On a soccer field in Clarkston, Georgia, you may find the Fugees, a boys’ soccer program at play. Though most may think they selected their team name to honor the hip-hop band, Fugees is actually short for “refugees.” These 9- to 17-year-old players are refugees from 18 different countries—Shahir Anwar, an Afghan teen whose parents fled the Taliban; Santino Jerke, a Sudanese boy who arrived after three years as a refugee in Cairo; and Mohammed Mohammed, an Iraqi Kurd whose family fled Iraq five years ago (St. John 2007). They are among the more than 1.1 million refugees admitted to the United States since 1990.

The United States is a diverse racial and ethnic society. Joe Feagin and Pinar Batur (2004) report that by the 2050s the majority of the U.S. population will comprise African, Latino, Asian, Middle Eastern, and Native Americans. Currently, White Americans are a minority in half of the largest 100 U.S. cities and in Hawaii, New Mexico, Texas, and California. Between 2015 and 2040, White Americans are expected to become a statistical minority in many other states. The U.S. Census estimates that in 2003 about 12 percent of the U.S. population or about 33.5 million individuals were foreign born (Larsen 2004).

Adding to the diversity of our population are increasing numbers of immigrants, their migration to the United States and throughout the world spurred on by the global economy. Population mobility since the middle of the twentieth century has been characterized by unprecedented volume, speed, and geographical range (Collin and Lee 2003). At the end of 2005, nearly 200 million people or about 3 percent of the world’s population lived in a country other than their birth country (DeParle 2007). The International Organization for Migration (2003) predicts that by 2030, this figure should increase to 230 million. As Zygmunt Bauman (2000) describes, “The world is on the move.”
In this chapter, we will explore how one’s racial and ethnic status serves as a basis of inequality. Like social class, depending on one’s race or ethnicity, a person’s life chances are altered and the likelihood of experiencing particular social problems increases. We begin first with understanding how race and ethnicity are defined.

**Defining Race and Ethnicity**

From a biological perspective, a race can be defined as a group or population that shares a set of genetic characteristics and physical features. The term has been applied broadly to groups with similar physical features (the White race), religion (the Jewish race), or the entire human species (the human race) (Marger 2002). However, generations of migration, intermarriage, and adaptations to different physical environments have produced a mixture of races. There is no such thing as a “pure” race.

Social scientists reject the biological notions of race, instead favoring an approach that treats race as a social construct. In *Racial Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*, Michael Omi and Howard Winant explain how race is a “concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies” (1994: 54). Instead of thinking of race as something “objective," the authors argue that we can imagine race as an “illusion,” a subjective social, political, and cultural construct. According to the authors, “The meaning of race is defined and contested throughout society, in both collective action and personal practice. In the process, racial categories themselves are formed, transformed, destroyed, and reformed” (p. 21). Robert Redfield says it simply, “Race is, so to speak, a human invention” (1958:67).

Race may be a social construction, but that does not make race any less powerful and controlling (Myers 2005). Omi and Winant argue that although particular stereotypes and meanings can change, “The presence of a system of racial meaning and stereotypes, of racial ideology, seems to be a permanent feature of U.S. culture” (1994:63).

**Ethnic groups** are groups that are set off to some degree from other groups by displaying a unique set of cultural traits, such as their language, religion, or diet. Members of an ethnic group perceive themselves as members of an ethnic community, sharing common historical roots and experiences. All of us, to one extent or another, have an ethnic identity. Increasingly the terms race and ethnicity are presented as a single construct pointing to how both terms are being conflated (Budrys 2003).

Martin Marger (2002) explains how ethnicity serves as a basis of social ranking, ranking a person according to the status of his or her ethnic group. He states that although class and ethnicity are separate dimensions of stratification, they are closely related: “In virtually all multiethnic societies, people’s ethnic classification becomes an important factor in the distribution of societal rewards and hence, their economic and political class positions…. The ethnic and class hierarchies are largely parallel and interwoven” (2002:286).
As of 2002, Hispanic Americans were the nation’s largest ethnic minority group. (The U.S. Census treats Hispanic origin and race as separate and distinct concepts; as a result, Hispanics may be of any race.) The U.S. Census Bureau includes in this category women and men who are Mexican, Central and South American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Hispanic. The growth in the number of Hispanic Americans has been attributed to increased international immigration and higher birthrates. The states with the highest proportion of Hispanics include New Mexico, California, Texas, and Arizona. The 2002 ethnic and racial composition of the United States is presented in Table 3.1.

Most U.S. families have an immigration history whether it is based upon stories of relatives as long as four generations ago or as recent as the current generation. Immigration involves leaving one’s country of origin to move to another. Though immigration has always been a part of U.S. history, the recent wave of immigration, particularly in the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first, has led to the observation that we are in the “age of migration” (Castles and Miller 1998).

Most immigrants are motivated by the global economics of immigration—men and women will move from low-wage to high-wage countries in search of better incomes and standards of living. Labor migration, the movement from one country to another for employment, has been a part of U.S. history beginning with Chinese male workers brought to build railroads in the 1800s. These men never brought their families or had any intention of staying after their work was completed. In their analysis of current migration trends, Gary Hytrek and Kristine Zentgraf (2007) note how an increasing number of highly skilled laborers are moving from less developed areas around the world to the United States and Europe. These migrants are more likely to return to their place of birth or move on to a third country. Migration tends to occur between geographically proximate countries—Turkey and North African migration to Western Europe and Mexican and Central American migration to the United States.

The U.S. Census distinguishes between native and foreign-born residents. A native refers to anyone born in the United States or a U.S. Island Area such as Puerto Rico or the Northern Marinas Islands or born abroad of a U.S. citizen parent; foreign born refers to anyone who is not a U.S. citizen at birth. In 2003, among the 33.5 million foreign born in the United States, most were from Latin America (53.3 percent), then Asia (25 percent), Europe (13.7 percent), and other regions in the world (8 percent) (Larsen 2004). Refer to Figure 3.1.

Refugees, like the players on the Fugees soccer team, are defined by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1980 as “aliens outside the United States who are unable or unwilling to return to his/her country of origin for persecution or fear of persecution on account of race,
religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.” Data on the number of admitted refugees are collected annually by the U.S. Department of State. In 2005, 53,183 persons were admitted as refugees. Almost 60 percent of all admitted refugees were from just four countries: Somalia (19 percent), Laos (16 percent), Cuba (12 percent), and Russia (11 percent). The majority of admitted refugees were less than 25 years of age (55 percent), male (51 percent), and single (58 percent) (Jeffreys 2006).

**What Does It Mean to Me?**

You may not be able to tell from my last name (Leon-Guerrero), but I consider my ethnic identity to be Japanese. My middle name is Yuri, a Japanese name that means “Lily.” I am Japanese not only because of my middle name or because of my Japanese mother, but also because of the Japanese traditions that I practice, the Japanese words that I use, and even the Japanese foods that I like to eat. Do you have an ethnic identity? If you do, how do you maintain it?

**Patterns of Racial and Ethnic Integration**

Sociologists explain that *ethnocentrism* is the belief that one’s own group values and behaviors are right and even better than all others. Feeling positive about one’s group is important for group solidarity and loyalty. However, it can lead groups and individuals to believe that certain racial or ethnic groups are inferior and that discriminatory practices against them are justified. This is called *racism*.

Though not all inequality can be attributed to racism, our nation’s history reveals how particular groups have been singled out and subject to unfair treatment. Certain groups have been subject to individual discrimination and institutional discrimination. Individual discrimination
Race and Ethnicity includes actions against minority members by individuals. Actions may range from avoiding contact with minority group members to physical or verbal attacks against minority group members. Institutional discrimination is practiced by the government, social institutions, and organizations. Institutional discrimination may include segregation, exclusion, or expulsion.

**Segregation** refers to the physical and social separation of ethnic or racial groups. Although we consider explicit segregation to be illegal and a thing of the past, ethnic and racial segregation still occurs in neighborhoods, schools, and personal relationships. According to Debra Van Ausdale and Feagin,

Racial discrimination and segregation are still central organizing factors in contemporary U.S. society. For the most part, Whites and Blacks do not live in the same neighborhoods, attend the same schools at all educational levels, enter into close friendships or other intimate relationships with one another, or share comparable opinions on a wide variety of political matters. The same is true, though sometimes to a lesser extent, for Whites and other Americans of color, such as most Latino, Native and Asian American groups. Despite progress since the 1960s, U.S. society remains intensely segregated across color lines. Generally speaking, Whites and people of color do not occupy the same social space or social status. (2001:29)

**Exclusion** refers to the practice of prohibiting or restricting the entry or participation of groups in society. In March 1882, U.S. Congressman Edward K. Valentine declared, “The [immigration] gate must be closed.” That year, Valentine, along with other congressional leaders, approved the Chinese Exclusion Act. From 1882 to 1943, the United States prohibited Chinese immigration because of concerns that Chinese laborers would compete with American workers. Through the 1940s, immigration was defined as a hindrance rather than a benefit to the United States.

*Photo 3.2* In 2005, the largest group of refugees in the United States was from Somalia. A male Somalian social worker is leading a Somalian family (not pictured) on a tour of a supermarket in Phoenix, Arizona.
Finally, expulsion is the removal of a group by direct force or intimidation. In 2006, journalist Eliot Jaspin documented the extent of racial expulsion that occurred in towns from Central Texas through Georgia. After the Civil War through the 1920s, White residents expelled nearly all Black persons from their communities, usually using direct physical force. Thirteen countywide expulsions were documented in eight states between 1864 and 1923 in which 4,000 Blacks were driven out of their communities.

What Does It Mean to Me?

After the 2007 NCAA Women’s Basketball finals, radio personality Don Imus made a racial and sexist comment regarding the members of the Rutgers University Women’s basketball team on his morning radio program. The statement ignited a national debate over racist and misogynistic language and lyrics. Imus was fired from his long-time position with NBC. Poll data from the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press revealed most White and Black Americans supported his termination, though others believed that his dismissal did not fit his “crime.” Should Imus have lost his job for his remark?

Taking a World View

Caste Discrimination in India

It is estimated that more than 250 million people worldwide suffer from caste segregation. A caste system segregates or excludes individuals on the basis of their descent. Caste communities exist in Asia and parts of Africa and include groups such as the Dalits (or untouchables) of Nepal, Bangladesh, India, and Sri Lanka; the Buraku people of Japan; and the Osu of Nigeria. Despite formal legislation to abolish or combat abuses based on caste systems, the Human Rights Watch (2001) reports, “Discriminatory treatment remains endemic and discriminatory societal norms continue to be reinforced by government and private structures and practices.” The inequalities suffered by these groups affect every level of their lives—social, physical, economic, and political.

The world’s longest surviving social hierarchy is India’s caste system. The caste is justified by the religious doctrine of “karma,” a belief that an individual’s place in life is determined by deeds in a previous life. The Dalits are the lowest members of the caste system, representing one-sixth of India’s population or approximately 160 to 240 million people. The status of the Dalits is reinforced by state allocation of resources and facilities—separate facilities are provided for different castes. For example, electricity, running water, or sanitation facilities may be installed for the upper caste section of town, but not for the Dalits and other lower castes. Dalits are prohibited from crossing from their side of the village. They cannot use the same water wells or visit the same temples as members of upper castes.

Children face discriminatory and abusive treatment at school by their teachers and their fellow students. Dalit children are often forced to sit in the back of the classroom. Most of the Indian schools with Dalit students are deficient in classrooms, teachers, and teaching aids. Dalit children also have the highest drop-out rates among Indian children—49.3 percent at the primary level, 67.8 percent for middle school, and 77.6 percent for secondary school.

Dalits are prohibited from performing marriage or funeral rites in public areas or from speaking directly to members of upper castes. Intermarriage among castes is still condemned in India, punishable by social ostracism or violence. The Dalits are usually employed as the removers of human waste and dead animals, leather workers, street cleaners, and cobblers. Dalit children are often sold into slavery to pay off debts to creditors. About 15 million children are working as slaves in order to pay off family debts.
Race and Ethnicity

Japanese American Internment Camps

Asian Americans are often characterized as the “model minority,” which focuses on their socio-economic achievement. Native-born Asian Americans as a group have achieved the same or better educations, occupations, and income levels as White Americans. Yet, social scientists observe how this image of success ignores Asian Americans’ history and experience of discrimination, in the United States. Part of their history is the internment of Japanese Americans between 1942 and 1945.

In August 1941, U.S. Representative John Dingell (Michigan) wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, suggesting that 10,000 Hawaiian Japanese be incarcerated to ensure “good behavior” by Japan. Roosevelt did not act on Dingell’s suggestion. But two months later when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor in December 1941, Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which allowed the Secretary of War to “prescribe military areas . . . from which any of all persons may be excluded.” Though no single ethnic group was identified, the order targeted Japanese Americans, most residing in the Western states. War department officials argued that Japanese Americans could not be trusted to serve in the Pacific theater because it was difficult to separate “the sheep from the goats” (Asahina 2006).

In Focus

From 1941 to 1945, about 120,000 Japanese Americans were relocated to internment camps. Like the Mochida family, most were instructed to pack their belongings in a single suitcase. The camps were closed at the end of World War II.
Sociological Perspectives on Inequalities Based on Race and Ethnicity

Functionalist Perspective

Theorists from this perspective believe that the differences between racial and ethnic groups are largely cultural. The solution is assimilation, a process where minority group members become part of the dominant group, losing their original group identity. This process is consistent with America’s image as the “melting pot.” Milton Gordon (1964) presents a seven-stage assimilation model that begins first with cultural assimilation (change of cultural patterns, e.g., learning the English language), followed by structural assimilation (interaction with members of the dominant group), marital assimilation (intermarriage), identification
assimilation (developing a sense of national identity, e.g., identifying as an American, rather than as an Asian American), attitude receptional assimilation (absence of prejudiced thoughts among dominant and minority group members), behavioral receptional assimilation (absence of discrimination, e.g., lower wages for minorities would not exist), and finally civic assimilation (absence of value and power conflicts).

Assimilation is said to allow a society to maintain its equilibrium (a goal of the functionalist perspective) if all members of society, regardless of their racial or ethnic identity, adopt one dominant culture. This is often characterized as a voluntary process. Critics argue that this perspective assumes that social integration is a shared goal and that members of the minority group are willing to assume the dominant group’s identity and culture, assuming that the dominant culture is the one and only preferred culture (Myers 2005). The perspective also assumes that assimilation is the same experience for all ethnic groups, ignoring the historical legacy of slavery and racial discrimination in our society.

Assimilation is not the only means to achieve racial-ethnic stability. Other countries maintain pluralism, where each ethnic or racial group maintains its own culture (cultural pluralism) or a separate set of social structures and institutions (structural pluralism). Switzerland, which has a number of different nationalities and religions, is an example of a pluralistic society. The country, also referred to as the Swiss Confederation, has four official languages—German, French, Italian, and Romansh. Relationships between each ethnic group are described for the most part as harmonious because each of the ethnically diverse parts joined the confederation voluntarily seeking protection (Farley 2005). In his examination of pluralism in the United States, Min Zhou notes, “As America becomes increasingly multiethnic, and as ethnic Americans become integral in our society, it becomes more and more evident that there is no contradiction between an ethnic identity and an American identity” (2004:153).

Conflict Perspective

According to sociologist W. E. B. Du Bois (1996), perhaps it is wrong “to speak of race at all as a concept, rather than as a group of contradictory forces, facts and tendencies.” The problem of the twentieth century, wrote Du Bois, is “the color line.”

Conflict theorists focus on how the dynamics of racial and ethnic relations divides groups while maintaining a dominant group. The dominant group may be defined according to racial or ethnic categories, but can also be defined according to social class. Instead of relationships based on consensus (or assimilation), relationships are based on power, force, and coercion. Ethnocentrism and racism maintain the status quo by dividing individuals along racial and ethnic lines (Myers 2005).

Drawing upon Marx’s class analysis, Du Bois was one of the first theorists to observe the connection between racism and capitalist-class oppression in the United States and throughout the world. He noted the link between racist ideas and actions to maintain a Eurocentric system of domination (Feagin and Batur 2004). Du Bois wrote,

Throughout the world today organized groups of men by monopoly of economic and physical power, legal enactment and intellectual training are limiting with great determination and unflagging zeal the development of other groups; and that the concentration particularly on economic power today puts the majority of mankind into a slavery to the rest. (1996:532)

Though most theorists from this perspective see conflict as emanating from one dominant group, conflict may also be mutual. Edna Bonacich (1972) offers a theory of ethnic antagonism, encompassing all levels of mutual intergroup conflict. She argues that this ethnic antagonism
emerges from a labor market, split along ethnic and class lines. To be split, the labor market must include at least two groups of workers whose price of labor differs for the same work. Conflict develops between three classes: businesses or employers, higher paid labor, and cheaper labor. Bonacich explains that as businesses attempt to maintain a cheap workforce (not caring about who does the work as long as it gets done), higher paid workers attempt to maintain their prime labor position (resisting the threat of lower wage laborers), and cheaper laborers attempt to advance their position (threatening higher paid workers). Higher paid workers may use exclusionary practices (attempting to prevent the importation of cheaper non-native labor) or caste arrangements (excluding some groups from certain types of work) to maintain their advantage in the labor market. According to Bonacich, the presence of a cheaper labor group threatens the jobs of higher paid workers and the standard for wages in all jobs. Under these conditions, laborers remain in conflict with each other, and the interests of capitalist business owners are maintained.

**Feminist Perspective**

Feminist theory has attempted to account for and focus on the experiences of women and other marginalized groups in society. Feminist theory intersects with multiculturalism through the analysis of multiple systems of oppression, not just gender, but including categories of race, class, sexual orientation, nation of origin, language, culture, and ethnicity. Emerging from this is Patricia Hill Collins’ Black feminist theory. Black feminists identify the value of a theoretical perspective that addresses the simultaneity of race, class, and gender oppression.

Black feminist scholars note that the misguided application of traditional feminist perspectives of “the family,” “patriarchy,” and “reproduction” to understand the experience of Black women’s lives. Black women do not lead parallel lives, but rather different lives. British scholar Hazel Carby (1985:390) argues that because Black women are subject to simultaneous oppression based on class, race, and patriarchy, the application of traditional (White) feminist perspectives are not appropriate and are actually misleading to comprehend their true experience. She argues that White feminist theory has to recognize “White women stand in a power relation as oppressors of Black women” (p. 390).

As an example, Carby analyzes an article on women in Third World manufacturing. Carby highlights how the photographs accompanying the article are of “anonymous Black women.” She observes, “This anonymity and the tendency to generalize into meaningless, the oppression of an amorphous category called ‘Third World Women,’ are symptomatic of the ways in which the specificity of our experiences and oppression are subsumed under inapplicable concepts and theories” (p. 394).

**Interactionist Perspective**

Sociologists believe that race is a social construct. We learn about racial and ethnic categories of White, Black, Latino, Asian, Native American, and immigrant through our social interaction. The meaning and values for these and other categories are provided by our social institutions, families, and friends (Ore 2003). As much as I and other social scientists inform our students about the unsubstantiated use of the term race, for most students, race is real. The term is loaded with social, cultural, and political baggage, making deconstructing it difficult to accomplish.

Social scientists have noted how people are raced, how race itself is not a category but a practice. Howard McGary (1999:83) defines practice as “a commonly accepted course of action that may be over time habitual in nature; a course of action that specifies certain forms of behavior as permissible and others impermissible, with rewards and penalties assigned accordingly.” In this way, racial categories and identities serve as intersections of social beliefs, perceptions, and activities that are reinforced by enduring systems of rewards and penalties (Shuford 2001).
The practice of being raced includes with it the bestowing of power and privilege and what is granted to one group may be denied to another. For example, Madonna and Angelina Jolie were honored (in some circles) for their adoption of children from Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Malawi, spotlighting their adoptions as examples of international goodwill and charity. Yet, as Matthew Jacobsen (1998) asks, why can White women have Black children but Black women cannot adopt White children? The interactionist perspective reminds us that racial designations may be fictitious, but their consequences are real.

A summary of all theoretical perspectives is provided in Table 3.2.

### The Consequences of Racial and Ethnic Inequalities

#### Income and Wealth

“Race is so associated with class in the United States that it might not be direct discrimination, but it still matters indirectly,” says sociologist Dalton Conley (Ohlemacher 2006:6). Data reported by the U.S. Census reveal that Black households had the lowest median income in the 2005, $30,858, which was 61 percent of the median income for non-Hispanic White households, $50,784. The median income for Hispanic households was $35,967, 71 percent of the median for non-Hispanic White households. American Indians and Alaska Natives had a median income of $33,627 (based on a three-year estimate). Asian households had the highest median income, $61,094, 120 percent of the median for non-Hispanic White households (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, and Lee 2006).
The U.S. Census presents income data in quintiles, dividing the population in fifths to determine the distribution of income. Households in the lowest quintile earned $19,178 or less in 2005, whereas households in the highest quintile earned $91,705 or more. Researchers calculate the Gini Index, an inequality measure that determines what percent of the total aggregate income earned by households that year is earned by each quintile. Their analysis revealed that non-Hispanic White households represented a larger proportion of households in the highest income quintile (81.2 percent) than in the lowest income quintile (61.4 percent). Despite their high median income, Asians represented only 5.8 percent of high-income quintile households, but only 3 percent of the lowest income quintile. Black and Hispanic households each represented a larger proportion of households in the lowest income quintile (20.6 and 13.4 percent, respectively) than in the highest quintile group (5.8 and 59 percent, respectively) (DeNavas-Walt et al. 2006).

Because of years of discrimination, low educational attainment, high unemployment, or underemployment, African Americans have not been able to achieve the same earnings or level of wealth as White Americans have. Studies indicate that for every dollar earned by White households, Black households earned 62 cents (Oliver and Shapiro 1995). Blacks have between $8 and $19 of wealth for every $100 possessed by Whites. Whites have nearly 12 times as much median net worth as Blacks, $43,000 compared with $3,700 (Oliver and Shapiro 1995).

One measure of wealth is home ownership. Home ownership is one of the primary means to accumulate wealth (Williams, Nesiba, and McConnell 2005). It enables families to finance college and invest in one’s future. Historically, home ownership grew among White middle-class families after World War II, when veterans had access to government and credit programs making home ownership more affordable. However, Blacks and other minority groups have been denied similar access because of structural barriers such as discrimination, low income, and lack of credit access. Feagin (1999) identifies how inequality in homeownership has contributed to inequality in other aspects of American life. Specifically, Blacks have been disadvantaged because of their lack of homeownership, particularly in their inability to provide their children with “the kind of education or other cultural advantages necessary for their children to compete equally or fairly with Whites” (p. 86).

In 2004, U.S. homeownership reached a record high of 69.2 percent with nearly 73.4 million Americans owning their own homes. However, racial gaps in homeownership have increased in the past 25 years. In 2005, 75 percent of White households owned their own homes, compared with 46 percent of Black households and 48 percent of Hispanics.

**Education**

The U.S. Supreme Court’s 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* ruled that racial segregation in public schools was illegal. Reaction to the ruling was mixed, with a strong response from the South. A major confrontation occurred in Arkansas, when Governor Orval
Faubus used to state’s National Guard to block the admission of nine Black students into Little Rock Central High School. The students persisted and successfully gained entry into the school the next day with 1,000 U.S. Army paratroopers at their side. The Little Rock incident has been identified as a catalyst for school integration throughout the South. Despite resistance to the court’s ruling, legally segregated education disappeared by the mid-1970s.

However, a different type of segregation persists, called de facto segregation. De facto segregation refers to a subtler process of segregation that is the result of other processes, such as housing segregation rather than because of an official policy (Farley 2005). Here, we clearly see the intersection of race and class. Schools have become economically segregated, with children of middle- or upper-class families attending predominantly White suburban schools and the children of poorer parents attending racially mixed urban schools (Gagné and Tewksbury 2003). Researchers, teachers, and policymakers have all observed a great disparity in the quality of education students receive in the United States (for more on social problems related to education, turn to Chapter 8). Educational systems reinforce patterns of social class inequality and, along with it, racial inequality (Farley 2005).

Latinos have the lowest educational achievement rates—for high school and college degrees—compared with all other major racial and ethnic groups in the United States. (Refer to Table 3.3.) Richard Fry (2004) explains that though more than 300,000 young Hispanics will graduate from high school each year, fewer than 60,000 will complete a bachelor’s degree. Data indicate that about half of young Latinos who enroll in college are at least minimally prepared academically to succeed in a four-year college. Even among the best prepared Latino students, only 57 percent finish a bachelor’s degree compared with 81 percent of their White counterparts. Hispanic undergraduates disproportionately enroll in “open-door” institutions that have lower degree completion rates (Fry 2004).

Much of the research on the achievement gap between Latinos and White students has focused on the characteristics of the students (family income, parents’ level of education). However, according to the Pew Hispanic Center (Fry 2005), we need to also consider the social context of Hispanic students’ learning, noting how educators and policymakers have more influence over the characteristics of their schools than over the characteristics of students.

Based on their state and national assessment of the basic characteristics of public high schools for Hispanic and other students, the Pew Hispanic Center found that Latinos were
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Source: Pew Hispanic Center 2006.
Note: Columns may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.
more likely than Whites or Blacks to attend the largest public high schools (enrollment of at least 1,838 students). More than 56 percent of Hispanics attend large schools, compared with 32 percent of Blacks and 26 percent of Whites. Schools with larger enrollments are associated with lower student achievement and higher drop-out rates. In addition, the center reported that Hispanics are more likely to be in high schools with lower instructional resources, which includes higher student-to-teacher ratios associated with lower academic performance. Nearly 37 percent of Hispanics are educated in public high schools with a student-teacher ratio greater than 22 to 1, compared with 14 percent of Blacks and 13 percent of White students (Fry 2005).

In June 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court, voting 5 to 4, invalidated the use of race to assign students to public schools, even if the goal was to achieve racial integration of its schools. The ruling addressed public school practices in Seattle, Washington (where 41 percent of all public school students are White), and Louisville, Kentucky (where two-thirds of all public school students are White). Legal experts and educators were divided about whether the ruling affirmed or betrayed Brown v. Board of Education. Though he voted with the majority, Justice Anthony M. Kennedy said in a separate statement that achieving racial diversity and addressing the problem of de facto segregation were issues that school districts could constitutionally pursue as long as the programs were “sufficiently ‘narrowly tailored’” (Greenhouse 2007:A1). It is unclear how the ruling will affect integration strategies adopted in school systems across the country.

Health

Racial disparities in access to health care and outcomes are pervasive according to Sara Rosenbaum and Joel Teitelbaum (2004). The issue is twofold—access to health care and the quality of care received once in the system. First, the researchers point to this nation’s approach to health insurance as a system that “significantly discriminates against racial and ethnic minorities” (p. 138). Data reveal how in a voluntary, employment-based health care system, racial and ethnic minority group members are more likely to be uninsured or publicly insured. In 2006, White non-Hispanics had the lowest uninsured rate (11 percent), compared with Blacks (20 percent), Asians (15 percent), and Hispanics (34 percent) (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, and Smith 2007). These disparities continue into old age—among those 65 years or older, non-Latino White seniors are more likely to have a private or employer-based supplemental health policy in addition to their Medicare coverage, whereas minority seniors are six to seven times more likely to have Medicaid (public assistance) in addition to Medicare.

Second, the researchers observe that even after minority patients enter a particular facility, they are less likely to receive the level of care provided to nonminority patients for the same condition regardless of their insurance status. For example, Latino and African American patients with public insurance do not receive coronary artery bypass surgery at rates comparable to those of White, publicly insured patients. African American patients are also less likely to receive treatment for early stage lung cancer and as a result have a lower five-year survival rate. Medicaid-insured African American and Latino children use less primary care (depending usually on emergency treatment), experience higher rates of hospitalization, and die at significantly higher rates than do White children. Though the U.S. government has invested in community-based primary health centers and programs to address these health care gaps, Rosenbaum and Teitelbaum (2004) conclude that these programs can hardly overcome the immense and inaccessible system of specialized and extended health services.

W. Michael Byrd and Linda Clayton (2002) assert that the health crisis among African Americans and poor populations is fueled by a medical-social culture laden with ideological, intellectual and scientific, and discriminatory race and class problems. They believe that America’s
health system is predicated on the belief that the poor and “unworthy” of our society do not deserve decent health. Consequently, health professionals, research, and educational systems engage in what they describe as “self-serving and elite behavior” that marginalizes and ignores the problems of health care for minority and disadvantaged groups. They caution that our failure to address, and eventually resolve, these race- and class-based health policy, structural, medical-social and cultural problems plaguing the American health care system could potentially undermine any possibility of a level playing field in health and health care for African American and other poor populations—eroding at the front end … the very foundations of American democracy. (2002:572–573)

**U.S. Immigration**

The U.S. Census 2005 American Community Survey revealed that there were 35.2 foreign-born individuals in the United States, composing 12.1 percent of the total population. This is the highest number of foreign born ever recorded in U.S. history. Between January 2000 and March 2005, a record number of 7.9 million immigrants arrived to the United States; nearly half were illegal aliens. Currently, one in eight U.S. residents is foreign born. If the current trend continues, within 10 years, the foreign-born share of the U.S. population will match the high of 14.7 percent reached in 1910 (Camarota 2003).

Our immigrant population is concentrated in five states. California, New York, Texas, Florida, and New Jersey account for 63 percent of the immigrant population and only 35 percent of the native-born population. Camarota (2005), reporting for the Center for Immigration Studies, notes that one of the striking patterns of recent immigration is the lack of diversity among immigrants themselves. Mexico accounts for the majority of immigrants, almost six times the combined total of immigrants from China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan.

The post–2000 wave of immigrants included men and women with lower educational attainment—34 percent have less than a high school education. Camarota observes that their lower educational attainment is related to their economic success. A larger proportion of immigrants than native-borns have low incomes, lack health insurance, and rely on social assistance programs. One in four immigrants and their families live in poverty.

Immigrant labor is concentrated in five occupations—farming (44 percent of all those employed), construction (26 percent), building cleaning and maintenance (34 percent), food preparation (24 percent), and general production (23 percent). Camarota (2005) states that millions of native-born Americans are employed in these same occupations and that there is no truth to the statement that immigrants only do jobs natives don’t want; no single occupation comprises entirely immigrant labor.

In 2006, the debate about foreign-born individuals in the United States heated up amid Bush administration proposals for comprehensive immigration reforms. While acknowledging the country’s immigration heritage, the administration proposed strengthening security at our southern borders with Mexico and establishing a temporary worker program without the benefit of amnesty. The plan was criticized for creating a class of workers who would never become fully integrated in U.S. society and for a plan that focused specifically on Mexican workers, ignoring all other immigrant groups.

In 2007, President George W. Bush pushed sweeping changes to the nation’s immigration laws. The president stressed the importance of a four-pronged plan that included the importance of border security, better enforcement of immigration laws, establishment of a temporary worker program, and resolving the status of the millions of illegal immigrants presently in the United States. In that same year, the U.S. Senate was unable to pass a bipartisan
immigration bill that included increasing border security and enforcement, expanding the temporary worker program, and granting illegal immigrants who arrived before January 1, 2007, immediate work authorization under a “Z” visa that would put them on the path to U.S. citizenship. In response to the failure of the federal government, every state took matters into its own hands, debating similar immigration issues within its own state legislature. In 2007, 41 states adopted immigration laws ranging from extending health care and education to the children of illegal immigrants to curbing illegal immigrants’ access to jobs (Preston 2007).

Global Immigration as a Social Problem

The United States is not the only country grappling with the issue of immigration. Great Britain, France, Germany, Australia, and other countries have seen an increase in pro- and anti-immigration protests, as well as increased hate crimes acts against immigrants in recent years. Migration has been elevated to a top international policy concern (Düvell 2005) largely because of the threat of terrorism and the challenge of global politics. Migrants now depart from and arrive in almost every country in the world. During the past 30 years, the proportion of foreign-born residents living in developed countries has generally increased, whereas the proportion has remained stable or decreased in developing countries. Migrant labor has been used at both ends of the labor market—low wage/manual labor to high wage/knowledge-based labor. Though globalization has created wealth, lifting many out of poverty, it still has not narrowed the gap between the rich and the poor (Global Commission on Immigration 2005).
Consider France’s immigration situation. One in every four French citizens has a non-French parent or grandparent (Silverman 1992). About 25 percent of France’s immigrant population comprises men and women of color from North Africa or sub-Saharan Africa. During fall 2005, France experienced its worst civil unrest in decades. North African rioters targeted schools, hospitals, and cars, prompting authorities to declare a state of emergency and impose curfews. The unrest broke out following the deaths of two young North African men who were electrocuted when they hid from police in an electricity substation in a Paris suburb.

The riots were characterized as France’s Katrina, exposing poverty and discrimination experienced by African French. Godoy (2002) reports that an invisible ceiling exists in France’s social and economic life that “stops the rise of qualified individuals to middle and high-level executive positions.” Discrimination in housing, employment, and education are common place for France’s immigrants. Many bars and clubs remain closed to African French. As the rioting subsided, Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin acknowledged in his remarks to the French National Assembly that the violence was the result of France’s failure to provide hope to thousands of young immigrants. Sweeping social and economic reforms were implemented after the riots.

The slogan “Russia is for Russians” was supported by more than 50 percent of Russians in a recent 2006 poll. In April 2007, a government decree banned immigrants from working as vendors or traders in Russia’s public markets. The decree was in response to anti-immigrant rioting in the town of Kondopoga, when rioters set fire to immigrant-owned market stalls. As a result of the ban, only 68 percent of all Russian stalls are operating, leading to a shortage of goods and price increases. The targeted immigrant vendors are primarily Azeris, Uzbeks, Tajiks, and Chinese immigrants. In 2006, 539 attacks were recorded on members of ethnic minorities in Russia, including 54 racially motivated murders (Kramer 2007).

Globalization has intensified the need to coordinate and harmonize government policies. Migration flows are regarded as a threat to national and global stability with some calling for an international migration policy (Düvell 2005). The United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Japan have increased policy coordination regarding immigration, refugee admissions, and programs to integrate foreigners and their family members already present in each country (Lee 2006).

Responding to Racial and Ethnic Inequalities

Encouraging Diversity and Multiculturalism

Accelerated global migration and a resurgence of racial/ethnic conflicts characterized the close of the twentieth century (Witting and Grant-Thompson 1998) and certainly the
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beginning of the twenty-first. In an effort to reduce racial/ethnic conflict and to encourage multiculturalism, researchers, educators, political and community leaders, and community members have implemented programs targeting racism and prejudice. Acknowledging that both are complex phenomena with individual, cultural, and structural components, these strategies attempt to address some or most of the components.

Kathleen Korgen, J. Mahon, and Gabe Wang (2003) believe that colleges and universities have the potential to counter the effects of segregated neighborhoods and socialization in primary and secondary schools. Interaction among races thrust together on a college campus provides a unique opportunity for individuals to experience and discuss the aspects of racial/ethnic diversity in their lives, some for the first time (Odell, Korgen, and Wang 2005). Gordon Allport (1954) argues that intergroup contact can have a positive effect in reducing interracial prejudice and increasing tolerance if four conditions are met: (1) cooperative interdependence among the groups, (2) a common goal, (3) equal group status during contact, and (4) support by authority figures.

Increasing numbers of colleges and universities are instituting course requirements that encourage students to examine diversity in the United States and globally. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2000) reported that 62 percent of schools have a diversity course requirement or were in the process of developing one. This is quite an increase from 1990, when only 15 percent of colleges and universities had such a requirement. Research is emerging on the effectiveness of diversity programming on college and university campuses. In one such study, D. A. Grinde (2001) found that more than 85 percent of University of Paris
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Vermont students believed that diversity courses strengthened their understanding of and appreciation of cultural diversity.

**What Does It Mean to Me?**

Does your college have a diversity requirement? If you have completed the course, do you believe the learning experience changed your diversity beliefs and values? Why or why not?

Educational programs are used most often to promote diversity in public and private workplaces. These programs attempt to eliminate incorrect stereotypes and unfounded prejudices by providing new information to participants (Farley 2005). Diversity training is thought to make managers aware of how their biases affect their actions in the workplace (Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly 2006). Research indicates that such programs are effective when people are not made to feel defensive over past behavior, but are participating in a learning process of new (versus old) ideas. This has also been found to be effective in diversity simulation and experiential exercises (i.e., role playing) (Farley 2005). These programs are designed to familiarize employees with antidiscrimination laws, to suggest behavioral changes that could address bias, and to increase cultural awareness and cross-cultural communication among employees (Bendick, Egan, and Lofhjelm 1998).

Business leaders are motivated to address diversity on principle and because they recognize how their company’s productivity and success depend on it (Galagan 1993). General diversity and management programs have been established in companies such as Aetna, Ernst and Young, General Mills, and Hewlett Packard. All programs note the importance of creating an “inclusive” workforce and work environment. In addition to diversity training or sensitivity programs, businesses have successfully implemented diversity management programs, targeting the development and advancement of women and people of color in their organization.

AT&T is an example of a corporation that has attempted to address diversity in its organization and the communities it serves. AT&T supports the Hispanic Association of Communications Employees (HACE) of AT&T, a volunteer employee group that develops educational and community programs. Since 1990, the San Diego chapter of the association has awarded more than $600,000 in scholarships to high school and college students. AT&T San Diego has been a partner in community events and programming, including San Diego’s Latino Film Festival, Fiesta Patrias, and World Soccer parties. The San Diego HACE chapter, along with other city chapters (Los Angeles and Dallas), offers Internet services and training for low-income and non-English-speaking communities.

**Voices in the Community**

**Rosa Parks**

Most would mark the beginning of the U.S. civil rights movement as December 1, 1955. On that day, a Black seamstress in Montgomery, Alabama, refused to give up her seat on the bus to a White person. Rosa Parks explains,

People always say that I didn’t give up my seat because I was tired, but that isn’t true. I was not tired physically, or no more tired than I usually was at the end of a working day. I was not
old, although some people have an image of me as being old then. I was forty-two. No, the only tired I was, was tired of giving in. (Academy of Achievement 2005)

For her actions, Parks was arrested and fined for violating a city ordinance, thrusting her in the middle of America’s civil rights movement.

The bus incident led to the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association, with a young Martin Luther King Jr. elected as its leader. The association promoted its first non-violent protest, boycotting the city-owned bus company. The boycott lasted 381 days ending in November 1956, when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the Montgomery ordinance under which Parks had been fined, outlawing racial segregation on public transportation.

When asked about the historical bus boycott, Parks remembers,

As I look back on those days, it’s just like a dream. The only thing that bothered me was that we waited so long to make this protest and to let it be known wherever we go that all of us should be free and equal and have all opportunities that others should have. (Academy of Achievement 2005)

Parks remained active in the civil rights movement until her death in 2005. In 1957, she and her husband, Raymond, moved to Detroit, Michigan. Parks worked for U.S. Congressman John Conyers. President Bill Clinton honored Parks with the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1996. Upon her death in 2005, her body was laid in state in the Capitol rotunda, the first woman to be so honored.

Parks was asked what advice she would give a young person who wants to make a difference. She replied,

The advice I would give any young person is, first of all, to rid themselves of prejudice against other people and to be concerned about what they can do to help others. And of course, to get a good education, and take advantage of the opportunities that they have. In fact, there are more opportunities today than when I was young. And whatever they do, to think positively and be concerned about other people, to think in terms of them being able to not succumb to many of the temptations, especially the use of drugs and substances that will destroy the physical health, as well as mental health. (Academy of Achievement 2005)

**Affirmative Action**

Since its inception nearly 40 years ago, affirmative action has been a “contentious issue on national, state, and local levels” (Yee 2001:135). Affirmative action is a policy that has attempted to improve minority access to occupational and educational opportunities (Woodhouse 2002). No federal initiatives enforced affirmative action until 1961, when President John Kennedy signed Executive Order 10925. The order created the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and forbade employers with federal contracts from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, or religion in their hiring practices. In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin by private employers, agencies, and educational institutions receiving federal funds (Swink 2003).

In June 1965, during a graduation speech at Howard University, President Johnson spoke for the first time about the importance of providing opportunities to minority groups, an important objective of affirmative action. According to Johnson (1965),

You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race and then say, “You are free to compete
with all others” and still justly believe you have been completely fair. Thus it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates. This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity.

**Employment**

In September 1965, Johnson signed Executive Order 11246, which required government contractors to “take affirmative action” toward prospective minority employees in all aspects of hiring and employment. Contractors are required to take specific proactive measures to ensure equality in hiring without regard to race, religion, and national origin. The order also established the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC), charged with enforcing and monitoring compliance among federal contractors. In 1967, Johnson amended the order to include discrimination based on gender (Swink 2003). In 1969, President Richard Nixon initiated the Philadelphia Plan, which required federal contractors to develop affirmative action plans by setting minimum levels of minority participation on federal construction projects in Philadelphia and three other cities (Idelson 1995). This was the first order that endorsed the use of specific goals for desegregating the workplace (Kotlowski 1998), but it did not include fixed quotas (Woodhouse 2002). In 1970, the order was extended to all federal contractors (Idelson 1995).

According to Dawn Swink (2003), “While the initial efforts of affirmative action were directed primarily at federal government employment and private industry, affirmative action gradually extended into other areas, including admissions programs in higher education” (2003:214–215). State and local governments followed the lead of the federal government and took formal steps to encourage employers to diversify their workforces.

Opponents of affirmative action believe that such policies encourage preferential treatment for minorities (Woodhouse 2002), giving women and ethnic minorities an unfair advantage over White males (Yee 2001). Affirmative action, say its critics, promotes “reverse discrimination,” the hiring of unqualified minorities and women at the expense of qualified White males. Some believe affirmative action has not worked and ultimately results in the stigmatization of those who benefit from the policies (Heilman, Block, and Stahatos 1997; Herring and Collins 1995).

Proponents argue that only through affirmative action policies can we address the historical societal discrimination that minorities experienced in the past (Kaplan and Lee 1995). Although these policies have not created true equality, there have been important accomplishments (Tsang and Dietz 2001). As a result of affirmative action, women and people of color have gained increased access to forms of public employment and education that were once closed to them (Yee 2001). Yet, research indicates that ethnic minorities and women do not have an unfair advantage over White men. Women and ethnic minorities are not receiving equal compensation compared with White males with similar education and background (Tsang and Dietz 2001). Although it may not be perfect, affirmative action has been the “only comprehensive set of policies that has given women and people of color opportunities for better paying jobs and access to higher education that did not exist before” (Yee 2001:137).

Shawn Woodhouse (1999, 2002) argues that the differences in individual perceptions of affirmative action policy may be related to the differences of racial group histories and socialization experiences. She writes,

Based upon these rationalizations, it is implicit that individuals interpret affirmative action through an ethnic specific lens. In other words, most individuals will assess their group condition when considering contentious legislation such as affirmative action because after all, a group’s history impacts its view of American society. (2002:158)
Education

Based on Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, affirmative action policies have been applied to student recruitment, admissions, and financial aid programs. Title VI permits the consideration of race, national origin, sex, or disability to provide opportunities to a class of disqualified people, such as minorities and women, who have been denied educational opportunities. Affirmative action policies have been supported as remedies for past discrimination and as means to encourage diversity in higher education. Affirmative action practices were affirmed in the 1978 Supreme Court decision in the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, suggesting that race-sensitive policies were necessary to create diverse campus environments (American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors 2000; Springer 2005).

Although affirmative action has been practiced since the *Bakke* decision, affirmative action has recently become vulnerable, particularly to challenges of the diversity argument in the Supreme Court’s decision. The first challenge occurred in one of our most diverse states, California. In 1995, the California Board of Regents banned the use of affirmative action guidelines in admissions. In 1996, California voters followed and passed Proposition 209, the California Civil Rights Initiative, which effectively dismantled the state’s affirmative action programs in education and employment. Also in 1996, a federal appeals court ruling struck down affirmative action in Texas. In the *Hopwood v. Texas* decision, the ruling referred to affirmative action policies as a form of discrimination against White students. State of Washington voters passed an initiative in 1998 that banned the use of race-conscious affirmative action in schools. In 1999, Florida Governor Jeb Bush banned the use of affirmative action in admission to state schools.

The *Hopwood* ruling led to a decline in the number of minority students enrolling in Texas A&M and the University of Texas (Yardley 2002). California’s state universities experienced a similar drop in minority student applications and enrollment after the *Bakke* decision and the California Civil Rights Initiative. In response, states have instituted other practices with the goal of increasing minority student recruitment. For example, California and Texas have initiated percentage solutions. In Texas, the top 10 percent of all graduating seniors are automatically admitted into the University of Texas system. California initiated a similar plan, covering only the top 4 percent of students, and Florida recently announced the One Florida Initiative, allowing the top 20 percent of graduating high school seniors into the state’s public colleges and universities. The University of Georgia increased its recruitment efforts among minority students, hoping to enlarge the pool of applications from minorities (Schemo 2001).

In 2000, a federal judge upheld the University of Michigan’s affirmative action program, ruling that “a racially and ethnically diverse student body produces significant educational benefits such that diversity, in the context of higher education, constitutes a compelling governmental interest” (Wilgoren 2000). In 2003, the case was considered by the U.S. Supreme Court, and in a 5 to 4 vote, the Court upheld the University of Michigan’s consideration of race for admission into its law school. Writing for the majority, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor stated, “In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry, it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talent and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity” (Greenhouse 2003:A1). In a separate decision, the U.S. Supreme Court voted 6 to 1, invalidating the university’s affirmative action program for admission into its undergraduate program. Unlike the law school program, the undergraduate program used a point system based on race. Twenty points on a scale of 150 were awarded for membership in an underrepresented minority group; 100 points were necessary to gain admission into the university (Greenhouse 2003).

In November 2006, Michigan voters approved Proposal 2, a state law banning consideration of race or gender in public university admissions or government hiring or contracting. After asking the courts if it could delay complying with the new law until its current admission process had been completed, the University of Michigan announced in January 2007 that it would comply with the law and stop considering race or gender in its admissions decisions.
Main Points

- From a biological perspective, a race can be defined as a group or population that shares a set of genetic characteristics and physical features. Social scientists reject the biological notion of race, instead treating race as a social construct.
- Ethnic groups are groups that are set off to some degree from other groups by displaying a unique set of cultural traits, such as their language, religion, or diet. Members of an ethnic group perceive themselves as members of an ethnic community, sharing common historical roots and experiences.
- Sociologists explain that ethnocentrism is the belief that the values and behaviors of one’s own group are right and actually better than all others. Although feeling positive about one’s group is important for group solidarity and loyalty, it can lead groups to believe that certain racial or ethnic groups are inferior and that discriminatory practices against them are justified. This is called racism.
- Certain ethnic/racial groups have been subject to institutional discrimination, discrimination practiced by the government, social institutions, and organizations. Institutional discrimination may include segregation, exclusion, or expulsion. Segregation refers to the physical and social separation of ethnic or racial groups. Exclusion refers to the practice of prohibiting or restricting the entry or participation of groups in society. Expulsion is the removal of a group by using direct force or intimidation.
- The impact of race and social class has been documented in studies regarding income attainment and mobility, educational attainment, and health and medical care. In all three areas, racial and ethnic minorities are disadvantaged.
- The U.S. Census 2005 American Community Survey revealed that there were 35.2 foreign-born individuals in the United States, constituting 12.1 percent of the total population. This is the highest number of foreign born ever recorded in U.S. history. Between January 2000 and March 2005, a record number of 7.9 million immigrants arrived to the United States; nearly half were illegal aliens.
- Migration has been identified as a global issue, partly because of its impact to the global economy and terrorism. Globalization has intensified the need to coordinate and harmonize government policies worldwide.
- Multiculturalism is promoted in schools and businesses through educational programming. Most U.S. colleges and universities require a diversity course as a general requirement.
- Affirmative action is a policy that has attempted to improve minority access to occupational and educational opportunities. Since its inception nearly 40 years ago, it has been a controversial issue on federal, state, and local levels.

On Your Own

Log on to the Web-based student study site at www.pineforge.com/leonguerrero2study for interactive quizzes, e-flashcards, journal articles, Community and Policy Guides, a Service Learning Guide, the end-of-chapter Web exercises, and additional Web resources.
Internet and Community Exercises

1. In what ways does your college encourage or celebrate racial and ethnic diversity (among its students, faculty, and staff)? Consider specific college sponsored clubs, activities, or events that highlight diversity on your campus.

2. To learn more about the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, visit the Web sites for the Manzanar War Relocation Center and internment camps located in Tule Lake, California, and Topaz, Utah. These Web sites feature virtual tours, photographs, and testimony from those interned. Log on to Study Site Chapter 3 for links.

3. Identify the largest private employer in your city or state. Investigate through the Internet or direct contact whether a diversity program or development office is in place. What are the diversity goals of this business, and how does it implement these goals (what specific program practices are in place)?

4. The International Organization for Migration, established in 1951, is an intergovernmental organization working with 120 nations to promote and support human and effective migration management. The organization also conducts immigration research worldwide. Its Web site includes a global map, noting migration problems affecting a selected nation. Log on to Study Site Chapter 3 for links.

Note

1. Tracy Ore (2003) acknowledges that externally created labels for some groups are not always accepted by those viewed as belonging to a particular group. For example, those of Latin American descent may not consider themselves to be “Hispanic.” In this text, I’ve adopted Ore’s practice regarding which racial and ethnic terms are used. In my own material, I will use Latina/o to refer to those of Latin American descent and will use Black and African American interchangeably. However, original terms used by authors or researchers (e.g., use of the term Hispanic by the U.S. Census Bureau) will not be altered.