

Introduction

At lunchtime, one need only walk into Berkeley's Sproul Plaza, that famed arena of leftist politics, to note the transformation: where a salvo of free speech and anti-war slogans could once be heard, mantras of religious recruitment now drown out all sounds of protest. Pamphlets promising salvation, karaoke and full immersion baptism, all in the same night, are proffered eagerly by members of the Evangelical Formosan Church, the Asian American Christian Fellowship and the Chinese Graduate Christian Society.

—Carrie Chang, *Amen. Pass the Kimchee*, 2000

Whether studying the Bible at Berkeley, engaging in feverish prayer at Harvard, or singing “praise” at Yale, Asian American Christian fellowships have become a familiar sight at many of the top colleges and universities across the country. Today, there are more than fifty Evangelical Christian groups at the University of California (UC) at Berkeley and the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and 80 percent of their members are Asian American (Busto 1996; Chang 2000; Hong 2000). On the East Coast, one out of four Evangelical college students at New York City colleges and universities are Asian American (Carnes and Yang 2004).¹

At Harvard, Asian Americans constitute 70 percent of the Harvard Radcliffe Christian Fellowship, and, given the popularity of Evangelical Christian fellowships, one can easily spot students who proudly don T-shirts with phrases like “the Asian Awakening” (Chang 2000: 1). At Yale, the Campus Crusade for Christ is now 90 percent Asian, which is astonishing considering that twenty years ago it was 100 percent white. Like Yale, Stanford's InterVarsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF) has become almost entirely Asian (Chang 2000). Moreover, the growth in the number of Asian American Evangelicals is obvious at other IVCF chapters in the nation.

With about 650 chapters at universities across America, IVCF saw the number of Asian Americans grow by 267 percent nationwide over the last 15 years, from 992 to 3,640. In New York and New Jersey, the number of Asian Americans increased by 605 percent, from 97 to 684.² Not surprisingly, the percentage of Asian Americans at InterVarsity chapters on some West Coast and Northeast campuses and throughout parts of the Midwest is often as high as 80 percent. Up until the 1990s, IVCF's triennial missions convention, Urbana, was predominately white. In 2000, however, it was 26 percent Asian American (Tokunaga 2003: 167). The ten largest InterVarsity chapters with a high percentage of Asian Americans include Cornell, Northwestern, Rutgers, University of Illinois–Chicago, Boston University, University of Michigan, Emory, University of Washington, Harvard, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Among the growing Asian American campus fellowships, second-generation Korean American (hereafter, SGKA) fellowships are the most visible, particularly on the West and East Coasts. For example, UCLA alone boasts of more than ten Korean American Christian fellowships. The growth of Korean American campus fellowships, however, is not restricted to the coasts; virtually every top-ranking university and college across the country has at least one Korean American campus fellowship. SGKA Evangelicals and their Christian fellowships not only embody but also constitute a major part of the surge of Asian American Evangelicals on elite campuses in the United States.

This book investigates this newly emerging phenomenon. Focusing on SGKA Evangelicals, it looks at the growing numbers of Asian American Evangelicals and their ethnic campus ministries. Specifically, it examines why Americanized SGKA Evangelicals from middle-class, largely white, suburban neighborhoods on a campus with a host of ethnically diverse religious organizations are flocking to separate ethnic campus ministries. The book explores this paradox: ethnic religious organizations have shed most of the practices and rituals of their ethnic community and embrace dominant, white Evangelical practices and rituals, yet they resist assimilation and maintain ethnic segregation.

Asian American College Evangelicals

The majority of Asian American college Evangelicals are U.S.-born Korean Americans and Chinese Americans, both of whom largely come

from middle-class families, grew up in white or racially mixed suburbs, and are familiar with mainstream culture and organizations. They have few barriers in participating in mainstream Christian organizations and can be considered “successful” in terms of their educational and future occupational status. Asian Americans’ median household income in 1999, \$55,525, was the highest of all racial groups (including whites), and their poverty rate, 10.7 percent, was the lowest of all racial groups; 44 percent of Asian Americans over the age of 25 had a least a bachelor’s degree—18 percentage points more than all other racial groups (Zhou 2004). Asian Americans account for only 4 percent of the U.S. population, but they account for more than 6 percent of college enrollment nationwide, and at the Ivy League universities Asian American enrollment often exceeds 20 percent (Hong 2000; Zhou and Gatewood 2000). Likewise enrollment of Asian Americans in California’s public universities is disproportionate to their 10.9 percent of the state’s population (U.S. Census, 2000). Asian Americans currently make up over 40 percent of the student population at UC Berkeley as well as UCLA and 50 percent of the student population at UC Irvine (Zhou and Gatewood 2000).³

By the second generation, most Asian Americans lose fluency in their parents’ native language and speak only English. Asian Americans also intermarry extensively with whites, and more than 25 percent of Asian Americans have a partner of a different racial background (Lee and Bean 2003, 2004). Furthermore, leaders in the Evangelical Christian community have eagerly labeled Asian Americans as the moral model minority, as “God’s new whiz kids”—who excel not only in school, but in faith (Busto 1996): “Not only are they smart, hardworking, and graduating from prestigious universities, but they are godly as well!” (Jeung 2005: 5). They have become the icons of active, if not aggressive, campus Evangelicals—to which other Evangelicals should aspire.

Despite their socioeconomic status, acculturation, and entrée into mainstream institutions, SGKA and other Asian American Evangelicals are flocking to separate ethnic campus ministries over multiethnic or predominately white Evangelical organizations. This pattern conflicts with assimilation theories that expect ethnic identification to decline, not increase, with socioeconomic mobility and entrance into mainstream institutions and organizations (Alba and Nee 1996; Gans 1992; Gordon 1964; Park 1950). Why would young Asian American adults who have grown up in white or racially mixed communities choose to affiliate themselves with ethnically separate ministries on campus?

Assimilation and Pluralist Theories

The classic assimilation model predicts that immigrants will integrate into mainstream society in a smooth, irreversible, linear, and inevitable fashion (Park 1950; Warner and Srole 1945). Ethnicity is viewed largely as a working-class phenomenon—something that immigrants and their descendants need and want to shed as they acculturate, obtain economic mobility, and incorporate into the dominant society. As immigrant ethnic groups shed their ethnicity, the dominant group, defined commonly as the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle-class, is expected to undergo little or no change.

Having been formulated to explain the experiences of European immigrants at the turn of the twentieth century, classic assimilation theory has been criticized for being unable to describe the experiences of contemporary post-1965 immigrants. Compared to the past European immigrants, today's immigrants are far more racially diverse and face an hourglass economy that offers relatively little opportunities for immigrant children to gradually achieve economic mobility (Portes and Zhou 1993). Assimilation theory has also been criticized for its ethnocentric Anglo-conformist bias. Among the problems with the theory are that it focuses only on the relationship between the immigrant and dominant group and ignores the relationships among minority groups that may affect the assimilation process (Brubaker 2001); does not consider how the majority group may change in the process of assimilation (Alba and Nee 2003); assumes that immigrants have little agency and choice in the process of assimilation; implies that it is in the minority's best interest to assimilate (Gibson 1988; Portes and Bach 1985; Yang 1999); and offers an unrealistic homogenous view of U.S. society.

One of the popular reformulations of assimilation theory that has responded to these criticisms is Portes and Zhou's (1993) segmented assimilation theory. Depending on immigrants' pre-migration characteristics, particular forms of exit and reception, size, structure, and resources of existing co-ethnic communities, location and economic and political context of settlement, and expectations of immigrant children, Portes and Zhou propose three paths of assimilation. First, some will follow the traditional path of incorporation and assimilate into the white middle class. Second, children of immigrants who lack strong ethnic communities and mobility ladders, and who are concentrated in an urban city with a hostile minority subculture, may permanently assimilate

late into a minority underclass. Third, those who have the support of strong and resourceful ethnic communities can circumvent outside hostility and mobility obstacles to achieve economic advancement while maintaining ethnic ties and preserving immigrant community values.

Segmented assimilation theory skillfully accounts for the diversity of today's immigrants and the cultural and structural pluralism in U.S. society without abandoning the concept of assimilation. It no doubt improves upon the classic assimilation model, but the theory likewise has its limitations.

Because segmented assimilation theory focuses mostly on the structural assimilation of the children of contemporary immigrants (their educational and occupational mobility), what happens to their ethnic identities after structural assimilation is not addressed. Segmented assimilation theory assumes that those who have difficulty attaining socio-economic mobility and are in danger of assimilating into a minority underclass may turn to ethnic communities for support and increase their ethnic affiliation. But it has difficulty explaining why and how those who are already middle class and are not dependant on the ethnic community for mobility would symbolically and practically maintain strong ethnic ties. Related to this, segmented assimilation theory does not explain exactly what individuals are assimilating into, aside from the white middle class or the minority underclass. For example, some of today's children of immigrants are expected to achieve rapid economic advancement by deliberately preserving elements of the immigrant community's values and maintaining strong ethnic ties. But what happens to these children after they have obtained structural mobility? Will they become "like" the white majority, will they continue to maintain separate ethnic boundaries, or will something else happen to them? What does it mean for the children of today's immigrants to "assimilate" when they have already obtained educational and occupational mobility? The answer is not clear.

Multicultural and pluralist theories do not have a problem explaining the resilience of ethnicity. American society is assumed to be heterogeneous, and ethnicity is argued to remain significant for multiple reasons. First, it persists because of rational interests. Ethnic groups are defined essentially as rational interest groups who struggle to gain benefits in an unequal competitive society through organizing around ethnicity. Individuals form ethnic groups because of the "strategic efficacy of ethnicity in making legitimate claims on the resources of the modern

state” (Glazer and Moynihan 1975: 11)—because it helps them to advance their economic and political interests. Thus, ethnicity lives on because it can become a means of claiming advantage in a competitive society (Bell 1975; Calderon 1992; Lopez and Espiritu 1990; Nagel 1986; Okamoto 2003).

Others criticize this conceptualization of ethnicity as simply a means to maximize group interests and argue that ethnicity is qualitatively substantial and made up of the cultures and heritages passed on from past generations. The persistence of cultural heritage is the basis for the continued importance placed on ascriptive groups (Abramson 1973; Greeley 1974). The problem with cultural heritage theories of ethnicity, however, is that it is not clear how ethnicity gets transmitted to the next generation and what exactly is retained by the later- generations who do not have any direct ties to the home country.

In contrast to cultural theories of ethnicity, symbolic ethnicity theory proposes that ethnicity exists only in insignificant symbolic forms. Herbert Gans (1979) contends that among third- and fourth-generation European Americans there is a new form of “symbolic” ethnicity, an ethnicity that is concerned more with the sociopsychological elements of “feeling” ethnic rather than actually being part of an ethnic culture and community. Ethnic symbols are consumed and used to identify with a particular ethnicity without being socially tied to a particular ethnic group. Thus, if ethnicity exists at all, it becomes largely expressive and symbolic—something of a “leisure-time activity.” This kind of optional symbolic ethnicity, however, is not a reality for later generations of Asian Americans who are continuously racialized and treated as physically distinct (Jeung 2005; Kibria 2002; Min 2000; Tuan 1998).

According to William Yancey et al. (1976), ethnicity is not merely symbolic, a product of competing interest groups, nor is it made up of inherited cultures. Instead, it is “emergent” and continuously constructed under the structural conditions that characterize urban American life. Criticizing both assimilation and pluralist theories, Yancey and his colleagues argue that ethnicity emerges and develops because of the social structural constraints of occupation, residence, and institutional affiliations. Ethnicity, as defined by identification with common origins and frequent patterns of association (Greeley 1974; Haller 1973), is “generated and becomes crystallized under conditions of residential stability and segregation, common occupational positions and dependence

on local institutions and services” (Yancey et al. 1976: 399). Thus, ethnic identification and association persist and take shape within the structural parameters that characterize urban working-class life.

Most contemporary immigration scholars (even assimilationists) would not dispute the claim that ethnicity is emergent and reconstructed in America. Many would agree that ethnicity continues to change and unfold and is not a constant ascribed trait inherited from a foreign land (Conzen et al. 1992; Rumbaut and Portes 2001). They would also agree that ethnic identification and association can be strong in ethnic urban settings. But the issue is whether this kind of emergent ethnicity can be constructed beyond the kind of urban ethnic community that Yancey et al. (1976) describe. In other words, why and how does ethnicity remain significant for later generations, who are more mobile and acculturated and are not residentially and occupationally segregated and dependent on local ethnic institutions for survival? Like the assimilationist approach that they criticize, Yancey et al. (1976) cannot explain this. Ethnicity is still viewed as a working-class phenomenon—the “stuff” that comes out of urban ethnic ghettos.

Moreover, Yancey et al. (1976) do not explain what draws individuals to form ethnic group boundaries at the microgroup level. They reject cultural heritages as the basis of ethnic groupness and argue, instead, that structural conditions are paramount. Having rejected cultural arguments, however, they do not offer any alternative explanation as to why individuals identify and associate ethnically when given the structural opportunities to do so.

Relatedly, Yancey et al. (1976), like the pluralists that they criticize (Abramson 1973; Greeley 1974), do not explain how ethnicity changes and what gets retained over generations. Yancey et al. (1976), along with many others (e.g., Conzen et al. 1992), argue that ethnicity is constructed in the urban ethnic communities of America, that the “so-called foreign heritage” takes shape in America. But they do little to address how ethnicity then changes for the later generations; they do not explain what may or may not be retained from the urban ethnic communities of America to make ethnicity salient for later generations. If second and later generations are maintaining strong ethnic group boundaries, what is the substance of those boundaries? How do they differ from those of the first generation and those in the larger mainstream society?

Second-Generation Asian Americans' Religious Participation

Studies on second-generation Asian Americans' religious participation remain relatively scarce. But there is an emerging literature on the topic that explains why Asian Americans, including SGKAs, would participate in separate ethnic religious organizations. The literature points to racialization and ethnicization explanations.

According to racialization perspectives, different Asian ethnic groups develop solidarity based on their dawning recognition that they are treated by others as distinct primarily because of their physical appearance (Alumkal 2002; Emerson and Smith 2000; Jeung 2000, 2002). Racialization theories stress experiences of marginalization and being marked as different, particularly by the majority or hegemonic group(s), as the basis of ethnic or pan-ethnic grouping.

For example, Antony Alumkal (2002) argues that Asian Americans turn to Evangelical campus fellowships as an act of self preservation in a racially hostile setting. Rudy V. Busto (1996) similarly argues that Asian Americans “retreat into Evangelicalism” on the “increasingly racialized college campus where Asian American students are imaged as competitive, overrepresented and culturally monolithic” (37). Examining the reorganization of Chinese and Japanese American congregations around a new pan-ethnic Asian American identity, Russell Jeung (2000) adds that contemporary Evangelicalism gives Asian Americans a chance to escape the undesirable aspects of their racial status by making Christianity the locus of their identity; that is, ethnic or racial distinctions are transcended through a relationship with God. Racialization perspectives thus suggest that Asian Americans turn to Evangelical fellowships, including pan-ethnic Evangelical fellowships, to escape a society where “race” continues to matter.⁴

By making “race” the operative principle of social differentiation, racialization theorists suggest that SGKAs would be equally comfortable in pan-Asian congregations where their fellow members are Chinese and Japanese Americans. This, however, is not the case. Few SGKAs participate in pan-ethnic Asian American campus ministries when given the choice to participate in separate ethnic campus ministries of their own. Furthermore, most of the large Asian American campus Evangelical organizations (including Asian American churches) tend to be predominately Chinese or Korean American; pan-ethnic ministries with a sizable mix of the different Asian ethnic groups are scarce.

By contrast, while acknowledging the significance of racial ascription and adversity, ethnicization perspectives stress cultural distinctiveness as the primary source of continuing ethnic religious group boundaries. According to the ethnicization perspectives, individuals cluster together in separate ethnic groups because they share common cultural experiences that make them distinct from others (Chai 1998; Chong 1998; Goette 1993; Smith 1978; Warner and Wittner 1998). For example, Karen Chai (1998) finds that the chance to be with those who have similar cultural backgrounds and experiences is one of SGKAs' main motives for attending the separate SGKA English-language ministries.

Kelly Chong (1998) goes further and finds that participating in ethnic churches reinforces a distinct Korean ethnic identity for SGKAs. She argues that the Korean American Evangelical Protestant community supports the construction of a strong ethnic identity among SGKAs. The ethnic church ideologically defends and legitimates a "set of core traditional Korean values and forms of social relationships" and serves "as an institutional vehicle for the cultural reproduction and socialization of the second-generation into Korean culture" (Chong 1998: 262). Thus, the main component of SGKAs' ethnicity is their parents' Korean culture.

This kind of ethnic retention argument, however, clashes with findings that show that SGKAs' religious services are in many ways distinct from those of the first generation. Studies show that SGKA and other Asian American Evangelicals' religious services are modeled after mainstream Evangelical organizations, not their parents' churches (Alumkal 2002; Jeung 2002; R. Kim 2004).⁵ SGKAs also commonly place their Christian identity above their ethnic identity, and some replace their ethnic identity with a broader Christian identity. As David Kyuman Kim writes, SGKA Christians "are becoming grounded, particularly those who have taken on an Evangelical form of faith, in religion that replaces a core 'Korean' identity" (1993: 41). Moreover, Korean church leaders are discovering that many SGKAs are alienated from the first-generation church and are leaving them, a movement dubbed the "silent exodus" (Pai et al. 1987); more than 80 percent of SGKAs are estimated to leave their parents' ethnic church (K. Kim and S. Kim 1996). And one complaint that the SGKAs have against the first generation is that the immigrant church seems more like an ethnic institution than an authentically religious institution (Jeung 2005; R. Kim 2004). Consequently, it is not clear just how much of the first generation's

traditional cultures and values constitute SGKAs' own ethnic religious organizations.

Ethnicity and Religion

Multiracial congregations are few and far between. According to the National Congregations Survey and the Survey of Multiracial Congregations, about 90 percent of American religious congregations are racially homogenous (Chaves 1999; Emerson and Smith 2000).⁶ Likewise, separate ethnic ministries, rather than multiethnic ministries, are the most popular on college campuses. Segregation, not integration, characterizes America's Christian communities.

In contemporary America, this finding does not just trouble the assimilationists. It disturbs those in religious communities who believe that their religion should be more than a collection of ethnic institutions and should extend beyond the ethnic and racial boundaries that divide the rest of society. It bothers Evangelical Christians who believe that Christians are all "one in Christ." Jesus Christ preached a fundamentally inclusive gospel and desired that his church be united as a "house of prayer for all nations" (Isaiah 56: 7). Evangelical Christians are thus discomfited that the church is more segregated than most other secular institutions in America.

This unease points to the broader tensions that exist between ethnic separatism and religious universalism. Because most religions adhere to some form of universalism, the ethnically separate nature of people's religious participation conflict with their more inclusive religious identity. The tension lies between the desire to stay within the comforts of one's own ethnic community and the desire to take part in the broader religious community. As Raymond Williams writes from his observations on immigrant religious communities in the United States, "the ecumenical is always in tension with the national and the ethnic, as most religious groups appeal to some form of universalism" (1988: 279).

This tension is not strongly felt by newly arrived immigrants whose limited language ability and cultural familiarity in America make it difficult for them to take part in the larger religious community. But it is pronounced for the later generations who do not have such limitations and adhere to a universal faith like Christianity (DeYoung et al. 2003; Jeung 2005). This is the dilemma of SGKA Evangelicals.

As “Evangelicals,” Korean American Evangelicals share several theological principles with other conservative Protestants. They believe in the complete reliability and authority of the Bible alone; the divinity of Christ and the efficacy of his life, death, and physical resurrection for the salvation of the human soul; and the importance of conversion and a personal commitment to live according to the commandments of the Bible.⁷ Believing that these principles are universally applicable, Evangelicals emphasize sharing their faith with “all nations” and being ultimately united with all ethnic and racial groups through their common faith in Jesus Christ. As a passage in the Bible states: “There is neither Jew nor Greek . . . for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3: 28).⁸ This kind of religious belief system conflicts with the separatist nature of Korean American Evangelicals’ ethnic religious participation since the ability and option to be more integrative exist, particularly in today’s multicultural context (Alumkal 2001; DeYoung et al. 2003; Emerson and Smith 2000; Jeung 2000; Niebuhr 1929).

Despite this conflict between ethnic separatism and religious universalism, separation remains the norm. Sunday mornings are still the most segregated hours of America.

Core Questions

In view of the limitations of assimilation and pluralist theories, as well as the gaps that remain in the literature on ethnicity, religion, and the second generation, this book answers the following questions. What does it mean for today’s “successful” children of immigrants to incorporate into contemporary America beyond the attainment of socioeconomic mobility? How does the second generation’s ethnic identification change—how does it compare with that of their parents, as well as with those in the broader society? What is it about the relationships between ethnicity and religion that makes separation the norm in America’s religious communities? These questions are answered through a study of SGKA college Evangelicals’ religious participation.

Specifically, the book answers these questions: (1) Why are SGKAs disproportionately joining ethnically exclusive Evangelical campus ministries over pan-ethnic, multiracial, or predominately white campus ministries? (2) How do SGKA Evangelical campus ministries compare with those of first-generation Korean Americans, as well as with other

non-Korean Americans' religious communities? (3) How do SGKAs' interactions with the ethnic community and with the broader Evangelical Christian community shape their religious participation? (4) How do SGKAs negotiate the moral and normative tension between ethnic separatism and religious universalism to maintain their ethnic group boundaries?

Why Second-Generation Korean American Campus Evangelicals?

SGKA Evangelicals in college are the focus of this study because they represent a group that is precisely at the juncture of separation versus integration. On the one hand, SGKAs come from an immigrant community where an estimated 70 percent of the population attends an ethnic church. On the other hand, many SGKA college Evangelicals are acculturated and socioeconomically mobile; they have the ability and opportunity to participate in other mainstream Christian congregations and move beyond the ethnic church. This is particularly true since Protestant Christianity has traditionally defined what it means to be American. Being a Protestant is consistent with being American and should facilitate rather than hinder assimilation (Gordon 1964; Yang 1999).

Studying SGKA and other "campus" Evangelicals in the context of a large and diverse university is also appropriate. Newly independent and away from home, students in a large and diverse college setting come in contact with different ethnic groups and have the opportunity to participate in a variety of ethnically diverse religious organizations of their own. By focusing on the college campus, we can also examine various religious organizations within a controlled setting with individuals of similar age and educational status. Additionally, studying the college campus is useful because second-generation Asian Americans and their Evangelical organizations are largely concentrated on college campuses. Moreover, from civil rights to ethnic student movements, college campuses continue to be the locus of new trends, activism, and identity development. Colleges are important arenas of sociopolitical debates, including the topic of ethnic and racial group relations. College is often the first time when students, particularly ethnic minority students, seriously consider notions of ethnicity and race in relation to themselves

and others (Kibria 2002). And what develops on the college campus commonly shapes the debates and policies relating to ethnic and racial group relations and foretells what is to come in broader society.

There is also a dearth of research on SGKA and other Asian American campus Evangelicals. Much research and interest has been placed on Asian Americans' educational and occupational attainment, but relatively little is known about their religiosity, particularly on the college campus. Few are aware that the largest Asian American student organizations on college and university campuses are Asian American Christian organizations. As Rudy Busto writes in his observations about the growing numbers of Asian American Evangelicals on college and university campuses, "The lack of empirical data, interpretations, or even acknowledgement of Evangelicalism among Asian American college students is glaring" (1996: 134).

A New Model of Emergent Ethnicity

Instead of assimilation or retention, this book argues that an emergent ethnicity that is constantly "made in the U.S.A." shapes the lives of today's structurally assimilated children of immigrants. I argue that this ethnic formation is not unique to any particular ethnic group but follows the general development of three interactive processes involving microindividual and macrostructural factors:

1. *The Desire for Community x Structural Opportunities* An individual's desire for belonging and community interacts with changes in ethnic density and diversity (the availability of other co-ethnics) to make separate ethnic associations, including separate ethnic religious associations, more possible.
2. *The Desire for Homophily x Imposed Ethnic and Racial Categorizations* Given the choice of a variety of different ethnic group associations, individuals seeking belonging and community at the primary group level will choose what is *most* similar and familiar to them. This homophilic tendency interacts with ethnic and racial categorizations to make separate ethnic identifications and associations more likely.
3. *The Desire for Majority Status x Marginalization* Individuals' desire for power and majority status interacts with ethnic and racial

marginalization to make separate ethnic associations more desirable.

These three interactive processes guide SGKAs' preference for ethnic-specific over pan-ethnic, multiracial, and predominately white campus ministries. Given the structural opportunity to choose from a number of different campus ministries, SGKA Evangelicals will participate in a campus ministry where they (a) can associate with those who are *most* like themselves (those who are *most* likely to share similar familial and cultural experiences); (b) can have the highest likelihood of obtaining power/leadership positions and group dominance; and (c) are least likely to be marginalized as an ethnic or racial group.⁹

Ethnic minorities are not the only ones constructing emergent ethnicities. The same basic three interactive processes that shape SGKAs' emergent ethnicities also explain why whites form a reactive emergent ethnicity. Within an increasingly diverse and multicultural setting where their majority group status seems threatened, whites develop a reactive sense of ethnic groupness. They retreat to separate ethnic organizations of their own where they too can be with those who are most familiar and similar to themselves, are similarly categorized as belonging together, and can maintain their majority status without contest.

All of this does not mean that ethnic group boundaries at the primary group level cannot be crossed. Indeed, they can. Asian Americans' relatively high level of intermarriage, their participation in the growing, albeit few, multiracial congregations all testify to this (DeYoung et al. 2003; Lee and Bean 2003, 2004). But given the structural opportunity to choose, individuals will more likely separate than integrate.

Ethnicity and Religion

Part of why ethnic and racial divisions continue to characterize the Christian community—why Christians can't "all just get along"—is because ethnicity and religion get along so well. Ethnicity and religion perform similar functions and reinforce each other's existence. They both provide meaning and a strong basis for group identity and community. Ethnic religious organizations provide shelter from ethnic and racial marginalization, as well as from secularism. They attract individuals seeking the good in religious and ethnic ties. For these reasons, pur-

suing separate ethnic ministries becomes the most desirable path for religious leaders.

Data and Research Methods

This case study of SGKA campus Evangelical organizations was conducted at a large and diverse public university campus on the West Coast, which I refer to anonymously as West University (WU). I chose WU because of its sizable Asian American student population, particularly Korean Americans, and its variety of campus Evangelical organizations. Among the growing numbers of Asian American campus Evangelical organizations, Korean American campus Evangelical organizations are the most numerous. There are fourteen different Korean American-related ethnic or pan-ethnic campus Evangelical organizations on the WU campus, and approximately half of the Korean undergraduate student population at WU are involved in Korean Christian ministries.

West University is a large public university with about 30,000 students. Located within one of the most ethnically and racially diverse cities of America, WU is surrounded by various ethnic communities and their respective religious organizations. Reflecting the diversity of its surroundings, WU's student population is approximately 38 percent Asian American, 35 percent white, 15 percent Latin American, and 5 percent African American.¹⁰ Considering WU's size and diversity, the findings of my study should not be generalized to apply to smaller university campuses that are neither as ethnically diverse nor located in a metropolitan area. However, my study of campus ministries at WU will provide a snapshot of what is to come on other major campuses and cities where ethnic and racial diversity is on the rise.

In conducting my research, I first gathered general historical and descriptive data on the growing numbers of Asian American Evangelicals and their organizations using resources available through the internet and the organizations themselves. Additionally, I used data gathered from various informal conversations, a focus group interview, and an e-mail survey with the leaders and administrators of religious communities on campus. I benefited from attending the annual conference of the Association of College and University Religious Affairs (ACURA) and conducting a focus interview with the chaplains, deans, and religious organization coordinators of several university campuses across

the United States regarding the growth of Asian American campus Evangelical organizations. My data also include information gathered from an e-mail survey that I sent out to thirty members of ACURA regarding the same topic.¹¹ After gathering the historical and descriptive data on campus Evangelical organizations in general and Asian American campus Evangelical organizations in particular, I conducted participant observation and 100 personal interviews over a two-year period.

Before conducting in-depth participant observation, I visited most of the Christian campus ministries at WU. Out of the twenty-four Christian campus ministries that I visited, I selected five representative types (six actual groups) of organizations for in-depth field research based on the size, history, ethnicity, and theology of the organizations.¹² They consist of two SGKA campus ministries, which I refer to as the Korean American Mission for Christ (KAMC) and Christian Student Fellowship (CSF);¹³ a first-generation Korean American campus ministry, Korea-Campus Crusade for Christ (KCCC); a pan-ethnic Asian American campus ministry, Asian American Christian Fellowship (AACF); a multi-racial campus ministry, a chapter of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF); and a predominately white campus ministry, a chapter of Campus Crusade for Christ (CCC). I conducted participant observation for two years at these six campus Evangelical organizations to examine SGKA Evangelicals' religious participation.

As a Korean American graduate student in her twenties (at the time of my research) fluent in both Korean and English, I had easy access to the various Christian campus organizations. After introducing myself and informing the leaders of the organizations of my research and receiving permission to conduct my study, I began my participant observation. I examined the worship services and Bible studies, non-religious social activities, organizational structure, and characteristics of the leaders and members of the different organizations.

As a 1.5 Korean American familiar with Evangelical Christianity, I was also able to gain rapport with my research subjects and understand the religious subculture of Evangelicals.¹⁴ Growing up in a family that was involved in a multiracial Evangelical campus ministry helped me to connect with the leaders and members within the campus Evangelical community. While I was familiar with campus Evangelicalism and churches in general, I was unfamiliar with ethnic-specific campus ministries and Korean churches. This, along with my identity as a re-

searcher, helped me to gain some distance and objectivity in my research even as I was able to build rapport and camaraderie with my research subjects.

In addition to participant observation, I conducted 100 personal interviews with the students, as well as the directors, staff, and pastors involved in campus Evangelical organizations. Of the 100 interviews, 50 interviews were conducted with SGKAs involved in Korean American campus ministries;¹⁵ 25 interviews were conducted with SGKAs as well as non-Korean Americans involved in pan-Asian, multiracial, or white-dominant campus ministries; and 25 interviews were conducted with the pastors and staff members of the various campus ministries. Interviews were tape-recorded and lasted between thirty minutes and two hours. After first contacting the leaders of the campus Evangelical organizations, I conducted personal interviews with various members of the organization using the snowball sampling method. I interviewed the staff members and the student leaders of the campus ministry, then the other regular members of the campus ministry based on referrals. I also directly asked students whom I met during my participant observation for interviews.

In the interviews, I first gathered descriptive information about the interview subjects and their religious participation (e.g., place of birth, where they grew up, year in college, past and present religious participation). I then asked them why and how they decided to participate in the campus ministry that they were currently a part of. Those in the Korean American campus ministries were asked why they decided to participate in separate campus ministries over the variety of other campus ministries. The entire set of interview questions is included in Appendix A.

Outline of Chapters

The book is divided into seven chapters, plus a conclusion. Chapter 1 examines the emergence of Asian American Evangelicals and the diversification of the campus Christian community.

Given that seven out of ten Koreans in the United States identify as Christians and are affiliated with an ethnic church, chapter 2 examines the ethnic church background of SGKAs and compares SGKA campus

Evangelicals' religious participation with that of their parents. Chapter 3 then compares SGKAs' campus ministries to those of other first-generation Korean American, Asian American, multiracial, and white majority campus ministries.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine the basis of SGKAs' separate ethnic religious group formation. Chapter 4 answers why the majority of SGKAs choose to participate in separate ethnic ministries in lieu of other pan-ethnic, multiracial, and predominately white campus ministries. Chapter 5 details the substance of the ties that bind SGKAs and examines the factors that unite and separate SGKAs from two ethnic groups that they come into the most contact with: other Asian Americans and whites.

Chapter 6 considers how other ethnic groups', namely whites', interactions with SGKAs and other Asian Americans influence SGKAs' separate ethnic religious participation. Specifically, it addresses why "white flight" takes place when the numbers of Asian Americans increase in a campus ministry and how mainstream campus ministries racially pre-segregate their organization to separate Asian American students from white students. It shows that whites create their own reactive emergent ethnicity for essentially the same reasons that SGKAs pursue their own ethnic ministries.

Looking at the connections between ethnicity and religion, chapter 7 examines how SGKA Evangelicals work through the tensions between ethnic separatism and religious universalism and maintain separate ethnic group boundaries.

Finally, the concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the book and reflects on what we can expect from SGKA Evangelicals after they leave college.