, as in an educational institution, you're supposed to set role modeling by being fair and equal. When you're the one or two Asians in local district X as an AP and you're always not getting positions when newer assistant principals without that much experience get promoted, you start questioning and rightfully so.

LD recalled her district's promotional interview process where she felt that she was discriminated against due to her accent:

> …and this is confidential, but two interviewers who interviewed me one person...out of two, the one person was friends of [my mentor] and that person went to [him] and told him about me, that I did great, but the other person insisted that I shouldn't pass the test…and that was, again, a part of the racism there. That's what actually [my mentor] told me, blatantly. One person was white male and the other was a black woman. So their argument, in terms of me being a Korean American, that the other woman didn't agree that I should be, that I was not...Well, I don't know what conversation they had or what went on about my accent, I don't know what bothered her.

While many more principals from the 2000-2011 group recounted episodes of racial discrimination they felt outside of LAUSD such as in the university system, workplace, and in society, most (13 out of the 15) perceived that LAUSD's promotional process of exams and interview was fair, with no discriminatory elements.

Availability of resources.

Mentor. Both groups reported that they benefited from receiving support from a mentor or mentors. Mentors assisted them by serving as models, actively encouraging them to advance in their careers, providing learning opportunities or advice, and sharing information directly related to promotional job opportunities.

Although almost all members of both groups benefited from having mentor support (1970-1989: five out of five, and 2000-2011: 14 out of 15), for the 2000-2011 group, there was an increase in the acknowledgement of two areas of support: receiving encouragement (1970-1989: two out of five, and 2000-2011: 12 out of 15) and modeled behavior (1970-1989: one out of five, and 2000-2011: 10 out of 15). The majority of the 2000-2011 group said that receiving encouragement from their mentors was in some cases the very thing that led them to pursue a career as a principal. AB recalled how she did not have confidence in herself but her mentor did:

> It was actually, it was, I mean, most importantly it would be the people around me that really…number one reassured me or made me confident in my own abilities. They saw things in me that I wasn't aware of at the time and without that I would have never have even taken the first step…I'm truly honestly never even dreamed of going down this road when I first started this. I really thought I would just become a teacher because I always felt that I was more of a person behind the limelight, you know, behind the scenes as opposed to up in the front and I never considered myself a leader. I'm a hard-worker, but I'm not really a leader…it was gradual, I started by taking a more, smaller responsibilities, and then gradually realized…the principal and I had a conversation at one point and he was saying, you are taking the principal's, the AP exam and I said, well I don't know, I don't know if I could really do a good job or I don't know if I'm ready for that and his response was, you know, he said, "well you're already doing everything an assistant principal is doing right now, you just don't have the title" and so it took other people to make me realize that I already, I had that capability and that I was able to do it because at that point I wasn't ready to see it in myself.

In the life of principal LD, her mentor's support played a direct role in her persevering to become a principal despite the challenges that she faced in the district. Like many of her AAPI colleagues in this study, she grew up in a family that struggled with money problems. Her single mother worked as a waitress to support the family while stressing the importance of hard work

and education. They lived month-to-month on a single income, which led LD to desire a professional job with a stable income. During a job interview unrelated to education, she discovered by chance an opportunity to teach. Having majored in history and not wanting to be jobless after graduation, she pursued teaching. She found herself enjoying working with students and loving teaching. She worked with mostly Korean students as a bilingual teacher, then became a coordinator with the support of her mentor and supervisor who was one of the few Asian principals at the time. LD then became an Assistant Principal. At this point in her career, she encountered some barriers to becoming a principal. LD took the district's promotional exam but did not pass. She suspected that she might have been a target of discrimination as she became aware of a conversation about her accent that took place between the two people who interviewed her. LD stated that when she did not pass the exam the first time, she was ready to give up and started to believe that she did not have what it took to be a principal. At this point, her mentor intervened and pushed her to try again. LD shared:

> I didn't pass my principal exam the first time around. Up until that time, I felt like, I'm rolling and then…maybe I'm not the principal material…and James kept saying, "No no no, something is not right there, that's not true, you can do this job, you'll be great at it." So he said, "It wasn't you. Really, I don't want you to feel like you're a failure or you're not up to this job. I want you to know that actually it was pure..." That's what he told me. So I realized, okay maybe, I just had bad luck or it wasn't really me. So they encouraged me, I took the test again and sure enough, I passed it.

LD credited her mentors for pushing her forward even though she was ready to give up. Without their encouragement, she would not have taken the next step in becoming a principal. She is currently serving as a principal and hopes to promote up to higher positions down the road.

The majority of the 2000-2011 group (10 out of 15) cited the behavior modeled by their mentors, who were mostly principals of various ethnic background under whom they worked, as

important in their becoming principals. The following phrases provide samples of their descriptions:

- PO: "My goal is to be like her."

- PR: "I saw her in action."

- LD: "…she was able to lead the school …with her vision, and the way she interacted with the staff…it was truly amazing for a Korean woman to be in that position doing all the things that she was doing…"

- KL: "This particular principal really honed in on the art of observation and how to speak with teachers and I was able to sit in with him that was one thing he did for me."

- JK: "So I learned a lot through just sitting and listening and that's how she played that good role model for me…she didn't preach…I saw her in action, how things were done."

It is noteworthy that over half of the 1970-1989 principals (three out of five) stated that one of the reasons they decided to become a principal was because they felt that they could do a better job than the principals they saw at the school sites.

Organizational support. There was a marked difference between the 1970-1989 and 2000-2011 group in the area of receiving support from organizations in order to earn promotion into principal positions. The 1970-1989 group mentioned ACSA and the LAUSD district one time each as the only organizations from which they received support while they pursued principal positions. They reported no organizational support in the areas of assistance with the promotional exam or networking. One member of this group (LW) commented:

Yeah. We said that there was no support. I got to give Thomas Shicano for saying that and pulling us together and saying, we made it. We could've helped other Asians make it. And that's when we started APEA. We didn't really have mentoring or mentor per se unless somebody said, Oh…I like what you do. I'm going to help you move up.

Since there were few organizational support systems in place at the time, the 1970-1989 group decided to start APEA to help others through the promotional exam process.

The 2000-2011 group mentioned other organizations such as APEA, AKEA, and district organizational supports such as Tier I, Administrative Academy, LEAP, district mentors, and various district administrator organizations. Half of this group found that the organizational supports helped them pass the promotional exams and provided networking support, while half found that they did not assist in these areas. Half from this group who found the organizational supports helpful in passing the promotional exam typically stated, "So I would connect with other people that were doing the same thing," "that gave us time to collaborate, network, learn policies," "I took both study groups from APEA for the AP and principal exam," and "I got hired before the [exam] and went through the APEA study group."

FG shared one particularly descriptive recollection of the benefits he received from an organization:

> Yeah, so I got a lot of help through APEA through study groups, through the people who were in charge of APPA at the time, giving me feedback and telling me things like, everything from the way you're dressed to your demeanor during an interview to basic knowledge of information that the district had. And it was the same thing, when I was already sitting as a principal, when I took the principal's exam.

Most principals in this group concurred that the organizations helped them with the process by providing networking opportunities (11 out of 15) and study groups to pass the promotional exams (eight out of 15), but not with actually acquiring the job itself. DE observed, "being in that group, it gave me friendship, but it didn't give me the principalship that I needed. Does that make sense?"

Social network. Two out of five members of the 1970-1989 group did not feel that their social network was especially influential in their becoming a principal. However, over half of the

2000-2011 group (10 out of 15) stated that a friend influenced them to become a principal. Both groups revealed that their social network consisted of an ethnically diverse group of people with 12 out of 15 members of the 2000-2011 group identifying their network as such. It is interesting to note that between the two groups, only two people from the 2000-2011 group reported their social network as being mostly Asian.

People in higher positions. Although the 1970-1989 group said they were not influenced much by their social network to pursue principalships, everyone in this group said they were influenced by a person in a higher position to become a principal. All five of the principals in the 1970-1989 group reported that they were placed into their first principal positions by someone in a higher position. In contrast, a little over fourof the 15 principals from the 2000-2011 group were placed in principal positions by someone in a higher position.

Other Asians as support system. More AAPIs in the 2000-2011 group reported feelings of not belonging in the Asian group/culture than AAPIs in the 1970-1989 group.

Identity and group identification. When asked how they identify themselves, all of the principals from the 1970-1989 group were quick to describe themselves in reference to being an American either by stating that they are American, American Chinese, or Japanese American. They revealed pride in being American by saying, "I was American first and then Chinese next" or " Unless people ask me what is my ethnicity, I'm just American." Two of the three who identified with being Japanese American did so in reference to their experience in the internment camps. Their identification as Japanese American seems to stem not just from their upbringing but also from their experiences being labeled by others. When asked how she identifies herself, LW stated,

> Japanese American, because you have to remember, I was put into a concentration camp as a kid. I do have that memory of being taken away from the home, put into these

concentration camps, I've watched a kid killed by a guard because we knew we weren't suppose to go under the barb wired fence but our ball went under the barb wired fence and these kids went under it and got shot. My mother got polio, they took her away. At that time, I was seven and my brothers were five and three. They took my father who was college educated...I had to take care of the boys. That's stigma in the Japanese culture, you never talk about that. The word is 'gaman'. You endure this and you don't talk about it.

Another principal, TW, recalled:

Depends on the day…hahaha…Japanese-American. I always go back to what happened to us after December seventh and my ethnicity, boy…and my aunt was married to a Chinese person and didn't have to go to camp. Well she had two children, and she had to go to camp and declare that she was Japanese American because she had a Chinese surname but she stayed with her husband and she moved into my grandmother's home and so my grandmother lost her house and I had mixed feelings about it because I understood that it wasn't fair that they got to stay behind but she was one of my favorite aunts…and I don't know how they knew who was Chinese and Japanese but she had a Chinese surname… I'm going to research that pretty soon and find out…but because of that experience definitely Japanese American. I can't identify myself as being Japanese, although I've gone back six or seven times.

Most of the 2000-2011 group identified themselves with their relative ethnic groups hyphenated with the specifier "American." However, in contrast to the 1970-1989 group, only one out of five identified themselves simply as a person rather than of an ethnic label.

Not feeling like a part of the Asian group. In light of these data, it is also revealing to note that a small number (three out of 15 of the 2000-2011 group) also felt that they did not belong to or were accepted by Asian groups or culture. Whereas no participants in the 1970-1989 group shared this sentiment, three out of the 15 principals in the 2000-2011 group described themselves as "misfits" with respect to the Asian group. For example, HI recalled these feelings about the Korean community:

I feel like an outcast. To be honest with you, I felt like an outcast with my family and I felt like an outcast with other Korean American educators because I don't think they really accepted me because I wasn't the norm…it wasn't a conscious decision but I didn't feel like I wasn't that different form the norm or mainstream that I needed to be involved with the group that identified itself as being Asian…I never got the support or I didn't fit

in and I don't think they…maybe it's my fault but I didn't feel they accepted me either so I just stayed away.

Another principal, GH, who is a Korean-American, felt that Korean educators are harder on their own group, so for that reason she gravitates more towards non-Koreans. But another principal, DE, perceived Asians being less tolerant of his gay status, which prompted his choice to work in a non-Asian community. He shared that he thought about trying to become a principal in a highly Chinese area but deciding against it. When asked why he chose not to, he shared:

It's personal more than professional because I'm gay. You know that, right? The fact that the Asian community sees that, they're uncomfortable with it. I think that's more than anything else…it's the community that's not going to receive that very well… as well as probably the Korean community, as well as the Asian community.

Summary. Factors that supported or hindered the AAPI principals that differed between the two groups included cultural values such as collectivism, subservience, work ethics, and parents' trust that their children will succeed. The degree of emphasis on these values differed in expression between the two groups, but both groups generally felt these values supported their careers as principals. Other supporting factors that differed between the two groups included their beliefs about their abilities as well as the political environment of the their time. While there was a slight increase in reports of discrimination by the 2000-2011 group, neither group reported that organizational discrimination significantly got in the way of their promoting up. Availability of resources such as mentors, organizational support, social networking, and superiors supported the two groups differently based on what was available and what type of support the two groups needed. Finally, there was an increase of reports by the 2000-2011 group of feeling that they do not belong to any particular Asian group and thus did not perceive existing Asian groups as a supportive factor.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the findings that emerged from the AAPI principals' collective stories based on to the research questions for this study. The principals shared about their family background, family values, college subject matter interest, as well as their beliefs about the status of teachers and principals. Based on the data collected from 20 AAPI principals – five from 1970-1989 and 15 from 2000-2011 – using a demographic survey as well as face-to-face interviews, I examined the change over time of reasons they pursued careers as principals as well as conditions that supported or hindered their advancement into the principal position. This study found that the reasons for many members of both groups pursuing a career as a teacher, then as a principal, started with the principals' backgrounds in immigrant families or low socio-economic status families struggling for money. The principals from both groups believed that a career in education was stable as well as respectable. Differences between the two groups included an increase in reporting of a love of humanities-related majors as a reason they pursued a career in teaching and ultimately as a principal. Additionally, there was a negative shift of status and pay of teachers and a negative shift of the pay of principals since the 1970s. Although the status of principals remained high, the 2000-2011 group reported that teachers and principals are underpaid and undervalued based on their changing working conditions and public expectations and perceptions.

As for factors that supported or hindered the principals in becoming principals, some remained the same regardless of time, while others changed or were expressed to a different degree by the two groups. Factors that both groups of principals identified as supportive revolved around the emphasis on certain cultural values with which they grew up, such as valuing education, high expectations for academic achievement, and family recognition through

84

achievement. These values with pushed them to become principals. Additionally, neither group

reported that homophily or the pressures of taking care of their family as factors that interfered

with their advancement. Factors that supported or hindered the principals in their process to

becoming principals that changed over time included cultural values such as collectivism and

subservience. Other factors that varied included their beliefs about why they were chosen to

become principals, the political environment of their times, as well as resources available to them

and what they got out of those resources. While the 1970-1989 group cited work ethics as the

cultural value that most facilitated their becoming principals, the 2000-2011group increasingly

cited collectivism, where their parents sacrificed for their betterment, as well as subservience to

superiors as having assisted them in being promoted to principal positions. Unlike the 2000-2011

group, nine out of 15 of whom reported their people skills as the reason they were chosen to

become principals, the 1970-1989 group reported that the reasons they were chosen were directly

related to their ethnicity as well as their specific skills in language, literacy, special education, etc.

They attributed their promotion into principal positions to the political environment of their

times as their superiors started to emphasize the need for racial integration and representation as

part of the aftermath of the Civil Rights Movement. Although neither group reported

organizational discrimination as a significant hindrance in their becoming principals, there was a

slight rise reported by the 2000-2011 group. With regard to available resources and what the

groups got out of them, the 1970-1989 group reported that they had very little organizational

support, while the 2000-2011 group reported that they received promotional exam preparation

support as well as networking support. The 2000-2011 group also reported that the mentor

support they valued the most included encouragement and direct modeling of how to work as a

principal. Finally, most AAPI principals did not rely solely on other Asians as their support

system as they pursued their careers. In fact, the superiors and mentors as well as their social networks were diverse in ethic background. Going further, the 2000-2011 group reported a feeling of not belonging to any particular Asian group and as a result frequently did not identify with any particular ethnicity.

In the next chapter, I highlight some key findings, discuss the limitations of this study, explore the implications of the findings on policy and practice, and make recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The Asian population grew and became more visible in the United States as the fastest growing minority group, but representative staffing of principals in the K-12 school system has not kept pace with this growth nationally. Even in the state of California, 11.7% of whose student body was comprised of AAPI students, AAPI principals were underrepresented at 4.7% (NCES, 2009). AAPI students could benefit from engaging with culturally representative role models who understand their unique needs in the school setting, but the lack of representation by AAPIs in principal leadership roles may negatively impact the provision of culturally sensitive services and programs for AAPI student. This impact may become more apparent as the AAPI population continues to grow. Without role models to encourage AAPI students' career path into school administration, the chances of broadening the pipeline for AAPI students may further be impacted.

Despite the overall underrepresentation of AAPI principals in the nation, LAUSD was unique in that it managed to have a proportional representation of K-12 AAPI principals. In looking at this atypical case, the focus of this study was to examine the experiences of AAPIs and the reasons the AAPI principals pursued a career as a principal as well as the change over time of factors that supported or hindered their progress.

This chapter is organized in five sections beginning with the highlights of the findings from Chapter 4 and a discussion of the related literature. The other sections address the limitations of the study, the implications of the findings for policy and practice, and recommendations for future research. I conclude with some final thoughts.

Reasons for Pursuing a Career as a School Principal

Many AAPI principals from both groups came from immigrant families or low socio-economic status. Despite the research that portrays teaching, a prerequisite for becoming a principal, as a low status career (Johnson, 2008; Spencer, 1996), the majority of the AAPIs in this study saw teaching as a respectable job with stable pay. This may have been due to the fact that as either recent immigrants coming from countries where the teaching profession was viewed as respectable or having grown up in a lower socio-economic status family, their entrance into teaching was seen as positive career move. As the AAPI population continues to grow and succeed professionally in the United States and with the generations to follow, the belief in teaching as a profession that brings in an adequate income may shift as we saw in the findings of this research how the two groups made sense of the rewards of the profession differently.

According to a 2012 release by the U.S. Census Bureau (*Profile America: Facts for Features*), 22% of Asians and 29% of Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders were under the age of 18. While the younger generation of AAPIs prepares to go into the job force, the poverty rate of AAPIs had stabilized. As of 2010, the poverty rate of the Asians and Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders had stayed the same since 2009 at 12% and 18.8% respectively, while increasing for the Hispanic and Black population. Looking more closely at the Asians and Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders separately, we can see a difference within the AAPI group. While 28% of the general U.S. population received a bachelor's degree, 50% of Asians and 15% of Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders did. While 10% of the general U.S. population received a graduate or professional degree, this was true of 20% of the Asians and 4% of the Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders. Although the Hawaiian/Pacific Islander population has an equivalent percentage of high school degrees to

the rest of the population and Asians at 87%, we can still see that the Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders are struggling compared to the rest of the U.S. population, while the Asians surpass every other group in this area. If the status and pay of the teaching profession is indeed viewed relative to the income and education level of the potential candidate through the lens of Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964), than of the AAPI group, the teaching profession may seem less appealing to Asians and more appealing for the Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders. This is further discussed in subsequent sections.

Negative shift in teacher and principal status and pay. Both groups reported that they believed that the status of the teaching profession has shifted negatively since the 1970s. The 1970-1989 group reported that the status of teachers, the prerequisite position for becoming a principal, was strong when they first entered the profession, but both the 1970-1989 and the 2000-2011 groups reported that the current perceived status of teachers was low.

Additionally, the 2000-2011 group reported that the principal's salary was low for what the job requires. The lower status of the teaching profession as well as the belief that the pay might not be adequate compensation for the demands of the job may negatively affect AAPIs' entrance into the profession in the future.

For AAPIs, previous studies of career choices supported the fact that AAPIs valued more extrinsic motivators such as earning power, status, prestige, and job security as compared to Caucasians (Kelly et al., 2009; Leong, 1991). In fact, if more AAPIs were in the technical fields rather than in subjective and perceived low-status fields such as education, they may have developed a higher interest in pursuing careers in the technical fields in accordance with their perception of prestige. Although for this study's participants, this did not deter them from pursuing a career first as a teacher and then a principal, the negative shift of teacher's status and

principal's pay from 1970-1989 to 2000-2011 as reported by the participants may prevent AAPIs from pursuing the principalship in the future. Although the AAPIs in this study successfully pursued a career as a principal, if Expectancy Theory (Herzberg, 1996; Vroom, 1964) holds true, AAPIs' willingness and desire to pursue a career as a K-12 principal in the future will be tied closely to their perception of the amount of effort needed to acquire the position as well as their perceptions and beliefs about the rewards. With the perceived deterioration of the teacher status and the increasing workload and demands on principals, AAPIs may not find it worthwhile to pursue careers as principals in the future as the 2000-2011 group made sense of the rewards of the profession differently than the 1970-1989 group.

Factors That Supported or Hindered the Process of Becoming a Principal

Values viewed as important to becoming a principal vary in their degree of emphasis between the two groups. Both groups placed a high value on education, high academic expectations, and family recognition through achievement. These values could support the successful pursuit of any field of work, including the principalship. Not surprising is the increased emphasis on collectivism in the sense of parents sacrificing for the betterment of their children, since the 2000-2011 group was composed of a higher percentage of newly immigrated families and parents who may have come to the United States to create a better life for themselves and their family. However, it was surprising to see an increase in reporting of subservience to their immediate supervisors in the 2000-2011 group as a cultural value that supported their promotion into principal positions, since the literature points to the possibility of cultural emphasis on humility as a factor that may hinder promotions because some AAPIs strive to not stand out, put others' needs ahead of theirs, and be humble about their accomplishments (Kim et al., 1989). Perhaps the subservience toward the immediate supervisor is seen as

90

supportive and may foster support back from the supervisor in the process of career advancement. However, this study did not look at the effects of subservience in the promotional interview process. We may find that at this particular point, subservience may be a hindering force rather than a supportive force.

Beliefs in the reasons why they were chosen to become a principal differ between the two groups. The 2000-2011 group's report that having people skills supported them in their career development may be explained by the more recent shift in the increase in value of more collaborative leadership styles such as distributive leadership (Allix, 2000; Harris, 2004; Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001) and democratic leadership (Apple & Beane, 2007; Chapman, 2005; Fullan, 2001; Lees, 1995), rather than the use of the top-down model of administration.

Unlike the 2000-2011 group, the 1970-1989 group did not mention people skills as one of the factors that supported them in becoming principals. The supporting factors for this group included their race as well as their specific skills such as literacy, second language, or special credentialing. For the older group, the environment of their time had a greater impact on their promotion. Due to the push for racial integration in 1970-1989, many principals from this group reported that their race was the determining factor in their placement into principal positions. Contrary to what I had initially predicted in line with Social Reproduction Theory, which maintains that the existing class structure and social inequalities of individuals in society are reproduced by that society (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), the principals from this group did not report having to fight to break into the system. It seems that the fight for equal access to principal positions was won and the people in higher positions and community groups were actively

advocating for racial integration by the time the principals of 1970-1989 were starting to be placed into their positions as reported by the 1970/80s group.

Both groups reported that homophily and organizational discrimination did not greatly hinder them from acquiring principal positions. Homophily, which is the tendency for people to interact and develop relationships with those who are like themselves "based on greater ease of communication, acceptance, trust, and predictability among those who are similar" (Friedman & Krackhardt, 1997, p. 321), was not reported to be a great factor that hindered either group of AAPI principals. For the 1970-1989 group, the environment of the time as described previously may have had some role as a counter force to homophily. As for the 2000-2011 group, there was a slight increase in perceptions of discrimination, with one participant reporting that being an Asian in a heavily Latino area interfered with her advancement, and another participant reporting the negative impact of her accent during a promotional interview. This emergence of reported instances of homophily may be due to the fact that, at present, there is a diminished focus on racial integration as compared to 1970-1989. This increase in perception in the existence of discrimination did not confirm that there was an actual increase in discrimination but rather that the two groups made meaning of their experiences differently over time. .

In contrast, just because neither group reported homophily as a factor that got in their way does not mean that it did not exist. One of many things we do not know based on this study is how many AAPIs desired and attempted to be promoted up to a principal position and were not granted the opportunity. By virtue of the fact that the participants in this study were at the end of the principalship pipeline, they lend themselves to being a biased sample. Somehow they made it, but we cannot account for all those who tried and were prevented. Additionally, just because most of the participants in both groups did not report homophily as a factor that hindered

them, this does not mean it didn't hinder them as they participated in multiple interviews in their efforts to become a principal. We cannot tell what happened behind closed doors. Given the fact that we cannot completely rule out the presence of homophily, we cannot discount how Lopez's (2003) CRT fits into this scenario. Regardless of whether LAUSD currently has adequate AAPI representation or not, we do need to continue supporting public education and the democracy upon which it was founded while recognizing inequity and developing inclusive and reform-minded school communities (Cooper, 2009). We must continue to keep in mind Lopez's assertion that all individuals may not have equal rights under the law or policy, as public space is not racially neutral, and contextual factors do matter in the larger arena.

Social network, mentors, and superiors are of mixed races. One encouraging finding was the report from both groups that they received support from social networks, mentors, and superiors of mixed races. Although based on McGuire's (1984) Distinctiveness Theory I predicted that the AAPI principals would receive support while pursuing their careers as principals by identifying with others with whom they share relatively rare characteristics within that context, this was not the case. I believed that the successful AAPI principals found a way to negotiate their challenging environment by surrounding themselves with members of other minorities to gain social networking support. This may have assisted them in gaining the needed work and emotional support to become principals. For the AAPIs who successfully became principals during times when they had few AAPI role models or peers, they may have found social network support by seeking out members of other minorities. Contrary to this prediction, most AAPIs reported being supported by people of all races.

Of those from the 1970-1989 group who reported having mentors, supportive superiors, or social network support, the mentors consisted of 6% Latino, 19% Black, 6% Asian, and 69%

White. Superiors consisted of 11% Latino, 0% Black, 0% Asian, and 89% White. Their social

network was reported at 33% mostly mixed and 67% mostly White.

In total, of the 2000-2011 group who reported having mentors, superiors, or social

network support reported that mentors who supported them were 16% Latino, 9% Black, 27%

Asian, and 48% White. The Superiors who supported them were 23% Latino, 15% Black, 0%

Asian, and 62% White. Their social network consisted of 14% mostly Asian, 77% mostly mixed,

and 14% mostly White. These figures are summarized in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1

Races of Reported Mentors, Superiors, and Social Network

Group	Support	Latino	Black	Asian	White	Mixed
1970-1989	Mentor	6%	19%	6%	69%	
	Superior	11%	0%	0%	89%	
	Social Network				67%	33%
2000-2011	Mentor	16%	9%	27%	48%	
	Superior	23%	15%	0%	62%	
	Social Network			14%	14%	77%

We can see by the mixture of the races of the mentors and superiors that the AAPI groups

benefited from support from members of various races, including a relatively high number of

Whites especially in the older group. Contrary to my predictions based on Distinctiveness

Theory, the AAPIs in this study did not solely rely on other minority groups but received

noticeable support from Whites. Both AAPI groups reported a high level of support from mixed-

race as well as White groups within their social network.

Family care: Support by spouse or parents. Of the 14 female and six male principals,

regardless of gender, both groups reported that the responsibilities of having to take care of their

family did not negatively impact their promotional progress. Despite the generally held idea from

the past that females are charged with the responsibility of family, the participants of this study

regardless of gender, discussed how their spouses and/or their parents helped with childcare so that they could put in the long hours needed to function as principals. This theme expressed itself consistently regardless of time or gender. This finding was surprising because the male principals from both groups were aware that they needed support for family care in order of them to do their jobs, and did not take the support they received for granted.

Each group differed in what resources were available to them and what supports they received from those resources. The 1970-1989 group reported not having organizational support in their process of getting promoted to principal positions. In response, they created a group to support others. About half of the members of the 2000-2011 group reported they benefited from the promotional test preparation support the organizations provided.

An unexpected finding was what the 2000-2011 group valued in the support that they received from their mentors. Unlike the 1970-1989 group who did not report encouragement and modeling as supports they valued from their mentors, the 2000-2011 group reported that these two supports assisted them in becoming principals, and in some cases they were the determining factors. The members of the 1970-1989 group seemed more confident of themselves as they reported that they were placed in positions and scored high on the promotional exams. Additionally, they believed that they had the experience and knowledge to do better than other principals already in place. The 2000-2011 group seemed to need more encouragement and support from mentors who believed in their abilities. This finding could be due to the 1970-1989 group needing to have these characteristics to stand out during a time when there were few Asian representatives in the field, or it could be due to the participants not recalling the exact supports they received 30-40 years after the fact.

The 2000-2011 group had an increase in the number of participants who did not identify with any particular Asian group and who felt they did not belong to any particular Asian group, in comparison to the 1970-1989 group. When asked how they identify themselves, all of the principals from the 1970-1989 group were quick to describe themselves in reference to being an American either by stating that they are American, American Chinese, or Japanese American. They revealed pride in being American by saying, "I was American first and then Chinese next," or "Unless people ask me what is my ethnicity, I'm just American."

Two of the three who identified with being a Japanese American did so in reference to their experience in the internment camps. Their identification as Japanese American seemed to stem not just from their upbringing but also from their experiences being labeled by others. Not identifying completely with just being American may be in accordance with what Social Reproduction Theorists (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) say about the melting pot. Anglocentric middle-class norms will be valued and "melting into the pot" may have worked for European immigrant groups, however, for the AAPI group, this kind of assimilation was not possible due to physical features, language, and cultural norms that were greatly different from the dominant American culture (Okihiro, 2001; Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997; Takaki, 1989). Some of the 1970-1989 AAPI principals shared experiences where their identity was self-imposed as well as imposed on them by others.

In contrast to the 1970-1989 group, only a few members (three out of 15) of the 2000-2011 group identified themselves simply as a person rather than using an ethnic label. Additionally, three out of 15 also felt that they did not belong to or were not accepted by Asian groups or culture. Whereas no members of the 1970-1989 expressed this sentiment, three of the 15 principals of the 2000-2011 group described themselves as misfits in relationship to the Asian

group. This curious finding may stem from their rejection of the "Asian" label in response to the model minority pigeonholing that came with it, since the participants who did not identify with a Asian group spoke about not fitting in with regard to their "non-mainstream" characteristics such as personal life choices, the refusal to interact solely within Asian dominant settings, or sexual orientation.

Interplay of the factors supporting or hindering the AAPIs' process of becoming principals. When looking at the highlights of the findings, the interplay of the factors that supported or hindered both groups of AAPIs in their progress to becoming a principal were greatly affected by the environment of their times.

For the 1970-1989 group, the environment of their time was such that racial representation in the K-12 education system was being promoted following the Civil Rights Movement. Thus, their race had quite a bit to do with their promotion into principal positions even when they were not actively looking to do so. This group believed that because they had specific expert knowledge in areas such as literacy, special education, and curriculum development, coupled with their race, they were placed as principals. Additionally, due to the environment of their time when there were few minority colleagues, mentors, and superiors to begin with, the AAPIs mainly received support from Whites, who were also functioning within the same political environment, in order to promote up. As the few AAPIs in existence during the time of having to be noticed by their superiors as well as having to pass the promotional exams with high scores, the cultural value of strong work ethics supported them. If they worked harder than the others around them, they would be more likely to be noticed. Lastly, as some of the first AAPIs to have become principals, the AAPIs of the 1970-1989 group did not have organizational support from an existing AAPI group, so they were motivated to start one.

As for the 2000-2011 group, the environment of their time called for the emergence of a more collaborative leadership style with less emphasis placed on achieving equal racial representation. With the heavier emphasis on collaborative leadership styles, the value of subservience toward their immediate superiors may have supported their advancement. They were seen as team players that did not take credit for all the work and strove to support their superiors. However, this group needed more encouragement from their mentors and modeling of the job to feel that they could meet the increasingly challenging demands of being a principal. In addition, the 2000-2011 AAPIs benefited from the organizational group formed by the AAPIs of 1970-1989 as they received assistance in preparing for their promotional exams. This support would not have been available to them had they been trying to promote up from 1970-1989. Additionally, as a group composed of a higher number of members from the second wave of immigrants from the 1970s, there was a heavier emphasis on the cultural value of collectivism where their parents sacrificed for their children's benefit. This supporting factor was probably due to the influence of their time, when immigrants came to the U.S. looking for a better way of life. Lastly, trying to promote up in the environment of their time which no longer emphasized racial representation, this group reported the emerging feeling of not identifying with any Asian group or feeling that they truly belonged to an Asian group. This may be due to their rejection of the model minority stereotype imposed on them by the general population as well as other AAPI groups. Additionally, with less focus on their race, this group may have felt that they are more than just their ethnicity, and as people, they need to be valued in terms of their contribution to the profession as they work as well as receive support from people of all races.

Limitations of the Study

Whereas the findings that emerged from the collective stories of the 20 AAPI principals in this study may have useful implications for educators and educational leaders, this study also had several limitations that need to be considered. First, the sample size of this study was limited to 20 people, five in one group and 15 in the other, and the findings were not generalizable to the experiences of all AAPI principals within California or across the nation. However, the findings were directly relevant and applicable to the current as well as future leaders in LAUSD. In order to add to the validity of the findings, I conducted this study using qualitative methods providing the readers with rich and thick descriptions of the findings so that the readers can determine how applicable the findings may be to their individual situations. The extensive description of the AAPI principals' experiences and perspective in the process of pursuing their principal positions in LAUSD told through their collective as well as individual experiences gave the readers the opportunity to apply the findings to other related cases.

The second limitation to this study was the low response rate for the writing prompt that was originally part of the study design. In addition to the demographic survey and the face-to-face interviews, the participants were asked to complete two writing prompts related to the two research questions. The prompts were made optional in order to lessen the pressure on the principals' participation time. However, with only two out of 20 participants responding to the writing prompt, it could not be used as an additional data source to triangulate data.

The third limitation was the unknown accuracy of recalling events from the past. Although the 2000-2011 AAPI principals were asked to recall and express their views on events that occurred within the last 10 years or so, the members of the 1970-1989 group were asked to recall and express their views on events that may have occurred as far back as 30 to 40 years.

Thus, the 1970-1989 group had a longer period of time between the events and recollection, which gave them more time to process, reflect, and form opinions as well as to change perceptions based on other experiences they had much later, after they moved on from their positions as principals. In contrast, the AAPI principals in the 2000-2011 group had just recently experienced the process of becoming a principal and are in the middle of doing their work as principals.

Implications of the Findings for Policy and Practice

   Recommendation 1: Developing transparent criteria for advancement to principalship. The findings of this study suggested that the cultural value of subservience to their immediate supervisors supported the 2000-2011 group's ascension into principal positions. However, it is unclear how this value impacted the AAPIs during the interview process in which most of the 2000-2011 group had to participate. In this study, I did not explore how AAPIs compared in the number of interviews they had to go through with the number of interviews principals of other races had to go through. Despite the lack of these data, I believe that giving away credit and being humble during an interview may have negatively impacted their timely placement as principals. Additionally, over the past year, the promotional process for LAUSD shifted from a clearly defined promotional exam process consisting of meeting minimal requirements, essay responses, multiple choice test, in-basket activity, and a panel interview. Currently, the promotional process consists of an application submission and an interview by the superintendent and deputy superintendent of instruction. Although the previous promotional system used was far from perfect, as described by a few of the AAPI principals interviewed, the unclear criteria solely based on the opinions of the superintendent and the deputy superintendent of instruction may make it difficult for AAPIs to focus their preparation for advancement. It is

not clear exactly what qualities and requirements are needed to promote up, so aspiring AAPI principals do not have a solid direction as to how to prepare.

We need a transparent system to support AAPIs and others in understanding what is required to become a principal in LAUSD. If the qualities and criteria are not defined, it is too vague for potential candidates to decipher while at the same time fighting cultural tendencies such as humility, compliance, etc. to demonstrate themselves as effective leaders. In light of the lack of clarity regarding the qualities needed to promote to a principal and the heavy emphasis on using one interview – which may be susceptible to cultural biases – as the method to screen candidates for promotion, we need to make a race-based effort to assist AAPIs in promoting up. We must seek out AAPIs who have the potential to become good principals and target support and resources to assist them in becoming principals.

The counter argument to this recommendation would be that just because someone is of AAPI descent, it does not mean that he/she has the qualities necessary to become a good principal. MA from the 1970-1989 group stated that there was a group of Asians who were really upset that APEA was more inclusive because they felt that APEA should advocate for only Asians rather than everyone who would be a good administrator. However, FG, a principal from the 2000-2011 group stated,

> And this might be negative, but I think because Asians don't tend to promote Asians, I think it's harder for them to move up. I think Hispanics are very good at supporting Hispanics. I think our Black administrators are very good at promoting our Black administrators, Jewish educators same thing. I think all the other groups are very good at promoting their own. I think the Asians are the only ones aren't good at promoting their own because they still expect you to be better than everybody else.

Taking this cultural factor as well as the cultural tendencies of humility and high expectations into consideration, I believe that in the absence of clarity regarding the qualifications of principals, a race-based effort must be made by organizations such as APEA to assist AAPIs in

becoming principals. Since APEA was founded by AAPIs in the 1970/80s to assist others in the

promotional process, it should change with the needs of the times to better serve the changing

needs of the AAPIs.

On a final note on this matter, a principal from the 1970-1989 group, RZ, stated the

following during her interview:

> I understand that your generation wants to be much more strategic, which is good. For
> example, I can mentor a few Asian administrators as long as I don't teach them how to be
> too aggressive or too out of the box and then you'll help to kind of get…them through the
> principalship, but ultimately I think each one of us individually has to have the
> confidence to say I belong here. Somebody created the beginning and end, but I have to
> shape the middle. All the mentoring and all the titles aren't going to give you not only the
> satisfaction, but get the outcome. It's got to come quite a bit from within.

This research study has demonstrated that AAPIs are sensitive to the shifting contexts as

their environment changes. This makes any shifts fragile to AAPIs entering the education

profession. Thus, the process must be made transparent. If we wipe out organizational support

due to not knowing how to support AAPIs within a murky promotional system, we can quickly

decrease interest and entrance into principalship. Factors laid out in this research can apply to

aspiring principals of other races, however, we must recognize that AAPIs are sensitive to shifts

in these areas.

Recommendation 2: Changing organizational support from test preparation to one-on-one mentoring and workshops to develop effective interviewing skills. We can do little to

influence individuals' innate interest in humanities as an undergraduate student or family values

someone, but we can change the nature of mentoring and organizational support based on the

findings of this research, which suggested that the principals of the 2000-2011 group benefited

from encouragement from their mentors and modeling from their immediate supervisors. AAPIs

in this study stated that they grew up in a culture where humility is emphasized. In light of this

cultural factor, we need to give more encouragement to AAPIs in promoting themselves and in believing in themselves rather than giving away credit and being excessively hard on themselves as compared to others, especially during promotional interviews.

Along with the shift of the promotional process to a single interview with the superintendent and the deputy superintendent of instruction and with the absence of environmental pressures for equal racial representation, those providing organizational support must change their focus from test preparation to one-on-one mentoring to provide potential AAPI principals with support and encouragement. As discussed in the Findings section, the 2000-2011 AAPI principals reported that encouragement and opportunities to see their mentors in action assisted them in becoming principals. In alignment with this finding, the organization can help provide one-on-one mentors within the organizational network at the school sites, explicitly model principal behaviors for the incoming group, provide opportunities for shadowing, actively encourage the candidates to make moves to advance their careers by providing learning opportunities and advice, and share information directly related to promotional job opportunities. As one of the principals of the 1970-1989, LW, described her system of mentoring, "we should just pick a person of good potential and mentor him or her to move up."

Recommendation 3: To increase the pool of potential principals, raise the status of teachers to attract highly qualified candidates to teaching. Another highlighted finding of this study suggested that the status of teachers has gone down since 1970-1989 and that the pay of principals does not adequately compensate for the demands of the work. As it is relevant for the quality control of the entire teaching profession, we need to raise the status of teachers in our society to attract more AAPIs into teaching. As described in the literature review, AAPIs have

103

historically pursued technically-oriented fields with higher pay and status, which appeals to their cultural value of family recognition through achievement. If the number of AAPI teachers diminishes due to the low status and monetary compensation of the profession, it will lower the chances of having AAPI representation in higher educational positions.

The efforts of raising the pay of teachers and adequately addressing the work demands of the principal can be addressed locally to start. The school district can start by finding a way to more rigorously recruit and screen teacher candidates and to raise the starting salary of beginning teachers to move closer to the beginning salaries of other professions to make it a more appealing career to pursue. Additionally, the salary cap that is applied after five years as reported by the principals should be removed to adequately compensate principals for their work while providing more on-site support and resources. The process of attracting more AAPIs to careers as teachers and principals can start with the increase of pay, but there must be a national as well as local effort to elevate the status of teachers by addressing both the quality of the candidates as well as their pay. As public employees, teachers and principals are more vulnerable to pay cuts and lack of pay raises than those in private, technical fields.

Recommendations for Future Research

In looking forward, there are areas of interest not addressed that should be explored. First, a study about AAPIs' qualifications would be helpful. Although I did not find evidence of the glass ceiling at the level of the principalship, it would be helpful to know if AAPIs must have higher levels of education as compared to principals of other ethnicities. As I discussed in Chapter 2, AAPIs experienced lower return for education at one point in history. It would be helpful to find out if this is the case with the current LAUSD AAPI principals. Another researchable question is, are AAPIs seen mainly as people who can work with the AAPI

population and not with other groups? Second, a study about why some AAPIs want to advance but do not attempt to transition from teacher to principal would be revealing. The AAPI principals in this study conjectured that possible reasons included family obligations, lack of mentors, fear of public speaking, low pay, and culturally not being seen as leaders. However, it would be useful to find out the AAPIs' perceptions about why some AAPIs don't make that move. Third, a study of Assistant Principals and others with administrative credentials who have wanted to become principals but did not would add to our knowledge of the pipeline to the principalship for AAPIs. How have factors such as organizational discrimination and other factors explored in this chapter affected them?

Final Thoughts

I explored and compared the perceptions, motivations, and aspirations of AAPIs who became principals from 1970-1989 and from 2000-2011 to look at the change over time in the reasons and factors that supported or hindered them as they negotiated their career from teachers to principals. This qualitative research design allowed me to identify the changes over time of the AAPIs' experience in LAUSD as they promoted up to principals by looking at the rich context of the participants' environment and experiences. Ultimately, I hoped that this dissertation would enhance accessibility to AAPIs in pursuing a career as principals, thereby maintaining the comparable representation of AAPI students and AAPI principals in the district.

As I concluded the study, I discovered unexpected changes over time within the findings, such as the value of subservience. Findings about the supportive nature of most cultural values, even subservience, in the AAPI principals' journey in their career made me rethink about and have a new appreciation of the values with which I grew up.

The data about LAUSD noted through this research suggested that there was the little

evidence of discrimination in the hiring process, even as the educational culture has shifted away

from a push for racial integration. Evidence of homophily was perceived as low in the 1970-1989

group and only increased slightly in the 2000-2011 group. I was pleased to see that most

participants experienced support from mentors, superiors, and social networks of all races,

including the White population. However, we must be mindful of the fact that the low reports of

discrimination by the participants do not negate the possible existence of homophily, since we do

not know how many other AAPIs attempted to promote up and did not or if memories related to

homophily changed over time. Another advancement was the formation of an organizational

support by the 1970-1989 group, which helped the 2000-2011 groups' promotional process,

specifically in the area of exam preparation and social networking. Even though the promotional

process has changed this year (2012), there is an organization in place to advocate for AAPIs:

something the 1970-1989 group did not have.

Along with progress the district has made, this study brought to the forefront emerging

concerns for the future in regards to AAPI representation in LAUSD, one of the largest school

districts in the United States. Increased reports of homophily and discrimination, no matter how

small, should be examined. As the Latino population becomes the dominant group in LAUSD,

we must keep in mind that AAPIs are minorities within the racial minority groups as the smallest

group. If AAPIs are viewed as "model minorities" who do not have differing needs, or are

viewed as people who cannot lead any race other then AAPIs, their representation in the district

may start to diminish. Another area of concern is the lack of clarity of qualifications the

candidates must have to promote into principal positions. If the qualifications are not made

transparent with a more holistic promotional screening system in place, AAPIs may be

negatively impacted if cultural tendencies are a mismatch with the person doing the screening.

Lastly, if the status of teachers and the pay of the principals continue to decrease or remain low, this may decrease the number of the future AAPIs in the principal pipeline. This trend may impact the AAPI population most of all, since research points to the importance of pay and status for AAPIs in career choice. As the state and district negotiate through the current budget crisis, we must consider the impact of lower wages on the recruitment of highly qualified candidates into the profession, especially those of AAPI descent.

Personal Reflection: As a principal currently working in LAUSD, the findings of this study made me realize how much the environment of the times affects the determination of the career pathway of AAPIs as it is probably true for people of all races. This study made me think about the possibility of the equal representation of AAPI principals to AAPI students in LAUSD, not found in many other parts of the United States, being dissolved over a short period of time based on who is in charge of the district if the process is only dependent on the opinions of a few people in charge. Although the current administration at the central level may be fair-minded and thoughtful, the establishment of a transparent and fair process regarding the promotional process with input from all stakeholders would better ensure the sustainability of the racial representation regardless of who is in charge. Additionally, this study made me think about how important it is to make sure that the organizational support adapts to the changing times and the changing political environment during which AAPIs attempt to pursue a career as K-12 principals. As the 1970/80s AAPIs benefited from the environment of their times, they had foresight to establish APEA in support of others to come. However, without the assumption that racial representation is still one of the priorities of all involved in the running of LAUSD, APEA must shift their focus from supporting all aspiring administrators to making a race-based effort in providing

networking opportunities to incoming AAPIs with collaborative leadership capabilities. As an active member of APEA with a voice in determining the direction of the organization, I am not suggesting that the organization solely assist AAPIs, however, whereas to date it supported people of all ethnicities with capabilities, it must start focusing on making sure that they proactively assist capable AAPIs in the principal career pipeline. Additionally, the nature of their support must change from test preparation to mentoring, giving encouragement, and improving interview skills. Lastly, this study allowed me to think about the positions of people who had in the past and who have currently the authority to influence the staffing decisions of LAUSD. I realize that more AAPIs must think about acquiring higher positions beyond the principal positions such as director, superintendent, board of education member, and more in order to make sure AAPIs' voices are heard in the decisions made to meet the needs of all students in LAUSD.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Demographic Survey Instrument

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey. This will take about 5 minutes to complete. Please note that if you exit the survey, you will not be able to return and finish. Therefore, please fill it out as completely as possible before exiting the survey. Thank you again for your participation!

1. Which AAPI group do you identify with?
a. Asian Indian
b. Bangladeshi
c. Cambodian
d. Chinese
e. Filipino
f. Hmong
g. Indonesian
h. Japanese
i. Korean
j. Laotian
k. Malaysian
l. Pakistani
m. Sri Lankan
n. Taiwanese
o. Thai
p. Vietnamese
q. Bhutanese
r. Burmese
s. Indochinese
t. Iwo Jiman
u. Madagascar
v. Maldivian
w. Nepalese
x. Okinawan
y. Singaporean
z. other Asian not specified

2. In what year did you start your principalship? *(select one)*
a. 1970-1989
b. 2000-2011
c. other year

3. What school level were/are you a principal?
a. elementary
b. middle
c. high

d. span

4. Gender
a. Male
b. Female
c. Other

5. Which immigrant generation do you identify with?
a. First generation (born and raised outside of U.S.)
b. 1.5 generation (born outside, but mostly raised in U.S.)
c. Second generation (born in U.S., at least one parent born outside)
d. Third generation (self and parents born and raised in U.S.,
grandparents born and raised outside), and up
e. Other (please specify):

6. Which of the following is your highest degree earned?
a. Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)
b. Master's (M.A., M.Ed.,M.S., etc.)
c. L.L.B.,J.D.
d. M.D., D.D.S., or equivalent
e. Ed.D.
f. Ph.D.
g. Other degree (please identify)

7. If you are currently working on a degree, please indicate which one:
a. Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)
b. Master's (M.A., M.S., etc.)
c. L.L.B.,J.D.
d. M.D., D.D.S., or equivalent
e. Ed.D.
f. Ph.D.
g. Other degree (please identify)

8. Age Range at the time first hired as a principal
a. 20-29
b. 30-39
c. 40-49
d. 50-59
e. 60-69
f. 70+

9. What was your undergraduate major?
10. If you have an advanced degree, what subject is it in?

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. I will see you soon for our interview!

Appendix B:

Writing Prompts

Hello. I hope you are doing well. I am writing to remind you that I will be coming to your school in two days for our interview about your experience as a principal. If you have a few minutes, please take a few minutes to respond to the following prompt and email it to me by tomorrow:

Describe an event or a situation that reflects why you became a principal:

Describe an event or a situation that reflects how, if at all, your Asian American/Pacific Islander identity has had an effect on your becoming a principal (supported or got in the way):

Appendix C:

Interview Protocol

Thank you for volunteering your time to speak with me. This interview should take no more than 30-60 minutes. Everything you say here today will be confidential, so please feel free to speak openly. I will not report your answers back to your supervisors or anyone else. Your name and location will not be reported. However, so that I can concentrate on what you have to say, I would like to record our conversation. It will really help me focus on what you're saying. The audio will not be shared with anyone. Only I will use it to transcribe the interview. I'm going to place the recorder in front of you, and if at any time during our conversation you would prefer not to record what you are saying, you can press the stop button here. Do you have any questions? Okay, let's begin.

I would like to get your thoughts about your process in becoming a principal.

I. I'm going to ask you a little about your background:
1. When growing up, what kind of job did you want?
2. What are your parents' occupations? Siblings'? Spouse's?
3. When you entered college, what kind of profession did you want ultimately?
4. When did you decide to become a teacher?
5. What other positions did you hold before becoming a principal?
6. What events, people, or information influenced your decision to acquire those positions?
7. How long have you worked in the field of education?

II. Why were you were interested in pursuing a career as a K-12 principal?
1. How, if at all, has your family (parents) influenced you in deciding to pursue a career as a principal?
2. How, if at all, did your interest in subject matter in college lead you to pursuing teaching?
3. What was LAUSD like when you first became a principal?
4. How, if at all, did family values you grew up with influence you in deciding to pursue a career as a principal?
5. What do you think about the status of teachers in our society?
6. How did your family feel about you becoming a teacher?
7. How, if at all, do you think as a principal that you affect others such as teachers, students, other administrators?
8. What do you think about the status of principals in our society?
9. What do you think about the pay rate of principals as compared to other professional jobs?
10. What do you think about the pay rate of teachers compared to other professional jobs?
11. What people, events, or information influenced your decision to become a principal?
12. What was going on in the field of education that influenced you to pursue a principal position?

III. What supported or hindered you as you pursued a career as a principal?
1. Describe the people in your life who supported you: Friends? Colleagues? Family? Others?
2. What was the role, if any, of your family in influencing your decision to become a principal?
3. Do you identify yourself as Asian-American, ___-American, American..?
4. What did the others at the time of you becoming a principal refer to you as? Asian American? Korean American? Etc.
5. Do you think your cultural background as an AAPI has affected your opportunities for advancement? If so, how?
6. How, if at all, has your family values supported or hindered you as you pursued a position as a principal?
7. How, if at all, did your belief in the status of teachers in our society support or hinder you as you pursued a position as a principal?
8. What skills do you possess that helped you become a principal? (interpersonal, language, public speaking, etc.)
9. What skills do you think you lacked that got in the way when pursuing the principalship?
10. Who were your role models? (Race, age, gender)
11. How, if at all did this person helped you to become a principal?
12. What resources did you have that assisted you to advancement? Mentor? Organizational support? Family? Etc
13. Have you had any experiences of discrimination in the school system that may have shaped your career choices?
14. What was going on in the field of education that may have either made it more difficult or assisted you at the time you first became a principal?
15. Do you have a sense of why some AAPIs are not interested in pursing this career path?

Appendix D:

Document Summary Form

Participant:_____
Date Received: _____
Today's Date: _____

Name or description of the document: Writing prompt response
Significance or importance of document:

Brief Summary of contents:

If document is central or crucial to particular themes, ideas, which?

Appendix E:

Contact Summary Sheet

Contact Type: Interview
Contact Date: _____
Today's Date: _____

1. What were the main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?

2. Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions you had for this contact.

Research Question	Information
1. Do AAPI principals from different time periods offer distinctive explanations for why they became principals?	
1. What factors supported and what factors posed challenges for AAPI educators who wished to become principals? Does this differ for AAPI educators across two periods of time?	

2. Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting, illuminating, or important in this contact?

3. What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next contact?

Appendix F:

Participant Consent

University of California, Los Angeles

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Asian American and Pacific Islander Principals in K-12 Schools
Then and Now: 1970/1989 and 2000/2011

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jina Kim-Qvale sponsored by Dr. Rose, Dr. Chang and associates from the *Graduate School of Education and Information Studies*, at the University of California, Los Angeles. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you identified either as an Asian American and Pacific Islander Principal in LAUSD's K-12 schools in the 1970/1989 or 2000/2011. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?

Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) is the fastest growing group in the United States. However, on a national as well as on the state level, representative staffing of principals in the K-12 school system has not kept pace with this growth. Unlike the nation and state, as of 2010, LAUSD has adequate representation of AAPI principals as related to AAPI students. This study is being conducted to investigate the changes in conditions for AAPI principal from 1970/1989 and 2000/2011 to understand how to support incoming AAPI principals.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to do the following:

1. Fill out a short 5 minute demographic online survey.
2. Participate in one interview of about 30-60 minutes before or after working hours.
3. Complete two 10 minute writing prompts.
4. Review the transcript of your interview for accuracy.

How long will I be in the research study?

Participation in the study will take a total of about 1.5 to 2.5 hours within a month.
All data collection activities will take place during participant's off working hours.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You may not directly benefit from participating in the study. However, the results of the research may help to enhance accessibility to AAPIs interested in pursuing principal positions in K-12 education. In addition, this study may provide helpful information to AAPI educators in the skills, supports, and experiences necessary to pursue a principal position in the K-12 setting.

This study may add to the knowledge of improving the management of school environment and improving educational outcomes across all or selected subgroups of students. Specifically, this research has the potential to help LAUSD to continue to diversify the pipeline for principal positions to meet the needs of all of our students. The number of AAPI principals generally is small throughout the United States. The Southern California area contains one of the highest populations of AAPI K – 12 students. As the AAPI population continues to grow, this study may contribute to the continuation of culturally responsive representation of AAPI administrators in the district.

Will I receive any payment if I participate in this study?

You will receive an opportunity to be in a raffle for a $20 giftcard for filling out the short survey. Each interview participant will receive a token of appreciation of a $15 giftcard.

Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. All data obtained in this project will be coded to ensure confidentiality, and all code keys will be destroyed upon the completion of the study. No participants' names including retired principals will be attached to individual data. All hard copies of interview transcripts will be destroyed within two years of the study to ensure confidentiality.

Withdrawal of participation by the investigator

The investigator may withdraw you from participating in this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. If you do the meet the criteria for the two groups being studied, you may have to drop out even if you would like to continue.

What are my rights if I take part in this study?

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty or loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.

You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may leave the study at any time without consequences of any kind. You

are not waiving any of your legal rights if you choose to be in this research study. You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

Who can answer questions I might have about this study?

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact

Principal investigator:
Jina Kim-Qvale
807 N. Edgemont St.
Los Angeles, CA 90029
Email: jinateach@yahoo.com
Phone: (818) 802-2463

Faculty Sponsor:
Dr. Linda Rose
Co-Director, Educational Leadership
UCLA Department of Education and Information Studies
P.O. Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
Email: rose@gseis.ucla.edu
Phone: (310) 794-9230

If you wish to ask questions about your rights as a research participant or if you wish to voice any problems or concerns you may have about the study to someone other than the researchers, please call the Office of the Human Research Protection Program at (310) 825-7122 or write to Office of the Human Research Protection Program, UCLA, 11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 102, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694.

Appendix G:

Recruitment Email

Attention all educators of **Asian American Pacific Islander** descent who are currently or have ever been a **principal** in LAUSD

As a doctoral student in the UCLA Educational Leadership Program, I am currently recruiting volunteers to participate in a research study regarding Asian American and Pacific Islander principals in the K-12 system. Specifically, I will look at factors that helped and factors that challenged them as they pursued their career.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

1. Fill out a short 5 minute demographic online survey.
2. Participate in one interview of about 30-60 minutes before or after working hours.
3. Complete two 10 minute writing prompts.
4. Review the transcript of your interview for accuracy.

Will I receive any payment if I participate in this study?

You will receive an opportunity to be in a raffle for a $20 giftcard for filling out the short survey. Each interview participant will receive a token of appreciation of a $15 giftcard.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You may not directly benefit from participating in the study. However, the results of the research may help to enhance accessibility to others interested in pursuing principal positions in K-12 education. In addition, this study may provide helpful information to educators in the skills, supports, and experiences necessary to pursue a principal position in the K-12 setting.

This study may add to the knowledge of improving the management of school environment and improving educational outcomes across all or selected subgroups of students. Specifically, this research has the potential to help LAUSD to continue to diversify the pipeline for principal positions to meet the needs of all of our students. The number of AAPI principals generally is small throughout the United States. The Southern California area contains one of the highest populations of AAPI K – 12 students. As the AAPI population continues to grow, this study may contribute to the continuation of culturally responsive representation of AAPI administrators in the district.

If you are willing to participate or know someone who is willing to participate in this study, please email **Jina Kim** at:
jinateach@yahoo.com

Recruitment Flyer

Attention all educators of **Asian American Pacific Islander** descent who are currently or have ever been a **principal** in LAUSD

As a doctoral student in the UCLA Educational Leadership Program, I am currently recruiting volunteers to participate in a research study regarding Asian American and Pacific Islander principals in the K-12 system. Specifically, I will look at factors that helped and factors that challenged them as they pursued their career.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

1. Fill out a short 5 minute demographic online survey.
2. Participate in one interview of about 30-60 minutes before or after working hours.
3. Complete two10 minute writing prompts.
4. Review the transcript of your interview for accuracy.

Will I receive any payment if I participate in this study?

You will receive an opportunity to be in a raffle for a $20 giftcard for filling out the short survey. Each interview participant will receive a token of appreciation of a $15 giftcard.

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You may not directly benefit from participating in the study. However, the results of the research may help to enhance accessibility to others interested in pursuing principal positions in K-12 education. In addition, this study may provide helpful information to educators in the skills, supports, and experiences necessary to pursue a principal position in the K-12 setting.

This study may add to the knowledge of improving the management of school environment and improving educational outcomes across all or selected subgroups of students. Specifically, this research has the potential to help LAUSD to continue to diversify the pipeline for principal positions to meet the needs of all of our students. The number of AAPI principals generally is small throughout the United States. The Southern California area contains one of the highest populations of AAPI K – 12 students. As the AAPI population continues to grow, this study may contribute to the continuation of culturally responsive representation of AAPI administrators in the district.

If you are willing to participate or know someone who is willing to participate in this study, please email **Jina Kim at: jinateach@yahoo.com**

REFERENCES

Adrian, L. P. (2004). *Asian American leaders in higher education: An exploration of a dynamic constructivist approach to leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI 3132977)

Aguilar-San Juan, K. (1994). *The State of Asian America: Activism and resistance in the 1990s*. Boston, MA: South End.

Allen, K., Jacobson, S., & Kofi, L. (1995). African American women in educational administration: The importance of mentors and sponsors. *Journal of Negro Education*, *64*(4), 409-422.

Allix, N. M. (2000). Transformational leadership: Democratic or despotic? *Educational Management and Administration*, *28*(1), 7-20.

Apple, M., & Beane, J. (2007). *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Apple, W. M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Arias, M. B. (2005). The impact of Brown on Latinos: A study of transformation of policy intentions. *Teachers College Record*, *107*(9), 1974-1998.

Astin, A. W. (1982). *Minorities in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Aud, S., Fox, M. A., & KewalRamani, A. (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups*. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/files/AIR-NCESracial_stats__trends1.pdf

Auguste, B., Kihn, P., & Miller, M. (2010, September). *Education: Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching. An international*

and market research-based perspective. London, UK: McKinsey & Company.

Bloom, C. M., & Erlandson, D. A. (2003). African American women principals in urban
schools: Realities, (re)constructions, and resolutions. *Educational Administration
Quarterly*, *39*, 339-369.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*
(2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008). *Administrative services credential.*
Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/CREDS/admin-svcs.html

Chapman, P. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheng, C. (1997). Are Asian American employees a model minority or just a minority? *Journal
of Applied Behavioral Science*, *33*, 277-290.

Chun, K. T. (1995). The myth of Asian American success and its educational ramifications. In
D.T. Nakanishi & T.Y. Nishida (Eds.), *The Asian American educational experience: A
source book for teachers and students* (pp. 95-112). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cooper, C. (2009). Performing cultural work in democratically changing schools: Implications
for expanding transformative leadership framework. *Educational Administration
Quarterly*, *45*, 695-723. doi: 10.1177/0013161X09341639.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods
approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard
Educational Review*, *56*, 18-36.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*.
Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fong, T. P. (2002). *The contemporary Asian American experience: Beyond the model minority*

(2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Friedman, R. A., & Krackhardt, D. (1997). Social capital and career mobility: A structural theory of lower returns to education for Asian employees. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Behavioral Science, 33,* 316-334.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harris, A. (2004). Distributive leadership: Leading or misleading. *Educational Management Administration Leadership, 32*(1), 11-24.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, OH: World.

Hoeffel, E. M., Rastogi, S., Ouk Kim, M., & Shahid, H. (2012). *The Asian population: 2010.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 56-87.

Johnson, S. (2008). Education policy brief: The status of male teachers in public education today. *Center for Evaluation & Education Policy*, *6*(4), 1-12.

Jonassen-Bailey, J. & Hernandez-Serrano, J. (2002). Case-based reasoning and instructional design: Using stories to support problem solving. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *50*(2), 65-77.

Kelly, K. R., Gunsalus, A. C., & Gunsalus, R. (2009). Social cognitive predictors of the career goals of Korean American students. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *58*, 14-28.

Kim, B., Atkinson, D. R., & Yang, P. H. (1999). The Asian values scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46,* 342-352. doi:10.1037//0022-0167.46.3.342

Kim, B., Yang, P., Atkinson, D., Wolfe, M., & Hong, S. (2001). Cultural value similarities and

    differences among Asian American ethnic groups. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic*

    Minority Psychology, *7*(4), 343-361.

LAUSD. (2004). *LAUSD school finder.* Retrieved from http://search.lausd.k12.ca.us/cgi-

    bin/fccgi.exe

LAUSD Human Resources Division. (2010). *Principals' ethnic origin totals as of October 7,*

    2009. Los Angeles, CA: Author.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Hoffmann Davis, J. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*. San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, J., & Zhou, M. (2004). *Asian American youth: Culture, identity and ethnicity*. New York,

    NY: Routledge.

Lees, K. (1995). Advancing democratic leadership through critical theory. *Journal of Leadership*,

    5(3), 220-230.

Leonard, A., Mehra, A., & Katerberg, R. (2008). The social identity and social networks of

    ethnic minority groups in organizations: A crucial test of distinctiveness theory. *Journal*

    of Organizational Behavior, *29*, 573-589.

Leong, F. T. (1991). Career development attributes and occupational values of AsianAmerican

    and White American college students. *Career Development Quarterly, 39*(3), 221-230.

Lew, J. (2004). The "other" story of model minorities: Korean American high school dropouts in

    an urban context. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *35*(3), 303-323.

Lew, J. (2007). A structural analysis of success and failure of Asian Americans: A case of

    Korean Americans in urban schools. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(2), 369-390.

Lien, P., Conway, M., & Wong, J. (2003). The contours and sources of ethnic identity choices among Asian Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*. *84*, 461-481.

Lincoln, S., & Guba, G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lopez, G. R. (2003). The racially neutral politics of education: A critical race theory. *Education Administraton Quarterly, 39*(1), 68-94.

Matsuura, K. R. (1996). *Asian-American academics: Facilitators and barriers in becoming administrators in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 9634088)

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McGuire, W. J. (1984). Search of the self: going beyond self-esteem and the reactive self. In R. A. Zurcher, J. Arnoff, & A. I. Rabin (Eds.), *Personality and the prediction of behaviors* (pp. 73-120). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. (1998). At the margins: A distinctiveness approach to the social identity and social network of underrepresented groups. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(4), 441-452.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.

Miles, M. & Huberman, M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Min, P. G. (1995). *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morgan, D. L. (1993). *Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008, June). *Characteristics of public, private,*
     and bureau of Indian education elementary and secondary school principals in
     the United States. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009323.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009, June). *Contexts of elementary and secondary*
     education: Characteristics of school principals. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/
     programs/coe/indicator_pal.asp

Ngo, B., & Lee, S J (2007). Complicating the image of model minority success: A review of
     Southeast Asian American education. *Review of Educational Research, 77,* 415-453.

Noguera, P. A. (2001). Racial politics and the elusive quest for excellence and equity in
     education. *Education and Urban Society*, *34*, 18-41.

Ogbu, J. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross cultural*
     perspective. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Okihiro, Y. G. (2001). *Columbia Guide to Asian American History*. New York, NY: Columbia
     University Press.

Ong, P. M., & Blumberg, E. (1994). *Welfare and work among Southeast Asians: The state of*
     Asian Pacific American economic diversity, issues, and policies – a public policy report.
     Los Angeles, CA: LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute and UCLA
     Asian American Studies Center.

Oyserman, D., & Sakamoto, I. (1997). Being Asian American: Identity, cultural constructs, and
     stereotype perception. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *33*, 435-453.

Park, J. (2008). Second-generation Asian American pan-ethnic identity: Pluralized meanings of a
     racial label. *Sociological Perspective*, *51*(3), 541-561.

Riehl, C. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(1), 55-81.

Rong, X., & Preissle, J. (1997). The continual decline in Asian American teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(2), 267-293.

Seidman, I. E. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shields, C. M., & Sayani, A. (2005). Leading in the midst of diversity: The challenge of our times. In F. W. English (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 38-406)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Song, C., & Glick, J. E. (2004). College attendance and choice of college major among Asian-American students. *Social Science Quarterly*, *85*, 1401-1421.

Spencer, D. A. (1996). Teachers and educational reform. *Educational Researcher*, *25*(15), 15-40. doi: 10.3102/0013189X025009015

Spillane, J., & Diamond, J. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(3), 23-28.

Suzuki, B. (1995). Education and the socialization of Asian Americans: A revisionist analysis of the "model minority" thesis. In D. T. Nakanishi & T.Y. Nishida (Eds.), *The Asian American educational experience: A source book for teachers and students* (pp. 113-132). New York, NY: Routledge.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *We the people: Asians in the United States census 2000 special reports* (Publication No. CENSR-17). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). *The American community-Asians: 2004, American community survey reports* (Publication No. CENSR-ACS-05). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Profile America: Facts for features. Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. Department of Labor. (2012). *Occupational outlook handbook: Elementary, middle, and high school principals.* Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Management/ Elementary-middle-and-high-school-principals.htm

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. (2000). *Statistical yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1998.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Woo, D. (1994). *The glass ceiling and Asian Americans*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/129

Xin, K. (2004). Asian American managers: An impression gap? An investigation of impression management and supervisor-subordinate relationships. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 40*(2), 160-181.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, P., & Castaneda, J. (2008). Color of money as compared to color of principals: An

assessment of pay for male elementary school principals varying in surname (Hispanic vs. Non-Hispanic). *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 675-703. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08323791

Zhou, M. (2001). Straddling different worlds: The acculturation of Vietnamese refugee children. In R. Rumbaut & A. Portes (Eds.), *Ethnicities: Children of immigrants in America* (pp. 187-227). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Zhou, M. (2004). Are Asian Americans becoming White? *Contexts, 3*, 29-37.