DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 614 SO 023 660

AUTHOR Manrique, Gabriel G.; Manrique, Cecilia G.
TITLE Non-European Immigrants among Political Science Faculty: American Higher Education and the New Wave of Immigration.
PUB DATE Sep 93
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, DC, September 2-5, 1993). Main text in small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; College Environment; *College Faculty; Cross Cultural Studies; Departments; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Faculty Integration; Higher Education; *Immigrants; *Minority Group Teachers; *Political Science; Racial Bias; Racial Differences; Surveys; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This document reports the results of a survey of immigrant political science faculty of non-European origin during the fall of 1992. There were five purposes for conducting the survey: (1) to collect data on the characteristics of faculty in the United States who migrated from non-European countries, particularly the less developed countries; (2) to study differences across immigrant groups; (3) to study some of the factors that affect the decision of highly educated professionals to migrate; (4) to examine the experiences of immigrant faculty with racial discrimination and perceptions of the impact of race on their work; and (5) to study their views on racial diversity on U.S. campuses. The questionnaire sent to immigrant faculty included questions about the characteristics of the respondent, current institution, and department; respondent's comparisons of professional opportunities between the United States and country of origin; respondent's experiences with discrimination and racial prejudice; respondent's perceptions of how one's race affects work as a faculty member; and views about institutional efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and students. The study concluded that most immigrant faculty come to the United States as graduate students, finish their degrees, and then accept teaching positions here before seeking permanent residency. Immigrant faculty trade off a higher social standing in their country of origin for a higher standard of living, more academic freedom, and better access to library facilities in the United States. One out of three respondents reported encountering some form of discrimination on campus. (DK)

NON-EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS AMONG POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY: AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NEW WAVE OF IMMIGRATION[1]

by

Gabriel G. Manrique
Professor
Economics and Finance Dept.
Winona State University
Winona, Minnesota 55987
(507) 457-5193
(507) 457-5697 (FAX)
MANRIQUE@VAX2.WINONA.MSUS.EDU

Cecilia G. Manrique
Assistant Professor
Political Science Dept.
Univ. of Wisconsin-La Crosse
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601
(608) 785-6642
MANRIQUE@UWLAX.BITNET
MANRIQUE@UWLAX.EDU

"Prepared for delivery at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, The Washington Hilton, September 2-5, 1993.

[1]*Support for this project was provided by the Bureau of Business and Economics Research of Winona State University, the Winona State University Foundation, and by the Dean's Office, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse. This paper is one in a series that the authors are writing based on the results of their survey of non-European immigrant faculty in US colleges and universities.*

NON-EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS AMONG POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY: AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NEW WAVE OF IMMIGRATION[1]

by

Gabriel G. Manrique
Professor
Economics and Finance Dept.
Winona State University
Winona, Minnesota 55987
(507) 457-5193
(507) 457-5697 (FAX)
MANRIQUE@VAX2.WINONA.MSUS.EDU

Cecilia G. Manrique
Assistant Professor
Political Science Dept.
Univ. of Wisconsin-La Crosse
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601
(608) 785-6642
MANRIQUE@UWLAX.BITNET
MANRIQUE@UWLAX.EDU

"Prepared for delivery at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, The Washington Hilton, September 2-5, 1993.

---

[1]*Support for this project was provided by the Bureau of Business and Economics Research of Winona State University, the Winona State University Foundation, and by the Dean's Office, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse.* *This paper is one in a series that the authors are writing based on the results of their survey of non-European immigrant faculty in US colleges and universities.*

NON-EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS AMONG POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY: AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NEW WAVE OF IMMIGRATION

INTRODUCTION

The authors conducted a survey of immigrant faculty of non-European origin during the fall of 1992. There were five purposes for conducting the survey: to collect data on the characteristics of faculty in the US who migrated from non-European countries, particularly the less developed countries (LDCs); to study differences across immigrant groups; to study some of the factors that affect the decision of highly educated professionals to migrate; to examine the experiences of immigrant faculty with racial discrimination and immigrant faculty perceptions of the impact of race on their work; and to study their views on racial diversity in US campuses.

This paper presents our initial set of findings for one subset of respondents - faculty in departments of political science. This initial exposition is intended as a prelude to a larger study of non-European immigrant faculty - an increasingly visible segment of the immigrant population but one which has been barely studied in the immigration literature.[1]

THE NEW IMMIGRANTS IN US COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Although US colleges and universities, in particular the research institutions, have had a long tradition of attracting immigrant faculty, the large and continuing increase in the number of immigrant faculty in US schools is a relatively recent phenomenon that reflects changes in US immigration law passed in 1965. Prior to the Immigration Act of 1965, immigration to the US was regulated by a system of country quotas based on the national origins of the current US population.[2] This system resulted in very small immigration quotas allocated to non-European countries, particularly LDCs. For example, prior to 1965 the yearly quota of for most Asian countries was only 100.[3]

The Immigration Act of 1965 removed national origins as the basis for immigration thereby opening the doors for immigrants from non-European countries. In addition, preferences for immigrants were established that favored the migration of professionals and other persons whose skills were in high demand. With minor modifications, these principles of migration have been ratified and reinforced by the succeeding immigration laws of 1986 and 1990.

As a result, a large majority of recent (post-1965) immigrants to the US have come from the LDCs of Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. It is therefore not surprising that many of the recent immigrant faculty in US colleges and universities are also of non-European origin.[4]

The changes in US immigration laws have allowed increasing numbers of non-Europeans to come to the USA first to study, and then after earning their Ph.D.s, find jobs in US colleges and universities. They have enabled many former foreign graduate students to acquire permanent resident status in the US and to eventually acquire American citizenship.[5] The changes in the immigration law also coincided with the growth in demand for Ph.D.s as US colleges and universities expanded during the 1970s and 1980s. The immigrant faculty that came with these changes comprise the group that the authors studied for this project.

Like most migration movements, the recent influx of non-European immigrant faculty has been the source of both benefits and problems for the USA. The availability of immigrant faculty enabled schools to fill faculty positions particularly in business, computer science, and engineering - fields that have had a shortage of native-born Ph.D.s. Having immigrants on the faculty also connected schools to the rest of the world at a time when the "global economy" and "internationalizing the curriculum" were gaining acceptance. And for those who consider exposure to diverse people and cultures an important part of education, non-European immigrant faculty provided a beneficial dimension to US schools as well as potential role models for minority students.[6]

On the other hand, the presence of immigrant faculty can also generate problems for US colleges and universities. For example, when racism and prejudice surface on campus some of these can be directed at immigrant faculty. In turn, these can generate tensions that disrupt learning. There are also concerns about the speech of immigrant faculty and what effect this has on students particularly those not used to different accents.[7]

THE SAMPLE

To survey political science faculty who are non-European immigrants, the authors compiled a mailing list drawn from members of the American Political Science Association (APSA) with non-European sounding names, i.e. Oriental, Asian Indian, African, Middle Eastern, and Hispanic. Even though Hispanic names have a European (mainly Iberian) origin, they were used to include immigrants from the former colonies of Spain and Portugal. The names were taken from the directory of members of the APSA (APSA, 1991) and supplemented with names taken from the faculty rosters found in randomly selected college catalogs.

The survey's cover letter specifically asked the recipients to respond only if they were first- or second-generation immigrants of non-European origin, regardless of their current citizenship or visa status. We defined first generation immigrants as individuals born in another country but who plan to stay in the USA permanently or indefinitely, and second generation immigrants as individuals born in the USA but whose parents were born in another country. It turned out that 86% of the respondents are first-generation immigrants. The authors compiled a mailing list of 280 faculty members, each of whom was sent a survey. The authors received 64 valid responses for a survey response rate of 23%.[8]

THE SURVEY

The authors designed the questionnaire to extract information that would enable us to achieve the four purposes of the study discussed in the introduction. It included questions about: 1. the characteristics of the respondent, current institution, and department; 2. the respondent's comparisons of professional opportunities between the USA and country of origin; 3. the respondent's experiences with discrimination and racial prejudice; 4. the respondent's perceptions of how one's race affects his/her work as a faculty member; and 5. views about his/her institution's efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and students.

The authors pre-tested the questionnaire with 31 faculty members from various disciplines who the authors knew were first-generation immigrants to the USA. The questionnaires were then revised to reflect their comments and suggestions. The survey that was mailed contained 66 questions, many of which elicited responses on a Likert scale.

THE SURVEY RESULTS

The Profile of the Respondents

The respondents teach in 51 different schools of varying size, and 66% teach in state-supported institutions. Three-fourths teach at comprehensive universities, and 55% teach at Ph.D.-granting institutions. Most of the respondents are housed in a college of liberal arts, with 60% tenured and 42% full professors. The respondents have been with their current department an average of 15 years and their average age is 46 years. There were 52 male respondents. By area of origin, the respondents are distributed as follows: Asia/Pacific Islands (38%), Indian Subcontinent (17%), Middle East (20%), Latin America (6%), and Africa (10%). Although 86% are first generation immigrants, the majority now have US citizenship. Eight-three percent reported that prior to taking a full-time position in the USA, they came to the USA as graduate students, confirming that the most common pattern that immigrant faculty use is to initially come to the USA for graduate studies, then find employment in a US college or university, convert to immigrant or permanent resident status, and eventually apply for US citizenship.

Migration as Revealed Preference

The decision to migrate is an extremely complex and personal one that involves economic, political, social and family considerations. One way of characterizing the factors affecting international migration is by distinguishing between push and pull factors. Certain factors push persons from the sending country while other factors pull persons to the receiving country.[9] We sought to determine what job-related push and pull factors affect immigrant faculty.

The results found in Table 1 indicate that the lack of job opportunities commensurate with one's training does not appear to be a factor pushing political science faculty to migrate from their country of origin. A large majority of respondents believe that they have a high probability of finding a job in their country of origin. The percentages are even higher when the respondents were asked about the probability of being offered a faculty position in their country of origin. Although it is possible that perceptions of the job market do not fully correspond with reality, one's perception is just as important as the reality in deciding to migrate.

On the other hand, the results in Table 2 indicate that there are several factors that pull immigrant faculty to the USA such as: the chance to afford a higher standard of living; access to better library and research facilities; and more academic freedom. Thirty-four percent of the respondents said that if they were to work (not necessarily teach) in their country of origin, the standard of living they would be able to afford would be worse than what they can currently afford in the USA. To the extent that economic considerations play a role in the decision to migrate, then these perceived differences in the standard of living can help to explain why highly educated persons migrate to the USA. And because the professional activities of faculty revolve around the classroom and research, it is also likely that the perception of more academic freedom and better facilities in the USA would pull immigrant faculty. However, we are unable to assign relative weights to these factors.[10]

The decision to migrate is further complicated by the trade-offs immigrants must make between benefits in their country of origin and benefits in the receiving country. For example, immigrants may trade off the familiarity of an extended family for potential economic gains. Immigration may also force persons to switch roles - from being part of the majority to being part of the minority in the USA. This switch can be especially great for immigrants from non-European LDCs because: their cultures are distinctly different from the dominant culture in the USA; they look distinctly different from the majority in the USA; and they speak a language that is very different from English. Being placed with the minority may affect one's social standing relative to what one is accustomed to in one's country of origin.[11] In Table 2, we find some evidence that immigrant faculty do feel that their social standing as well as opportunities for advancement would be better in their country of origin.

The authors recognize that in addition to those included in our study, there are other factors which affect the decision to migrate. Furthermore, we are unable to rank the factors in their order of importance. However, if we treat the act of migrating to the USA as evidence of the revealed preference of individuals, then one way of summarizing the findings in this section of the paper is that the loss of social standing and opportunities for professional advancement suffered by immigrant faculty is not large enough to offset their gains in standard of living, academic freedom and library facilities. It is therefore not surprising that although 70% believe that there is a high probability of being offered a faculty position in their country of origin, only 47% said that there is a high probability that they would accept such an offer and 37% said that the probability is low that they would accept such an offer (see Table 1).

Job Discrimination Against Immigrant Faculty

Unlike past waves of migration to the USA, the latest and current wave has been dominated by people from non-European countries. These have created social tensions and problems although it is not at all clear that these are any different from those that accompanied earlier waves of migration.[12]

Although immigrant faculty tend to be more highly educated than the typical immigrant, and although US campuses may be more open than society in general, immigrant faculty may still be subjected to discrimination and prejudice. However, such racism towards faculty might be less blatant on campuses because of the tolerance and civility that is supposed to be part of academe. Racism on campus is not unheard of and is not targeted solely at African Americans. To learn more about the race-related experiences of immigrant faculty, we included questions about discrimination in the workplace. In the questionnaire, the authors described discrimination in the work place as: an action taken towards a person based mainly on his/her race which may involve actions on promotion, salaries, and the assignment of workload.

The results found in Table 3 indicate that from the standpoint of immigrant faculty, discrimination is alive and well on US campuses. One out of every four respondents said that they have been discriminated against by colleagues in their own department. An even larger proportion, more than

one out of every three, said that they had been discriminated against by colleagues outside their own department. One out of every three respondents said that they have been discriminated against by administrators in their institution, and 46% did not think that their institution has policies and procedures in place to effectively handle cases of job discrimination. Sixty-five percent said that they are aware of instances where foreign-born faculty have been discriminated against.

The reported extent of discrimination against non-European immigrant faculty is disturbing. However, it should also be noted that a significant portion of the respondents, more than 30%, did not feel that they had been discriminated against by colleagues in their department, by colleagues outside the department or by administrators. The differences in responses may be explained by other factors such as one's rank, country of origin, type of institution, gender, or length of stay in the USA - factors that the authors will study at length in their upcoming, larger survey.

These survey results reveal, not surprisingly, that US campuses are subject to the same tensions and problems that American society will continue to experience, for as long as the USA remains what it has always been - a nation of immigrants.[13]

Racial Prejudice Directed Towards Immigrant Faculty

Racism is manifested not only through discrimination in the workplace. On campuses, as in the rest of society, non-European immigrants may be subjected to racial prejudice. Faculty were asked about their experiences with overt acts of racial prejudice. In the questionnaire, the authors described acts of racial prejudice as adverse actions or hateful speech directed towards a person based largely on that person's race or ethnic origin.

The results found in Table 3 provide some evidence that even highly educated political science professors are subjected to acts of racial prejudice. Eighteen percent said that members of their own department had directed acts of racial prejudice towards them and 28% said that colleagues from outside their department had done so, Thirty-four percent said that students had directed acts of racial prejudice towards them and 36% said that people in their community had done so.

As with discrimination in the workplace, it should be noted that although there is evidence that non-European immigrant faculty experience acts of racism, a substantial portion of respondents (at least 40%) said that they had not been subjected to acts of racism by their colleagues, students, and people in their community. These differences may again be explained by factors such as the type of institution, location, origin of the respondent, etc.

Prejudice and the Campus Atmosphere

One of the questions that arises with regard to prejudice and discrimination on campuses concerns the "atmosphere" for race relations. In other words, whether the campus atmosphere encourages tolerance and acceptance of various races or the atmosphere ignores or even encourages instances of racial intolerance. One possible indication of the atmosphere on campuses would be extent to which immigrants of color encounter discrimination and prejudice. If a respondent encounters acts of racial prejudice within his/her department but not outside the department or with students, then it may be a problem that is isolated. However, if the same respondent encounters racial prejudice and discrimination in and outside the department, with administrators, and with students, then it is more likely that the campus atmosphere is itself to blame. Our survey appears to show that some of this latter possibility exists. Table 4 below contains gamma values for correlating the responses to the various questions about discrimination and prejudice. A high degree of correlation exists among the responses. In other words, a particular respondent who has been discriminated against by departmental colleagues is also likely to have been discriminated against by other colleagues and by the administration.

The authors acknowledge that campus "atmosphere" towards race is only one possible explanation for the statistical results. It is also possible that certain groups of immigrants are more likely to be discriminated against in various parts of the campus Indeed, in our larger sample of faculty from various disciplines, African immigrants consistently reported being subjected to more discrimination and prejudice than any other group of immigrant faculty.[14] Discrimination towards African Americans are also projected towards African immigrants.

Is Race a Handicap for Non-European Immigrant Faculty?

Another purpose of our study was to examine how immigrant faculty perceive the impact their race or "foreignness" has had on their work as academics. Specifically, the authors wished to find out if non-Europeans perceive their race and their speech accent as having a major impact on their work as academics. The authors also wanted to find out if immigrant faculty feel that, because they are part of the minority, they must work harder to prove themselves professionally,

The results found in Table 5 show that a significant portion of respondents do not think that their race or accent adversely impact their performance. A majority or close to a majority disagreed with statements that made race a barrier to teaching effectiveness. However, this does not mean that the respondents did not consider race a factor at all since 67% felt that because of their race, they had to try harder to prove themselves professionally. Immigrant faculty do not appear to view difficulties arising from their race as insurmountable.

This generation of immigrants, many of whom arrived and were hired in the 1970s and 1980s, would also have been socialized into the principles of affirmative action hiring. For this reason, immigrant faculty may think that their race was a factor in their getting hired. However, this assertion was not supported by the results of the survey since 61% did not think their race was a factor in their hiring. In a less than color blind society, it may even be asserted that non-European immigrants are hired in spite of their race.

Immigrant Attitudes Towards Cultural Diversity on Campus

Many colleges and universities have been attempting to create a more racially and culturally diverse campus (American Council on Education, 1989). This may be a reaction to the changing demographics of the USA, or a recognition of the inherent value of diversity or both. The authors sought to elicit the views of immigrant faculty with regard to their institution's efforts at fostering diversity on campus. The results in Table 6 below indicate that there is no widespread agreement among immigrant faculty about the effectiveness of their respective institution's efforts to recruit and retain racially diverse faculty and students. Because of the broad range of institutions represented in this survey, it is not yet possible to draw firm conclusions. The

authors believe that factors such as the type and location of institutions as well as the characteristics of the respondents themselves may help to explain the differences in responses to this set of questions.

We did find broader agreement among the respondents that their institutions should do more to recruit racially diverse students and faculty (see Table 7). However, it is also interesting to note that 22% of the respondents were non-committal about hiring more racially diverse faculty. There are probably several explanations for this ambivalence. However one view that was repeatedly expressed by respondents in the comments written on the survey was that the qualifications of job applicants should still take precedence over other considerations. In spite of the ambivalence expressed about the recruitment of more racially diverse faculty and students, there appears to be strong support for multi-cultural programs on campus. That 83% of the respondents agreed that institutions should do more to promote multi-cultural awareness and sensitivity on campus: 1) reflect the respondents' views that their institution is simply not doing enough to promote racial awareness; 2) reflect the fact that respondents perhaps are reacting to incidents of discrimination or prejudice they have witnessed; or 3) reflect the respondents' belief that multi-cultural programs have inherent educational and social utility.

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The major findings of this study of non-European immigrant faculty in political science departments are as follows:

1. The most common sequence used by immigrant faculty for migrating to the USA is to come as graduate students, complete the Ph.D., seek and accept a teaching position, and arrange to become permanent residents or US citizens.

2. Immigrant faculty engage in significant trade offs when they migrate to the USA. In particular, they trade off a higher social standing in their country of origin for a higher standard of living, more academic freedom, and better access to library and research facilities in the USA.

3. At least one out of three non-European immigrant faculty have encountered some form of discrimination and racial prejudice on campus.

4. Immigrant faculty do not view their race as a major deterrent to their professional and teaching effectiveness although two-thirds believe that because of their race, they have to work harder to prove themselves.

5. Immigrant faculty do not give their institutions very high marks in efforts to recruit and retain racially diverse faculty and students.

6. Although there is strong support among immigrant faculty for programs to enhance multi-cultural awareness, there seems to be less support for more hiring of racially diverse faculty.

These initial findings can assist in understanding better the experiences and attitudes of immigrant faculty. In turn, this understanding may be used to increase the effectiveness of immigrant faculty, reduce some of the tensions created by an increasingly multi-racial mix on campuses, and formulate policies aimed at maximizing the contribution of immigrant faculty to US higher education.

However, to accomplish these and to arrive at substantive recommendations, further study beyond this exposition of the survey results is necessary. Accordingly, the authors intend to pursue the following areas of study:

1. A broader survey that includes most academic disciplines and departments. A survey that is representative of US higher education is necessary to strengthen and validate any conclusions and policy recommendations. This will also enable us to compare immigrant attitudes and experiences across disciplines.

2. Statistical analysis to compare immigrants based on their place of origin. Immigrant faculty do not belong to one homogeneous group but are themselves very diverse. The experiences, attitudes, and reasons for migrating of the different immigrant groups are likely to vary depending on their place of origin. Our understanding of the immigrant experience will be enhanced if we are able to learn more about the differences among immigrant groups.

3. Statistical analysis of the impact of other variables on the experiences and attitudes of immigrant faculty. We believe that in addition to academic discipline and area of origin, there are other factors that differentiate the responses of immigrant faculty. For example, variables such as the type of institution, faculty rank, department size, the respondent's age and length of stay in the USA, can be significant factors that can help in understanding the immigrant experience.

The study suggests fertile areas for future study in the fields of gender differences, regional and institutional differences, maybe even state by state differences. This preliminary data therefore serves as the basis for further inquiry into the various factors and issues that affect a growing component of the American population. It is hoped that the study will encourage the discussion of the implications of the premilimary findings to current academic policy in various institutions.

Table 1 - Perception of Job Opportunities in One's Country of Origin (% of respondents)

In One's Country of Origin	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High
Probability of Finding a Job Commensurate with Training	5.0	15.7	22.4	29.3	27.6
Probability of Being Offered a Faculty Position	3.4	10.2	16.9	30.0	40.0
Probability of Accepting the Offer of a Faculty Position	15.8	21.4	15.8	26.0	21.0

Table 2 - Comparisons between the USA and One's Country of Origin (% of respondents)

Compared with One's Current Situation in USA	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better
Living Standard in Country of Origin	5.2	29.3	22.4	15.5	27.6
Social Standing in Country of Origin	1.7	5.1	20.3	28.8	44.1
Opportunities for Professional Advancement	3.4	22.4	32.8	27.6	13.8
Opportunities for Professional Advancement as Faculty	1.8	8.9	46.4	28.6	14.3
Access to Library and Research Facilities	23.2	64.3	10.7	0.0	1.8
Academic Freedom	22.4	37.9	34.5	0.0	5.2

Table 3 - Experiences with Discrimination and Racial Prejudice on Campus (% of respondents)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
Discriminated Against by Faculty in Department	22.0	18.6	32.2	16.9	10.2
Discriminated Against by Faculty outside Department	16.7	21.7	23.3	26.7	11.7
Discriminated Against by the Administration	18.3	20.0	25.0	20.0	16.7
Know Immigrant Faculty Who Have Been Discriminated Against	5.3	14.0	15.8	31.6	33.3
School Has Policies to Effectively Deal with Discrimination	7.3	18.2	29.1	38.2	7.3
Experienced Prejudiced Acts by Faculty in Department	33.3	28.1	21.1	10.5	7.0
Experienced Prejudiced Acts by Faculty outside Department	25.9	22.4	24.1	20.7	6.9
Experienced Prejudiced Acts by Students	19.0	31.0	15.5	31.0	3.4
Experienced Prejudiced Acts by Members of the Community	15.5	25.9	22.4	29.3	6.9

Table 4 - Correlation of Experiences with Discrimination and Prejudice Across Sectors on Campus (GAMMA Values)

	Discrimination towards Respondent by:			Racial Prejudice Towards Respondent by:	
	Department Colleagues	Other Faculty	Admin-istrators	Department Colleagues	Other Faculty
Other Faculty (Discrimination)	.857				
Administrators (Discrim.)	.851	.851			
Department Colleagues (Prejudice)	.888	.721	.749		
Other Faculty (Prejudice)	.663	.892	.709	.771	
Students (Prejudice)	.603	.721	.602	.666	.697

Table 5 - Perceptions Regarding Race and Professional Advancement (% of respondents)

Perceptions Regarding One's Race	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
Race Was a Factor in Getting Hired	37.3	23.7	23.7	13.6	1.7
Race Has Been a Barrier to Professional Advancement	17.2	25.9	20.7	27.6	8.6
Race Has Been a Barrier to Teaching Effectiveness	35.6	28.8	20.3	8.5	6.8
Speech Accent Has Been a Barrier to Teaching Effectiveness	37.9	32.8	17.2	6.9	5.2
Must Try Harder to Prove One's Self Professionally	16.1	7.1	10.7	30.4	35.7

Table 6 - Views on Institutional Efforts to Promote Cultural Diversity (% of respondents)

Perceptions Regarding Diversity on Campus	Nonexistent	Ineffective	Slightly Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
School's Efforts to Recruit Diverse Faculty	3.4	20.3	49.2	20.3	6.8
School's Efforts to Retain Diverse Faculty	8.6	29.3	31.0	25.9	5.2
School's Efforts to Recruit Diverse Students	3.4	19.0	41.4	29.3	6.9
School's Efforts to Retain Diverse Students	5.2	20.7	46.6	22.4	5.2

Table 7 - Prescriptive Attitudes Towards Promotion of Cultural Diversity (% of respondents)

Attitudes Towards Diversity on Campus	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
School Should Recruit More Racially Diverse Faculty	5.1	3.4	22.0	40.7	28.8
School Should Recruit More Racially Diverse Students	3.4	1.7	24.1	48.3	22.4
School Should Promote More Multi-Cultural Awareness	3.4	1.7	11.9	49.2	33.9

ENDNOTES

1. Two examples of studies that have been done on immigrant faculty are Wey, 1980 and Yun, 1989.

2. The immigration laws which were passed in 1924 and 1952 affirmed the use of national origins in allocating immigration quotas to different countries. The composition of the national origin of the US population was determined by the results of the 1920 census.

3. Actual immigration from Asian countries usually exceeded these quotas because of the quota-exempt classifications for children and spouses of American citizens, certain refugees, war veterans, etc.. But even with these exemptions, the total number of non-European immigrants to the US prior to 1966 was small. For example, of the 296,697 immigrants admitted to the USA in 1965, only 20,683 were from Asia.

4. There is a significant amount of literature on the history of migration to the US. For a history of the migration of non-European immigrants to the US, the reader is referred to Reimers, 1992.

5. Reimer (1992, p.98) reports that: in 1989 more than half of American doctorates in engineering and mathematics were awarded to foreign students; in 1978, over 18,000 nonimmigrant students became immigrants; the Labor Department found that foreign students today, are more likely than in the past to stay and work in the United States upon completion of their studies.

6. The importance of having role models for women and minorities, particularly in colleges and universities is discussed by various authors (Siegred, 1991; Ehrhart and Sandler, 1987; and John, 1992). However, Catanese (1991) was less conclusive about the effects of role models on minorities majoring in economics.

7. The issue of speech accent has been considered important enough for the Federal courts to rule on. In Carino v. University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, the court ruled that denial of employment opportunities because of a person's accent is national origin discrimination. (US Commission on Civil Rights, 1992).

8. For the entire study, the authors compiled a mailing list of 1380 and received 322 valid responses yielding a similar response rate of 23.3%. It should also be noted that the actual response rate from immigrant faculty is probably higher since it is very likely that not all of those who were sent the survey are first- or second-generation immigrants.

9. A discussion of the determinants of international migration can be found in, Alejandro Portes and Jozsef Borocz, 1990, "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation".

10. Zolberg, 1991, makes the point that the spread of information about variation in opportunities across countries and the decrease in transportation costs will probably assure the continuation of South to North immigration flows.

11. The experiences of various immigrants are likely to differ although one may expect similarities as well. What may be the typical experience of immigrants is described in Nieves-Squires, 1992, "Hispanic Women in the US Academic Context," and Leal, 1992, "Xenophobia or Xenophilia? Hispanic Women in Higher Education."

12. For an example of the similarity of the issues raised about immigrants to the USA in the 1800s, the early 1900s, and late 1900s, the reader is referred to the collection of readings found in Dudley, 1990.

13. The authors believe that the benefits gained by the USA from immigration exceed its costs. However, it is not the purpose of this expository paper to present the arguments for or against immigration. The pros and cons of immigration have been widely discussed elsewhere. The reader is referred to, among others, the collection of readings found in Glazer, 1985; Simcox, 1988; and Dudley, 1990.

14. Because of the small number of African immigrants in our sample of political science faculty, we are unable to make the same conclusion for political science. We do hypothesize that when we are able to expand our sample size, we will find that African faculty in political science experience more discrimination than other immigrants.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education. 1989. *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity.* Washington, DC: ACE.

American Economic Association. 1989. Biographical Listing of Members. *American Economic Review.* 79 (December): 25-526.

American Economic Association. 1991. *Telephone Directory of Members.* Nashville: AEA

American Political Science Association. 1991. *Directory of Membership, 1991-93.* Washington, DC: APSA.

Borjas, George J. 1991. Economic Theory and International Migration. *International Migration Review.* 28 (3): 457-485.

Catanese, Anthony V. 1991. Faculty Role Models and Diversifying the Gender and Racial Mix of Undergraduate Economics Majors. *Journal of Economic Education.* 22 (Summer): 276-284.

Civil Rights Issues Facing Asian Americans in the 1990s. 1992. Washington, DC: United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Contemporary American Immigration (Non-European): Interpretive Essays. 1982. Edited by D. Cuddy. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Dudley, William (ed.) 1991. *Immigration: Opposing Viewpoints.* San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Ehrhart, J.K. and B.R. Sandler. 1987. *Looking for More than a Few Good Women in Traditionally Male Fields.* Project on the Status and Education of Women. Washington, DC: Association for American Colleges.

Glazer, Nathan. 1985. *Clamor at the Gates.* San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

John, Martha Tyler. 1992. Academic Role Models Needed for Females in the Third World. In *Perspectives on Minority Women in Higher Education,* ed. by L. Welch, 107-113. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Leal, Anita and Cecilia Menjivar. 1992. Xenophobia or Xenophilia? Hispanic Women in Higher Education. In *Perspectives on Minority Women in Higher Education,* ed. by L. Welch, 93-103. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Nieves-Squires Sarah. 1992. Hispanic Women in the US Academic Context. In *Perspectives on Minority Women in Higher Education,* ed. by L. Welch, 71-92. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Portes, Alejandro and J. Borocz. 1991. Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on it Determinants and Modes of Incorporation. *International Migration Review.* 23 (3): 606-630.

Reimers, David M. 1992. *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America.* 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Siegfred, J. J. et al. 1991. The Status and Prospects of the Economics Major. *Journal of Economic Education.* 22 (Summer): 197-224.

Simcox, David (Ed.) 1988. *US Immigration in the 1980s: Reappraisal and Reform.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Weiner W. 1987. International Emigration and the Third World. In *Global Trends in Migration,* ed. by W. Alonso, 173-200. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Zolberg, Aristide. 1991. The Next Waves: Migration Theory for a Changing World. *International Migration Review.* 28(3): 403-430.