Beyond the Bamboo Ceiling

Ethics of Representation and Equity for Asian Americans in Trade Publishing

Kaitlin Phillips

Introduction

In the years since 2020, the U.S. trade publishing industry has made high-profile commitments to diversify its workforce and catalogs. Diversity statements and recruitment initiatives position publishers as responsive to calls for equity, yet statistics and testimonies suggest these efforts often translate more into optics than transformation. Diversity cannot be reduced to a number on a spreadsheet; what matters is who holds decision-making power over acquisitions, budgets, and publishing strategy.

The "bamboo ceiling" names a related problem: Asian Americans are present within publishing but face barriers against meaningful advancement and authority. Aggregated industry data further obscure subgroup differences, masking inequities within the category itself. This case study examines how the bamboo ceiling operates in trade publishing through industry data, testimony, and cross-industry research.

Despite public commitments to inclusion, U.S. trade publishing continues to ethically fail Asian Americans by sustaining leadership inequities and reducing identity to a marketing tool. Addressing this failure requires both ethical accountability and structural reform that redistributes authority in hiring, promotion, and resource allocation.

Defining the Bamboo Ceiling

The term "bamboo ceiling," coined by Jane Hyun in 2005, parallels the "glass ceiling" metaphor describing invisible barriers preventing women from advancing into leadership roles (Gong et al. 1). In trade publishing, the bamboo ceiling describes structural and cultural barriers that limit Asian Americans' advancement into positions shaping acquisitions, marketing priorities, and long-term editorial strategy, despite their presence throughout the workforce. Research identifies three recurring factors reinforcing this pattern: the "model minority" myth, cultural differences in communication and leadership norms, and misconceptions about leadership ambition.

Recent data from the Lee and Low Diversity Baseline Survey show that 7.8% of the publishing workforce identifies as "Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander/South Asian/Southeast Indian," compared to 6.3% of executives (Jiménez et al.). Although this difference appears small, it reflects a decline in representation at higher levels of authority. In an industry where more than 70% of executives identify as White, even modest gaps translate into limited influence over acquisitions, budgets, and long-term investment decisions (Jiménez et al.). Given that Asian Americans are among the most highly educated demographic groups in the United States, this decline suggests barriers to advancement rather than lack of qualification (Gee et al. 16).

These statistics also mask disparities within the category itself. The Diversity Baseline Survey aggregates East, South, and Southeast Asians alongside Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander populations, despite differences in professional experiences and advancement patterns (Jiménez et al.). Research in other industries shows that East Asians are often stereotyped as deferential, while South Asians may be perceived as more assertive, producing different leadership outcomes (Nunes). However, because publishing data remains aggregated, this case study uses "Asian Americans" as a collective term while acknowledging its limitations; the absence of disaggregated data is itself part of the ethical problem.

The Bamboo Ceiling Elsewhere

The underrepresentation of Asian Americans in executive roles within publishing reflects a broader national pattern. Because industry-specific data remains aggregated, research from other sectors provides important context. In Silicon Valley companies, Asians make up "27.2% of the professional workforce, but only 13.9% of executives" (Gee et al. 3). Similarly, analyses of S&P 500

companies found just 16 Asian CEOs in 2017 compared to 440 White CEOs, even though Asians represented roughly 6% of the U.S. population at the time (Nunes). These patterns suggest that the decline from workforce representation to executive authority is systemic rather than unique to publishing, reinforcing the interpretation of similar disparities within trade publishing.

Factors Reinforcing the Bamboo Ceiling

As previously mentioned, research suggests that three recurring factors reinforce the bamboo ceiling within publishing: the "model minority" myth, cultural differences in communication and leadership norms, and misconceptions about leadership ambition. Together, these forces shape how Asian American professionals are perceived and evaluated within workplace hierarchies.

The "Model Minority" Myth

In 1966, the "model minority" myth was coined to leverage Asian Americans' proximity to Whiteness and frame Asian immigrants as non-threatening, particularly in the aftermath of the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act and the 1942 incarceration of Japanese Americans (Gong et al. 2). The phrase has since evolved into a narrative that obscures "the existence of systemic and structural racism" not only against Asians but other racial minority groups as well (Gong et al. 2).

As Gong et al. explain, by "stereotyping Asian Americans as high achievers, those with strengths outside of academics… are often marginalized and deemed as 'failures' or 'outliers' (2). The assumption that Asian Americans will succeed without structural support can result in heightened expectations and unequal standards of evaluation. In professional settings, they may be expected to perform at consistently high levels while being granted less grace for error than their White counterparts. When those inflated expectations are not met, normal variation in performance may be interpreted as a deficiency rather than development, contributing to slower promotion rates and restricted leadership opportunities.

Cultural Differences

Advancement in American corporate environments often depends on self-promotion and visible assertion—expectations rooted in individualistic norms that equate confidence with leadership potential. However, many East and Southeast Asian cultural traditions emphasize humility, harmony, and collective

success. As Gee et al. note, "As aptly expressed in the popular Japanese proverb, 'the nail that sticks out will be hammered' and 'the quacking duck gets shot', Asian culture is more concerned with the dangers of speaking out. By contrast, in Western cultures, we are advised that 'the squeaky wheel gets the grease'" (17). In workplaces that reward visibility, modesty may be misinterpreted as disengagement or lack of ambition, shaping evaluations of leadership readiness.

Misconceptions about Leadership Ambition

Another common explanation for the bamboo ceiling is the claim that Asian Americans lack interest in leadership roles (Gong et al. 3). However, research contradicts this assumption, finding "no significant difference being found in leadership motivation amongst different ethnic groups" (Gong et al. 3). In fact, "[i]n a survey conducted by the Center for Work Life Policy, 64% of Asians aspired to high-ranking positions compared to 52% of Whites," indicating strong leadership aspirations among Asian professionals (Gong et al. 3).

The persistence of this misconception reflects how cultural expression of ambition is interpreted in the workplace. When leadership is defined primarily through Western norms of assertiveness, alternative expressions of ambition may go unrecognized. The result is not a lack of desire for advancement but a mismatch between cultural expression and institutional expectation.

Structural Authority and Tokenism

The effects of the bamboo ceiling in publishing extend beyond representation statistics. When Asian Americans remain underrepresented in executive roles, they have limited influence over consequences with true impact. Decision-making authority shapes not only careers but also the narratives that reach readers. Without diverse leadership, publishing risks reproducing existing cultural priorities under the language of inclusion.

Although recent surveys show a gradual decline in overall Whiteness within publishing, more than 76% of staff still identify as White as of 2023 (Jiménez et al.). This demographic concentration allows representation to function symbolically rather than structurally. Token hires may signal progress without altering who controls budgets or strategy, making diversity visible while leadership remains concentrated.

A 2021 Scholarly Kitchen article highlights this dynamic, observing that "it is unlikely that the few non- white… people have any kind of demonstrative power or agency to push against the normative status quo standards" (McLaughlin). Without genuine authority, diverse staff remains constrained.

As another publishing professional writes, "I consistently find a self-serving equation of 'diversity' (an outcome) with 'antiracism' (a practice) in our industry. The appearance of progress and harmony stands in for difficult, never-ending work, and ultimately, the relinquishment of privileges," highlighting how diversity efforts can preserve existing hierarchies while appearing reformist (The Scholarly Kitchen).

Ethical Analysis

A deontological framework emphasizes moral duties and treating individuals as ends in themselves rather than tools for an outcome. This helps clarify the ethical stakes of the bamboo ceiling in publishing. When Asian American professionals are hired or showcased primarily to signal diversity rather than to recognize expertise or leadership potential, their identities are instrumentalized and reduced to symbols of inclusion. This dynamic limits meaningful participation in decision-making processes and conflicts with the industry's stated commitments to representation and equity. Respect, in this context, requires not just visibility but empowerment and autonomy within the structures that shape cultural production.

John Rawls's concept of the "veil of ignorance," which asks whether systems remain fair when individuals do not know their own position within them, offers a second lens. Applied to publishing, this perspective draws attention to how advancement tied to culturally specific leadership norms can reproduce unequal opportunities. When evaluation standards privilege narrow expressions of assertiveness, alternative leadership styles may be overlooked, reinforcing existing disparities. Greater transparency in promotion criteria and decision-making processes then becomes less a matter of preference and more a question of fairness. In publishing, where acquisition and investment decisions shape cultural narratives, these structural inequities extend beyond individual careers.

Practical Import

For publishing to sustain its role as a space where diverse voices are heard, inclusion must extend beyond symbolic commitments. When diversity initiatives remain performative, trust erodes within the workplace and among the audiences the industry serves. As Dan Sinykin and Richard So note in The Atlantic, publishing often embraces diversity when it is fashionable but fails to sustain it once attention fades. Publishers may generate diverse "editorial fanfare, then fail to provide adequate investment in [subsequent divisions]; the titles [are set

up to fail,] underperform, and… provide publishers with an excuse to disinvest" (Sinykin and So). When racial minorities are hired without meaningful support and face discrimination, retention declines (Sinykin and So).

The lack of Asian American and other nonwhite leadership directly affects which books succeed and how "diverse stories" are perceived. Real transformation requires "making serious concessions within the traditional budgets" (Sinykin and So). Without diverse decision-makers in these areas, investment priorities continue to center White readerships and sustain the assumption that White women remain publishing's primary market (Sinykin and So). As one expert explained, the absence of nonwhite professionals in marketing and sales "means that they cannot reach the readers that the book needs to go to unless they're being directed by someone from that community" (Sinykin and So). Limited internal diversity narrows both creative and economic possibilities by shaping how books are positioned and who they are imagined to reach.

The practical import is clear: diversity without structural empowerment is unsustainable, and failure to equitably support diverse professionals weakens the industry's cultural legitimacy. Superficial diversity paired with homogeneous leadership restricts innovation and audience growth. Meaningful progress requires structural investment and accountability; the ability "to keep them from repeating the cycles of the past by seeing beyond the shortsighted demands of short-term financial growth toward a more flourishing literary culture for all" (Sinykin and So).

Recommendations

Addressing the bamboo ceiling in publishing requires structural change. Reform must occur at both organizational and interpersonal levels to ensure Asian American professionals are empowered to thrive. Structurally, publishers must prioritize redistribution of power and investment. Leadership should expand its definition of diversity to include equitable resource allocation, not only in editorial but in areas where inequity remains "most visible and most consequential," such as marketing, publicity, and sales (Sinykin and So). Genuine transformation requires sustained funding and accountability mechanisms that tie leadership performance to measurable DEI outcomes (Sinykin and So). Regular data audits can further promote transparency and help dismantle existing hierarchies (Sinykin and So).

Workplace culture must also support advancement. Yun Saksena, via the Journal of Dental Education, emphasizes that management must actively mentor and sponsor underrepresented professionals while fostering "psychological

safety and an atmosphere that fosters open communication" (683). Managers should include diverse perspectives in decision-making, recruit from varied sources, and provide honest feedback that enables growth (Saksena 683). Asian American employees should likewise be supported through initiatives that develop leadership and communication skills and expand professional networks (Saksena 683). These efforts create conditions for authentic growth rather than symbolic inclusion.

Conclusion

The persistence of the bamboo ceiling in publishing reveals how systemic bias, cultural misunderstanding, and tokenistic inclusion constrain Asian Americans' ability to thrive in an industry that claims to value diversity. Rooted in the "model minority" myth and reinforced by Western leadership norms, these barriers limit advancement and shape which voices are deemed worthy of investment. Inequities in leadership, mentorship, and decision-making perpetuate a cycle where Asian Americans are seen as contributors but rarely as visionaries. As the ethical analysis demonstrates, treating individuals as ends in themselves and building fair systems requires more than surface-level reform. The future of publishing depends on empowering diverse professionals to lead and shape its cultural trajectory. Dismantling the bamboo ceiling through structural change, authentic mentorship, and equitable investment can produce not only a more inclusive workforce but a more representative literary landscape. For Asian Americans, breaking this barrier is not simply upward mobility but reclaiming creative and cultural agency in an industry that shapes how the world reads and imagines.

Works Cited

Gee, Buck, et al. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Asian American Leaders in Silicon Valley." Ascend, Ascend, 2015, www.ascendleadership.org/thought-leadership/hidden-in-plain-sight-asian-american-lead ers-in-silicon-valley.

Gong, Olivia, et al. "Forging the 'bamboo ceiling': A narrative review on the impact to the Advancement of Asians, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in medicine." The American Journal of Medicine, June 2025, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2025.06.037.

Jiménez, Laura M., et al. "Diversity Baseline Survey 3.0." Lee & Low Books, Feb. 2024, www.leeandlow.com/about/diversity-baseline-survey/dbs3.

McLaughlin, Brenna. "Guest Post - Reckoning with Whiteness in Scholarly Publishing—Updated." The Scholarly Kitchen, 18 Mar. 2021, scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2021/03/18/guest-post-reckoning-with-whiteness-in-scholarly-publishing.

Nunes, Ludmila. "Lessons from the Bamboo Ceiling." Association for Psychological Science, 28 June 2021, www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/bamboo-ceiling.

"On Being Excluded: Testimonies by People of Color in Scholarly Publishing." The Scholarly Kitchen, 4 Apr. 2018, scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/04/04/excluded-testimonies-people-color-scholarly-pub lishing/.

Saksena, Yun. "Breaking the bamboo ceiling and de-bunking the model minority myth." Journal of Dental Education, vol. 88, no. S1, Apr. 2024, pp. 678–684, https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.13510.

Sinykin, Dan, and Richard Jean So. "Has the DEI Backlash Come for Publishing?" The Atlantic, Atlantic Media Company, 19 June 2024, www.theatlantic.com/books/archive/2024/06/diversity-publishing-backlash-study/678734 /.