

OCCASIONAL PAPERS/ REPRINTS SERIES IN CONTEMPORARY ASIAN STUDIES

NUMBER 5 — 1977

**ASIAN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN
NORTH AMERICA: PROFES-
SIONAL AND ETHNIC PROB-
LEMS**

Edited by Chün-tu Hsüeh

**School of LAW
UNIVERSITY
of
MARYLAND**

An outline map of the Asian continent and surrounding islands, including the Japanese archipelago, the Philippines, and the Indonesian archipelago. The map is rendered in a simple black line style on a white background.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS/REPRINTS SERIES IN CONTEMPORARY ASIAN STUDIES

General Editor: Hungdah Chiu

Executive Editor: David Simon

Assistant Editor: William L. Helfand

Editorial Advisory Board

Professor Robert A. Scalapino, University of California
at Berkeley

Professor Martin Wilbur, Columbia University

Professor Gaston J. Sigur, George Washington University

Professor Shao-chuan Leng, University of Virginia

Professor Lawrence W. Beer, University of Colorado

Professor James Hsiung, New York University

Dr. Robert Heuser, Max-Planck-Institute for Comparative Public
Law and International Law at Heidelberg

Professor K. P. Misra, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Published with the cooperation of the Maryland International Law Society.

All contributions (in English only) and communications should be sent to
Professor Hungdah Chiu, University of Maryland School of Law,
500 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 USA.

All publications in this series reflect only the views of the authors.

While the editor accepts responsibility for the selection of materials to be
published, the individual author is responsible for statements of facts and
expressions of opinion contained therein.

Subscription is US \$10.00 for 10 issues (regardless of the price of individual
issues) in the United States and Canada and \$12.00 for overseas. Check should be
addressed to OPRSCAS and sent to Professor Hungdah Chiu.

Price for single copy of this issue: US \$3.00.

©1977 by Occasional Papers/Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies,
Inc.

**ASIAN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN
NORTH AMERICA:
PROFESSIONAL AND ETHNIC
PROBLEMS**

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

CHÜN-TU HSÜEH

CONTENTS

About the Editor and the Contributors	ii-v
Introduction	1
Chün-tu Hsüeh	
1. The Role of Asian Political Scientists in the United States	11
Yung Wei	
2. Asian Political Scientists in North America: Their Aspirations and Problems	23
Yasumasa Kuroda	
3. Korean Political Scientists: Their Status and Aspirations	33
Se-Jin Kim and Sung Chul Yang	
4. Asian-born Political Scientists Viewed from the Vantage Point of Department Chairpersons	51
Yong Soon Yim	
5. Foreign-born Political Scientists in North America: A Profile	67
Madan Lal Goel and Yasumasa Kuroda	
6. Foreign-born Political Science Graduate Students in North America: An Interpretative Summary of an Exploratory Depth Interview Survey	91
Akira Kubota	
7. Collective Reflections	115
Yung-hwan Jo, "Reflections on the Road Ahead"	115
Karl G. Li, "Let's Fight for Equal Opportunity"	121
Theodore H. McNelly, "A Scotch-Irish Perspective"	122
Yawsoon Sim, "On Stereotype Image"	128
George O. Totten, "Asians, Asian-Americans and Asianists"	130
Derek J. Waller, "A British View"	135
Yuan-li Wu, "The Economic Condition of Some Asian-Americans Or Does Education Pay?"	138
Index	141

ABOUT THE EDITOR AND THE CONTRIBUTORS

CHÜN-TU HSÜEH (LL.B., Chaoyang University College of Law, China; M.A., Ph.D., Columbia University) was born in Canton, China. He is Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland, Chairman of the Washington and Southeast Regional Seminar on China, and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Asian Political Scientists Group in the USA.

Dr. Hsüeh was formerly a member of the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science (1973-75), member of the National Bicentennial Ethnic-Racial Council, and of the Advisory Committee of the Maryland Bicentennial Commission, (1975-76). He was Visiting Professor and Acting Director at the Free University of Berlin, and he has taught at Columbia University and the University of Hong Kong.

A member of the editorial board of *Ethnicity* and other journals, Professor Hsüeh is the author of *Huang Hsing and the Chinese Revolution* (Stanford University Press, 1961; reprinted 1968), editor and contributor, *Revolutionary Leaders of Modern China* (Oxford University Press, 1971; reprinted 1973; French edition, 1973), and *Dimensions of China's Foreign Relations* (New York: Praeger, 1977).

MADAN LAL GOEL (B.S., Panjab University; M.S., Oregon; Ph.D., State University of New York at Buffalo) was born in India. He is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of West Florida.

Dr. Goel's publications include *Political Participation in a Developing Nation* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1975).

YUNG-HWA JO (Ph.D., American University) was born in Masan, Korea. He is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Asian Studies at Arizona State University, and formerly Fulbright Professor at Keio University. He is currently the editor of *Asian Forum*, and President of the Association of Korean Political Scientists in North America.

Dr. Jo is the editor of *Korea's Response to the West* (1970), and *Taiwan's Future* (1974). He has contributed to *Journal of Politics* and other journals.

SE-JIN KIM (B.A., Southwestern at Memphis; M.A., Ph.D., University of Massachusetts) was born in Pyongyang, South Pyongyan Province, Korea. He is Professor and Chairman of the

Department of Political Science, North Carolina Central University (currently on leave). He has served as Director of the Research Center for Peace and Unification, Seoul, and he has taught at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Dr. Kim is the author of *Politics of Military Revolution in Korea* (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 1971), co-editor of *Government and Politics of Korea* (Silver Spring, Md.: Research Institute on Korean Affairs, 1972), and *Korea: A Divided Nation* (1976).

AKIRA KUBOTA (B.A., Tokyo; M.A., Ph.D., University of Michigan) was born in Sacramento, California. He left for Japan with his family in 1936 and returned to the U. S. in 1958. Author of *Higher Civil Servants in Postwar Japan* (Princeton University Press, 1969) and other articles, Dr. Kubota is now Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Windsor, Canada.

YASUMASA KURODA (B.A., M.A., Ph.D., University of Oregon) was born in Tokyo, Japan. He is Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, and he has contributed numerous articles to professional journals.

KARL G. LI (B.A., National Taiwan University; Ph.D., University of Maryland) was born in China. He is the coordinator of Asian-Pacific educational programs at the U. S. Office of Education.

Dr. Li has taught at Federal City College and contributed to *Asian Forum* and other journals.

THEODORE H. MCNELLY (B.S., M.A., Wisconsin; Ph.D., Columbia University) is Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland. He was a research analyst in the Civil Intelligence Section of General MacArthur's Headquarters in Tokyo during the Occupation of Japan.

Dr. McNelly was a Japan Foundation Fellow in 1973 and is now a member of the SSRC-Binational (U.S.-Japan) Study of the Occupation of Japan. He is the author of *Politics and Government in Japan*, 2nd ed. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), and editor of *Sources in Modern East Asian History and Politics* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967).

YAWSOON SIM (Diploma, New Asia College, Hong Kong; M.A., Yale University; Ph.D., Fordham University) is a native of Malaysia. He is Professor and Head of the Department of Political

Science at Grambling State University, Louisiana. Frequent contributor to a leading Chinese newspaper in Singapore, *Sin Chew Jit Poh*, Dr. Sim writes extensively on American politics, culture, racism and economics.

GEORGE O. TOTTEN, III (A.B., M.A., Columbia University; Ph.D., Yale University) was born in Washington, D. C. He is Professor of Political Science at the University of Southern California. He is author of *The Social Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan* (Yale University Press, 1966), and co-author of *Socialist Parties in Postwar Japan* (Yale University Press, 1966).

DEREK J. WALLER (Ph.D., University of London) was born in England. He is Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the East Asian Studies Program at Vanderbilt University. He is the author of *The Government and Politics of Communist China* (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1973), *The Kiangsi Soviet Republic* (Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studies, University of California, 1973), and a co-author of *Comparative Political Leadership* (New York: McKay, 1973).

YUNG WEI (LL.B., National Chengchi University, Taiwan, China; M.A., Ph.D., University of Oregon) was born in Wuhan, China. He is Professor of Political Science at Memphis State University currently on leave to serve as Chairman of the Research, Development and Evaluation Commission of the Executive Yuan (Cabinet), Taiwan, Republic of China.

A National Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, for 1974-75, Dr. Wei is the editor of *Communist China: A System-Functional Reader* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972). Among his many publications is "A Methodological Critique of Current Studies on Chinese Political Culture," *Journal of Politics* (Spring 1976).

YUAN-LI WU (B.Sc. (Econ.), Ph.D., University of London) was born in Tientsin, China. He is the Chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of San Francisco. Dr. Wu was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in the United States during 1969-70. He is the author of a number of books and various publications on China and international economic and strategic topics. He is the editor of a forthcoming book on the economic condition of Chinese-Americans. He also chaired a recent Task Force of University Professors on economic issues facing Asian-Americans.

SUNG CHUL YANG (B.A., Seoul National University; M.A., Hawaii; Ph.D., University of Kentucky) was born in Kok Sung, South Cholla Province, Korea. He is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Kentucky Center at Fort Knox. Dr. Yang has contributed chapters and articles on Korea to books and journals.

Yong Soon Yim (Ph.D., Rutgers University) is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Virginia Commonwealth University. He has contributed to a number of professional journals on Asian and Korean affairs.

INTRODUCTION

CHÜN-TU HSÜEH

This book consists of the revised versions of several papers originally presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1971-75. The last chapter is partly based on the round-table conference discussions organized and presided by me at the APSA meeting in September 1976. This is not only a timely project in the spirit of the Bicentennial and at a time of increasing awakening of ethnic problems, but also an attempt to study a unique subject heretofore unexplored. Furthermore, the Asian aspect of American society is not irrelevant to the understanding of the societies on the other side of the Pacific.

In the United States, there are about 900 women (including graduate students), 200 Chicanos (including 30 Ph.D.s), 125 black Ph.D.s (in addition to some 400 students), and several hundred Asian political scientists. Most of the Asian political scientists with Ph.D.s in the United States are academicians. In the U.S. academic community, there are at least 250 Asian political scientists with Ph.D.s, including 125 Koreans, 50 Chinese, and 75 other Asians. These are small numbers in view of the fact that there were 4,678 full-time "Oriental" faculty members in the country in 1972-73; but they amount to nearly one-third of the members of the Association for Asian Studies in the field of political science in 1972.

Not all Asian political scientists in North America are U. S. or Canadian citizens, but we assume that most of them are citizens or permanent residents of the United States, that if they are not, eventually they will attain this status, and that for a number of reasons most of them will not return to the countries of their origin except for temporary visits. Therefore, for the purpose of our discussions, they are all considered as a segment of the Asian-American population, and as such they reflect part of a larger problem of all the Asian-Americans.

Until recently, Asian-Americans have been neglected as a minority in social studies, by the government, and in politics. In a survey of 482 articles in three leading sociology journals representing a total of 165 years of publication, 344 (71%) dealt with blacks, 28 (6%) with American Jews, 18 with Japanese-Americans, and 14 with Chinese-Americans.¹ Federal laws

1. Abraham D. Lavender and John M. Forsyth, "The Sociological Study of Minority Groups as Reflected by Leading Sociological Journals," *Ethnicity*, Vol. 3,

enacted for the benefit of racial minorities were often inapplicable to Asian-Americans.

No Asian-American has attained a very high position in the executive branch of the government, not to mention the same level of prominence comparable to that of German-born Henry Kissinger (former Secretary of State), Polish-born Zbigniew Brzezinski (National Security Adviser to the President), or Secretary of the Treasury W. Michael Blumenthal. The appointment of Blumenthal in 1977 was the most interesting case. This "man from Shanghai" left Germany in 1938 and came to the United States in 1947 at the age of 21. Whether these gentlemen could have achieved the same distinguished careers if they were of Asian origin is not difficult to answer.

There are approximately 2.5 million Pacific/Asian-Americans in a total population of 212 million in the United States. However, it was not until Hawaii had become the 50th state and the election of Hiram L. Fong in 1959 that the United States had a Chinese-American senator for the first time in its history. It is significant to note, however, that although Senator Fong retired in December 1976, there are now three Japanese-American senators and one Japanese-American congressman in the 95th Congress (1977-78) of 535 members. To point to an extraordinary example, Senator Sam Hayakawa of California was elected at the age of 70! By and large and until recently, however, Asian-Americans had not been active in politics.

Three Chinese-American physicists have been awarded Nobel Prizes in the last two decades. Political science, however, is a field in which it is especially difficult to establish oneself professionally, not to mention to attain prominence. Asian political scientists in America share some common problems with their non-Asian colleagues in the profession, but, as the following essays show, some of their problems are closely related to their ethnic origins. It is the latter aspect of the problems that is the focus of the pioneering studies collected in this volume. The subject is also approached by several scholars from non-Asian viewpoints. Several problems may be presented here for discussion.

First, recognition and representation. Asian and American political scientists who specialize in Asian politics are often

No. 4 (December 1976), pp. 390 and 392. This study is based on a survey of *American Journal of Sociology* (January 1900), *American Sociological Review* (February 1936), and *Social Forces* (November 1922) through December 1974. There are no categories on Koreans or other Asian groups.

considered as area specialists rather than political scientists by their colleagues, although our culture-bound American political science is actually the biggest area study of all.² Thus the problem of recognition is closely related to the field of most Asian political scientists and to the parochial intellectual orientation of the mainstream of the American political science. As Professor John K. Fairbank of Harvard University pointed out, American political scientists,

though in a discipline which seems not to be moribund, have generally succeeded thus far in avoiding the challenge of the Chinese political record — in spite of the fact that it . . . represents, after all, the most long-continued experience of government, in the most populous of states, in human history.³

This remarkable parochialism on the part of Western political science [Fairbank suggested] has resulted from a mistaken doctrine of scientific universalism which forbids “regional” specialization. Political scientists trained in the data, concepts, and languages of Western political life, having divided their science into logical nonregional categories, have thereby estopped themselves from studying politics among the majority of mankind, who happen always to have lived in the Asian region.⁴

Thus the non-Asian American political scientists study the Western man but talk about mankind in general.

To the best of my knowledge, no Asian has ever served on the APSA Council. In fact, I was probably the first Asian-American ever nominated by any group to the Council. The APSA election in December 1976 fully revealed apathy of its members. Less than one-third of the 15,000 members cast their ballots. The APSA president was elected by 3,337 votes, while a Council member was elected by a mere 2,654 votes. None of the Council candidates nominated by the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS) was elected, with the exception of a black woman professor who was also an APSA nominee. I got 1,519 votes; there were two other candidates who each received 1,236 votes. It might just be a

2. Chalmers Johnson, “Political Science and East Asian Area Studies,” *World Politics* (July 1974), pp. 56-75.

3. John K. Fairbank, ed., *Chinese Thought and Institutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), Phoenix edition, 1967, p. 1.

4. *Ibid.*

coincidence, but I want to think that although I did not have a "Chinaman's chance," my "struggle" prompted the APSA establishment to move "ethnically" this time (probably the first time in its elections) by nominating a black woman.

After checking once again the qualifications and publications of all the candidates, I cannot honestly say that the rule of the game is, as a Western saying goes, "may the best man win." But I am confident, however, that APSA will eventually have to give due recognition to Asian political scientists in the organization. I only hope that the "beneficiary" will not be someone who is contemptuous of the Asian-American movement, as was the case in one professional association two years ago.

In a letter to the APSA Council, dated December 30, 1975, I argued that although the Asian-Americans were the minority of minorities, there were several hundreds of them in the profession, and that since the APSA had committees on the blacks, the Chicanos, and women, I believed that it should have an Asian committee in view of their numerical strength in the organization.

The APSA Council met on January 24-25, 1976 and discussed, among other things, my proposal. Its minutes read as follows:

The Council received a request from Chün-tu Hsüeh that the Association establish a Committee on the Status of Asians. [Herbert] Jacob [of Northwestern University] moved that the Council deny the request for the establishment of a Committee on the Status of Asians, but that the Council express the view that it is important for the Association to be responsive to interests and concerns of Asian political scientists, should publish professional notices in *PS*, make space available at Annual Meetings for meetings of Asian political scientists, and provide such other services as it is able to do. The motion was unanimously approved.

Subsequently, on March 1, 1976, I wrote to APSA Executive Director Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, requesting the Council to reconsider my proposal. Part of my letter reads as follows:

It is conceded that not all Asian-American scholars are interested in promoting their ethnic interests. In fact, in the high politics of the academic community, it may be the very Asian who takes a condescending attitude toward the activities of the Asian-American movement reaps the benefit of the symbolic gesture of the establishment in the high academic society. But those of us who are committed to the

cause are determined to carry out a protracted struggle and demand what we consider our "inalienable rights." I am sure that the Council can find excuses such as financial difficulties for not establishing an Asian Committee, yet I can cite a number of cases to show APSA's discrimination against the Asians at the time of affluence. Unless the Council can "scientifically" establish the validity of a triple standard for racial minorities, the expressed "concern," "interests" and provision of facilities offered in your letter cannot be considered as "equal opportunity" treatments.

I implore you to consider this letter as a formal request for the Council's reconsideration of my proposal, and forward it to all the Council members. Meanwhile, I am sending a copy of this letter to the *PS* editor for publication so that the Council's decision can be judged by "the masses." The issue has broad significant implications beyond the profession. Therefore, I am sending copies of this letter to those concerned with this sort of discriminations.

As expected, Mr. Walter E. Beach, editor of *PS* (an APSA publication), decided not to publish my letter without giving an explanation, and the Council in its February 1977 meeting did not reconsider my request.

Secondly, discrimination and identity. There is a general impression in this country (most of the time unspoken) that Asians are not objective in discussing Asian affairs, particularly in the case of China, which has been an emotional problem for many Americans since the 1940s. Ethnic Chinese are often classified by their fellow Americans and colleagues as "Peking men," or "Taiwan men" as if there is no "third road." (True, those who take an objective "third road" are invariably alienated from both camps.) But I have lived in the United States for such a long time I feel as ancient as an American Indian, and I do not believe that a person who has lived under more than one cultural environment is invariably biased when analyzing politics of the country of his birth. Otherwise, many émigré scholars would be disqualified to comment on the country of their origin, and U. S. politics should not be taught by native-born non-Asian Americans in order to maintain its objectivity. In fact, it is very doubtful that complete objectivity and value-free judgments are really possible in political studies because of the scholars' class origin and world view. Professor Alex Inkeles's statement on Soviet social development is equally applicable to Chinese studies:

How far there really are standards in economic, political, and sociological analysis which in a meaningful degree are truly neutral, is far from obvious to me. I do not feel that we can humanly treat an event so massive, one which touched so many lives over so many years, and which continues to win such deep commitment and arouse such profound antipathy, without, willy nilly, taking a stand.⁵

In any event, I believe that it is possible for a scholar of an "international set" to discuss the politics of any country with detachment regardless of his national origin.

Besides the intellectual bias and unjustified assumptions against the Asians mentioned above, blatant or subtle discrimination against Asian political scientists are part of the larger racial relations in the society. But sometimes it is difficult to determine the extent to which the problems of the Asian political scientists really have resulted from racial discrimination. There is no question, however, that exploitation of "cheap labor" does exist in the academic market.

According to a study of Professor Thomas Sowell of the University of California at Los Angeles, Asians lag significantly behind both blacks and whites with similar professional qualifications \$2,000 or \$3,000 in every field for any given level of degree and any given number of articles published in natural sciences. In the humanities, Orientals with five or more articles earned nearly \$2,000 less than blacks and nearly \$4,000 less than whites with the same publication records.⁶ But I strongly believe that there should be no discrimination against any faculty members in employment, promotion, or salary increments on the grounds of sex, race, age, seniority, status, or any other implicit or explicit double standard. "Contributions to the discipline" should not be narrowly defined, and merit judgment should not be wholly subjective. Approaches to the study of politics should be diversified.

Discrimination, identity and loyalty are more closely related than many people have generally realized. In a discussion of "Asians in America: Their Identity Crises and Problems" at the annual meeting of the Association for Asian Studies at San

5. Alex Inkeles, *Social Change in Soviet Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 2.

6. Thomas Sowell, *Affirmative Action Reconsidered* (Washington, D. C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1975), pp. 17-23.

Francisco Hilton in March 1975, I made the following remarks, part of which may be reiterated here:⁷

There is perhaps, truth in Karl Marx's statement that the crucial factor is not an individual's objective position in society, but his subjective interpretation of it. In any event, when an Asian-American feels that he is not accepted in this country, or that he is not well-integrated into the mainstream of this society, he should also ask whether he would be well accepted by the society of his origin, or, in effect, by any other societies. In the case of Chinese-Americans, class origin must be taken into consideration besides racial affinity and nationalist sentiment.

Emotional attachment to a country of one's origin is not a uniquely Chinese phenomena. It is quite common among ethnic groups all over the world. But if an Asian-American identifies with the country of his origin, it is only natural that he is not considered an American regardless of his citizenship. On the other hand, if he is not considered "one of us" by his fellow Americans, there is more reason for him to need a stronger emotional tie to the country of his origin. Thus a vicious cycle between racial discrimination and emotional loyalty develops.

It usually takes a long time for a sense of identity towards an adopted country to transpire, and it is not uncommon for a naturalized Asian-American to deride other Asians who become American citizens because the behavior of the latter signifies a relinquishment of commitments and "patriotism" to their former motherland. While an Asian-American may criticize his fellow Americans for not accepting him as one of them, perhaps he should also undertake "self-criticism" concerning his mentality and commitments. This is not a question of cultural pluralism versus assimilation.

For many years, Chinese in Southeast Asia and elsewhere have been criticized for rejecting assimilation, without mentioning the fact that the policy of the colonial and other governments was designed to prevent assimilation. In recent years, cultural pluralism, i.e., strong identification with an ethnic group, has been very much in vogue in the

7. Chün-tu Hsüeh, "Cultural Pluralism," *Bridge: An Asian American Perspective* (New York), August 1975, p. 41.

United States, and yet the same old criticism against overseas Chinese remains. The critics have often used contradictory sets of facts or standards to suit their own bias. For example, cultural pluralism in America, yes; cultural pluralism in Malaysia, no. Few people have overtly justified the Chinese attempts in Malaysia to preserve their cultural heritage. Even fewer have criticized the racial quota and other discriminatory acts of the Kuala Lumpur government, whose racist policy is hardly conducive to create Malaysian identity and emotional loyalty for the Malaysians of Chinese origin. Responsible people generally have a sense of responsibility if they feel that they are trusted.

Third, language difficulties. Several contributors in this volume have mentioned language difficulties of Asian political scientists, particularly those of foreign-born scholars, as a hindrance for their advancements. While not underestimating this shortcoming, especially spoken English, we should note that a number of distinguished political scientists in America do speak English with strong European accents. Furthermore, we should also note that in recent years there has been a great deal of criticism of the native-born Americans for their poor English. Nowadays, many students, bureaucrats, journalists and social scientists either cannot write simple and clear English, or simply murder the language in their writings.⁸ Their problems are more serious than that of Asian-Americans whose errors in prepositions, tense and other simple grammatical errors can be corrected by a copy-editor. It is not an insurmountable difficulty, because even the most distinguished American writers and professors do need a copy-editor's assistance.

As early as 1949, Professor Lindsay Rogers of Columbia complained about the "language of politics."⁹ Apparently, there was no significant improvement as *The New York Times* of August 9, 1963 reported that Washington University at St. Louis launched a program (\$135,000 a year) to translate "social science into English on the ground that 'many valuable research discoveries' are now lost to uncomprehending laymen." In 1964, Professor W. M. Frohock of Harvard University discussed in the

8. For samples, see Edwin Newman, *Strictly Speaking* (New York: Warner Books, 1974) and Paul Morgan and Sue Scott, *The D. C. Dialect* (New York: Washington News Books, 1975).

9. Lindsay Rogers, "Notes on the Language of Politics," *Political Science Quarterly* (December 1949), pp. 209-32.

New York Times Book Review academic studies “which, by the close reading of familiar texts, illuminate what is already not badly lighted.” Such literary activity, he said, “goes on everywhere — professors writing for other professors in periodicals which other professors edit.” This “academic discipline,” he added, “has little to do with the literary life of the country as a whole.”¹⁰

Another random example can be given. On the eve of his departure for Europe in 1969, President Nixon issued a statement of his mission. “There are three general categories that should be mentioned,” he announced. “First, I would expect to discuss all bilateral matters of substance which the other element may want to bring up and also those which we might think appropriate. Second, it would be my intention to discuss also multilateral matters . . . Third, there will be a substantial amount of time spent on subject that are neither bilateral or multilateral — or relating to Europe . . .”

“Translated” by *The Washington Post* editorial of February 24, 1969, “what the President meant to say was that in Europe he will discuss subjects of special interest to the countries he is visiting, subjects of special European — or alliance — concern, and subjects that do not fit either description.” The editorial concludes that was “more or less what we had surmised that he would do, until we were temporarily thrown off by his attempt at clarification government-style.”

What would the political scientists say about the death of George Washington? Some would have put it in a conceptual framework by stating that “his mortal existence achieved its termination,” or that “a definite determination of infinity had been further determined by its own negation.” Instead of simply saying “supply determines demand,” they would say that the “choice of exogenous variables in relation to multi-colinearity is contingent upon the derivations of certain multiple correlation coefficients.” Of course, language is a living thing, but Asian political scientists should be aware of the pitfalls of following some of these “models” when they make a conscientious effort to improve their English.

Besides the above three categories of problems, the essays and commentaries in this volume also deal with a number of other topics that should interest people in and out of the profession. The contributors do not necessarily agree with each other on specific

10. Quoted by Lindsay Rogers, “Notes on ‘Political Science’,” *Political Science Quarterly* (June 1964), p. 220.

facts, interpretations, or strategies to promote their professional and ethnic interests. We have a point of view, and we are not afraid to put it across, even if it makes some people angry.

There has been a growing awareness among the political scientists of Asian origin in the United States for the need to get organized; to fight for their "inalienable rights" and vested interests in America; and to have inputs to the formulation of the Asian foreign policy in Washington. They believe that their talents have not been utilized by the government on a high level, and that they do have a great deal to offer both to the profession and to the country. At the same time, they are also increasingly aware of the fact that Asians or Asian-Americans tend to be less demanding and assertive than members of other ethnic groups in America. They tend to avoid the spotlight and publicity, indifferent if not disdainful toward American politics while actively involved (at least for some of them) in the periphery of politics concerning their countries of origin.

We should carry on "self-criticism," and earnestly examine whether our failure is not *partly* due to our own fault rather than exclusively due to the "objective condition" or other factors.

College Park, Maryland
February 1977

Chapter 1**THE ROLE OF ASIAN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN THE
UNITED STATES: EVALUATIONS
AND PROJECTIONS**

YUNG WEI

In recent years, there has been a growing awareness among political scientists of Asian origin in the United States of their special role both in the discipline of political science as well as in the teaching profession. The organization of the Caucus of the Foreign Born Political Scientists reflected the common interest of the political scientists who were born in foreign countries; among them a large percentage were Asian political scientists. The renaming of the Caucus as the Asian Political Scientists Group (APSG) in 1973 further clarified the identity and concerns of the Asian political scientists in America and served to differentiate them from the European political scientists who were also foreign born. The change of name of the Caucus into APSG resulted partially from the findings of a research survey conducted by Lal Goel and Kuroda in which they found that, among the foreign born political scientists, the Asians really have problems which are rather different from those encountered by persons of European birth.¹ Although it was pointed out by the Executive Committee of the APSG that the renaming of the organization does not preclude a continuing interest in increasing communication among cultural minorities and with other members of the American Political Science Association, the naming of the group as The Asian Political Scientists Group does reflect more accurately the feeling of the majority of the members in the former group, i.e., the Asians in the Caucus of the Foreign Born Political Scientists.

This chapter examines the current status of the political scientists of Asian origin in the United States, identifies the

This chapter is a revised version of a paper originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Palmer House, Chicago, August 29-September 2, 1974.

1. Mandan Lal Goel and Yasumasa Kuroda, "Foreign Born Political Scientists in North America," paper delivered at 1973 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, La., September, 4-8, 1973;

special problems confronting the Asian political scientists, and projects the future pattern of professional development for the Asian political scientists in North America. In the last part of the chapter, several suggestions are offered to the Asian political scientists for both their role in the discipline of political science and for their career development in the teaching profession.

I

As a minority in the American political science profession, the Asian political scientists are a rather distinct group. The uniqueness of the Asian political scientists can be seen by reviewing their national origin, birth place, age, sex and major fields of interest.² First of all, the overwhelming majority of the Asian political scientists are not born in the United States. They are a part of the overall phenomenon of inter-nation intellectual migration throughout the world.³

Before coming to the United States, most of them had already gone through a series of strict screening processes in their own countries. This means that they generally belong to a select group from the very top brackets of the educational systems of the Asian nations. As scholars who migrated from Asia to the United States, the problems of Asian political scientists include both those of a minority as well as those of immigrants. It must be pointed out, however, that, although the majority of the Asian political scientists are not born in the United States, most of them apparently have chosen to stay on a permanent basis. This is demonstrated by the fact that 40 to 44% have already become American citizens, and an additional 33.1% have already acquired permanent residence status as of 1972.⁴

As for national origin, scholars from East Asia constitute the highest percentage (47.6%) among all the Asian political scientists in America, followed by 30.6% from South Asia and 21.3% from West Asia. The largest groups came from Korea and China. Most

Yasumasa Kuroda, "Asian Political Scientists in North America: Their Aspirations and Problems," paper prepared for delivery at the 1971 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, September 7-11, 1971. See Chapters 5 and 2 of this volume, respectively.

2. Data reported in this section are from Lal Goel and Kuroda, *op. cit.* For more detailed information, consult Chapter 5 of this book.

3. See Yung Wei, "Social Psychological Variables and the Inter-Nation Intellectual Migration," Working Paper No. 15, Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section, International Studies Association (Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, 1974).

4. Lal Goel and Kuroda, *op. cit.*

Asian political scientists in North America are relatively young. The average age of the Asian political scientists is around 40. They have been in the United States for 12 years or more.⁵

Other than place of birth, national origin and age, two other interesting characteristics of the Asian political scientists have been their major fields of interest and sex. The overwhelming majority of the Asian political scientists have majored either in international relations or in comparative politics, with 45.3% in the former field and 32.6% in the latter. Fewer than 8% of the Asian political scientists in Lal Goel and Kuroda's sample are women.

In terms of professional ranks, the Asian political scientists seem to have an adequate share of full professors, ranging from 27.7% for East Asians to 36.8% for the West Asians. More than half of the Asian political scientists are tenured.

The Asian political scientists in the profession have a relatively good record of publication. It was found that more than 30% of the Asian political scientists have at least one book published. The record was highest among the western Asians in the profession, with 47.4% of them having at least one book published.⁶

II

Simply by looking at the ranks, tenure and publication of the Asian political scientists, there do not seem to be any serious problems for the political scientists of Asian origin. Yet, a great number of Asian political scientists nevertheless believe that it is a great deal harder for them to achieve success in the profession of American political science. For instance, between 43.5 and 50% of the Asian political scientists believe they had a hard time in professional development in the United States which is a sharp contrast to less than 3% of the western European and eastern European political scientists.⁷ Quite a few of the political scientists of the Asian origin, especially the South Asians and the West Asians, also complain of racial discrimination.

One may argue that these feelings among Asian political scientists of being discriminated against and of having to try much harder are simply subjective sentiments which have not been substantiated by empirical data. There are, however, certain

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*

areas in which there is some evidence to support the complaints of the Asian political scientists. For instance, the percentages of eastern Asians and south Asians teaching in the Ph.D. awarding departments are substantially lower than the political scientists of European origin. A much higher percentage of East Asian and South Asian political scientists are teaching at institutions with less than 3000 students.

Moreover, according to a report made by the Personnel Service of the APSA, only two of the nineteen Oriental political scientists who were looking for jobs in 1971 were able to find employment. This was contrasted to 46.9% of their white colleagues who sought and obtained appointments in the same year.⁸ The situation, however, was improved in the year 1972. It was reported of the fourteen Orientals looking for jobs in the profession, six found positions, which constitutes 42.9% of the job seekers of Oriental origin. The ratio of successful job seekers is very close to the overall white average (44.5%). Also, there was no difference in terms of citizenship, for it was found that among the non-citizens, 40% found new positions as compared with 44.2% of the citizens. The authors of the 1972 APSA Personnel Service Survey, however, pointed out that, "We cannot be sure whether this change is due to an improvement in the market for Orientals and the non-U.S. citizens or is due to self-selections of the respondents."⁹

Another area of difficulty for the Asian political scientists is found in the area of applying for research grants, because many of the grant applications require U.S. citizenship. This automatically rules out many of the Asian political scientists who are permanent residents and yet are not U.S. citizens.¹⁰

There are also complaints among the Asian political scientists that it is very difficult for them to move into administrative positions such as the chairperson of a department or the chairperson of important departmental committees such as the graduate program committee or the curriculum committee.

8. Rona B. Hitlin and Robert A. Hitlin, "Report on the 1971 APSA Personnel Service Survey," *PS* (Summer, 1972), pp. 358, 361.

9. Rona B. Hitlin and Robert A. Hitlin, "Report on the 1972 APSA Personnel Service Survey," *PS* 6 (Summer, 1973), pp. 344-348.

10. As a matter of fact, the representatives of the Asian Political Scientist Group formally recommended to the nominees for the officers in the APSA in 1973 that the federal government eliminate the requirement of citizenship for the application of federal grants to allow foreign born political scientists who are permanent residents to apply for these grants. See *PS* 7 (Winter, 1974) p. 52.

It may be argued that many of these problems simply reflect the problems of immigrants, that is, the problems of groups of people of foreign background in adjusting to American life and American society, of which the teaching profession is a part. Nevertheless, judging by the much lower level of dissatisfaction with their place in the political science profession among immigrant scholars from Europe, there must be some concrete grounds for the political scientists of Asian origin to feel that somehow they have not been able to move ahead as far as they should have moved in the profession. It is interesting to note in this connection that before the Caucus of the Foreign Born Political Scientists was organized, a considerable number of foreign born political scientists who were of European origin actually opposed the Caucus. It has been reported that 39.5% of the West Europeans and 52.9% of the East Europeans did not like the idea of the Caucus.¹¹

Kuroda pointed out in his 1971 paper that most of the problems of the Asians reflect a subtle discrimination against the group which is very difficult to substantiate by concrete data.¹² An unsystematic and randomized interview with some of the sympathetic white members of the American political science profession, conducted by this author in 1973, revealed another side of the coin. Some pointed out that there are indeed language problems for some of the political scientists of Asian origin. Others indicated that, in some instances, the Asian political scientists are overly sensitive to the treatment they receive from the members of the white majority and to their racial origin in their interaction with the larger profession. They also complained that the Asian political scientists, especially the East Asians, do not seem to have as much interest in interacting with their white colleagues, which has resulted in some kinds of a social distance between them.

The criticism of the white colleagues of the role of Asian political scientists in a way does not contradict the actual situation facing the Asians. For instance, according to the survey done by Lal Goel and Kuroda, only about 50% of the East Asians believed that they have an excellent command of the English language. Furthermore, the isolation of the Asian political scientists from other members of the profession could well be the result of a vicious cycle. The cycle may start with an

11. See Lal Goel and Kuroda, *op. cit.*

12. Kuroda, "Asian Political Scientists in North America," *op. cit.*

Asian political scientist feeling rejected or deliberately left out by the majority in his profession. This could be followed by a loss of interest in getting involved, or, as a defense mechanism, by avoiding contact with other members in the profession, which in turn could be taken as evidence of the lack of desire for mingling and participating with their white colleagues in group activities.

Judging by the existing data, it may be concluded that the Asian political scientists do have some problems in the profession. But it is difficult to determine to what extent the problem of the political scientists of Asian origin really resulted from racial discrimination by the majority. In comparison with women in the profession, the Asian political scientists certainly have better representation.¹³ And in comparison with black political scientists in the profession, the Asian political scientists obviously have much more representation.¹⁴

Therefore, it may be concluded that the problem of the Asian political scientists is not so much one of representation as of recognition. As a group of scholars who have gone through a highly selective process of training both in their native countries as well as in the institutions of higher learning in the United States, the Asian political scientists may rightly feel that they have not received as much recognition as they should have received from members of the political science profession. While women, blacks and Chicanos gain more attention by the APSA, as reflected in the fact that there are specific committees formally recognized by the APSA for each of these groups, the Asian political scientists may have a legitimate ground to complain that as a minority group, their aspirations and their problems have been received with, to borrow Daniel P. Moynihan's term, "benign neglect" by the majority of the members of the profession.

III

After the review of the current status of the Asian political scientists in America as well as the problems they are now facing, some projections of their future in the discipline and in the profession are in order. First of all, it is safe to say that the

13. For representation of women in the departments of political science in the United States, see Committee on the Status of Women, "Committee Reports, Data on Women in the Departments of Political Science," *PS* 7 (Winter, 1974), pp. 38-41.

14. For the status of the blacks in the profession, see Paul L. Puryean, "Interim Report of the APSA Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession" (August 31, 1969).

overwhelming majority of the political scientists of Asian origin will stay in North America. Despite the fact that many of the Asian political scientists have indicated a desire to go back to their home country at least once in a while, only a very small percentage have chosen to go back permanently. This is in correspondence with the overall tendency for migrant intellectuals in the United States.¹⁵ This means that a growing number of them will become American citizens, which will partially solve some of the problems which they are now confronting, such as the application for research grants.

As the Asian political scientists stay longer, more of them will become full professors and some may become chairpersons. As a group, the average age of the Asian political scientists will probably go up. This is based upon the fact that recently there has been a decline in the number of foreign students coming to the United States to pursue graduate studies, owing to a tightening of policy by the U. S. Immigration Service. More recently, there have been cases where even scholars of foreign origin who have already obtained jobs in the U.S. have been denied permanent residence by the immigration authority.

As the profession is still in an academic recession and is not likely to recover from it for a while, there will probably not be much mobility for the Asian political scientists. The majority of them will have to be satisfied with the institution where they are now located. Furthermore, it will not be easy for the Asian political scientists, just as other political scientists, to obtain new positions in the teaching profession. Certain political scientists of Asian origin will probably look for appointments in the non-teaching sectors, such as the Federal government and other private research institutions. This is especially true for those with U.S. citizenship.

Because the profession is faced with increasing difficulties in terms of funding and governance, the Asian political scientists probably will face more problems in the areas of tenure, promotion and salary. Whether they will have more problems than the average political scientist in the profession remains to be seen. The Asian political scientists, however, now have additional protection by the arrangement and action of the federal government. For instance, on October 1, 1972, J. Stanley Pottinger, Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, sent a memorandum to the college and

15. Wei, *op. cit.*

university presidents in which he specified the requirements for the institution of higher learning to comply with Executive Order 11246, "Non-discrimination Under Federal Contracts."¹⁶ According to this Executive Order, the nondiscrimination requirements apply to all persons, whether or not the individual is a member of conventionally defined "minority groups." There is, however, a requirement for affirmative action to determine whether there is "underutilization" of members of the "minority" group in their employment opportunities. Here the word "minorities" is defined by the Department of Labor as "Negroes, Spanish-surnamed, American Indians, and Orientals."¹⁷ "Underutilization" is defined as "having fewer women or minorities in a particular job than would be reasonably expected by their availability."¹⁸

Judging by the regulations of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it is reasonable to expect that the college administrators will exercise more caution when they handle the problem in relation to the professional development of academicians of "Oriental" origin, which clearly are covered by this executive act.

IV

Looking to the future, the author would like to make several suggestions. First, the Asian political scientists should plan carefully for their career development in the United States. This is necessary because many of the Asian political scientists are immigrants in this country and quite a few of them have frequently entertained the idea of going back to their own country of origin. It is, of course, good for the Asian nations to have their lost talents, such as the U.S. trained political scientists, back in their country of origin. Yet, if our data on the brain drain process can be a guide for future projection, then it is safe to predict that only a very small portion of the Asian political scientists in America will ever go back to their home country and stay. It is important, therefore, for individual Asian political scientists to carefully develop a long-term plan for professional development in the United States. Such a plan is needed even for those who believe that they will eventually go back to their country of origin,

16. J. Stanley Pottinger, "Memorandum to College and University Presidents" (Washington, D. C.: Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, October 1, 1972).

17. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

18. *Ibid.*

for without a clear-cut and detailed plan for career development, it is difficult for an individual to move ahead in any profession of any country.

A second recommendation is for the Asian political scientists to diversify their major areas of interest in the discipline of political science. There are simply too many Asian political scientists who are majoring in international relations and comparative politics. This creates problems for them in terms of opportunities for employment and in terms of competition with each other for career opportunities. Granted, it is only natural for the Asian political scientists to fall back on their knowledge in their country and area of origin by majoring in international relations and comparative politics. Surely it is rather convenient and, at time, rewarding for Asian political scientists to become "Asian specialists" within the discipline. Yet, by becoming Asian specialists, the Asian political scientists may actually, consciously or unconsciously, give up the opportunities of moving into other areas within political science which may provide better avenues for career development.

There are, of course, overt or hidden prejudices among the white colleagues that Asians are qualified to teach only Asian courses or to do competent research only in the Asian area, yet it is also a fact that many Asians allow themselves to be identified as purely Asian specialists and to be locked in that specific pocket within the discipline. This is a phenomenon which needs to be changed. There should be more Asian political scientists with a major interest in American politics, methodology, political psychology, normative and empirical theory, urban politics, and public administration. There may be initial difficulties both in terms of job opportunities as well as research grants, but eventually this change of orientation will pay off, for it will open new avenues for the Asian political scientists which have not been fully explored. In a way, this may be compared to moving out of the ghetto by racial minorities and joining the main stream of the American society, which has substantially improved their lot in the United States.

Whenever opportunities come up, the Asian political scientists should also participate more in departmental and professional decision-making processes. As a matter of fact, the HEW regulations specified that the minorities should have equal opportunities to become administrators and to participate in the decision-making bodies in the colleges and universities.¹⁹ This is

19. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

not to say that all the Asian political scientists should try to become chairpersons of a department, for that is not always the most rewarding job in the profession. But as more Asians are moving into higher ranks and as they are accumulating more experience and knowledge of the profession, they should not give up the opportunities to play a more important role in the planning of program development of the department or to become officers of professional associations. By assuming these roles they will not only improve their own career in the profession but also help other Asian political scientists in obtaining equal opportunities for employment and career development.

The Asian Political Scientists Group should conduct a survey of chairpersons of the departments of political science, especially those departments with Asian scholars. The survey of chairpersons should include questions such as: How do you evaluate the performance of the Asian political scientists as compared with their colleagues? Do you automatically assume that Asian scholars should primarily teach Asian courses? Will you hire more than one Asian in your department if they happen to be highly qualified and are not in the same field? Are you willing to assign Asian scholars to key committees and programs within the department? If not, what are the reasons? Answers from the chairpersons on these questions will be very helpful for the Asian Political Scientists Group to assess their roles and functions.

In achieving their goals, the Asian political scientists probably should not adopt the strategy of militant ethnic politics, for their problems are not exactly those of discrimination based upon ethnic origin. Their need is not so much that of obtaining academic qualification as of full recognition and equal opportunity in their career development in the profession. Therefore, it will be to their advantage to strive for the maintenance of professional standards and work for the goal of winning due recognition and respect from their white colleagues rather than taking too strong a militant stand against those in the so-called "establishment." This is not to say, however, that the Asian political scientists should not lend support to the goals and activities of other minority groups such as women, Chicanos, and blacks, for whatever they are fighting for and whatever they are going to gain will indirectly improve the professional role of the Asian political scientists.

It is most important for the Asian political scientists to acquire an understanding of their legal rights. The United States

is a society governed by law. When one is discriminated against, it does not always pay to be quiet and hope that his persecutor will become kinder after a while. The constitution of the United States protects all *persons* living within the United States. Unless specified by federal or state laws, a resident should not be denied employment for lack of U.S. citizenship. This is especially true when one has already acquired permanent resident status. A thorough understanding of the grievance process within the university, participation in professional groups such as American Association of University Professors, and an overall understanding of the legal system of the United States would be of great benefit in the long run.

It is the opinion of this author that the American Political Science Association should formally recognize the Asian Political Scientists Group, give it status of a committee, and allocate funds to support its activities. The establishment of such a committee does not have to be justified only by the minority status of the Asians. It can be justified on the ground that there are certain unique cultural and social backgrounds which bind the Asian political scientists together and which make interaction among members of the group more meaningful for them, which in turn can contribute to the professional development of the members of the American Political Science Association as a whole.

The Asian political scientists brought with them into this country their non-western background and knowledge which can complement very well other political scientists whose backgrounds are basically European-American. The fact that the political tradition and political life of more than half of the population of the world are in one way or another represented by the Asian political scientists in North America makes their participation in teaching, research and other activities in the profession a very significant facet of the overall development of political science in the United States. So far there has not been a Henry Kissinger, Carl Friedrich, Karl W. Deutsch, or Heinz Eulau among the Asian political scientists. But given more time and given the right conditions, there can well be original, imaginative, and productive scholars from among the ranks of Asian political scientists who have, thus far, not attained the level of distinction of *émigré* scholars of European origin.

It is therefore up to the Asian political scientists to work hard for recognition, to reach out for understanding by the members in a larger profession, and to forcefully develop their role and cultivate their stature both as political scientists and as members

of American society. Meanwhile, it is also up to the members of the Association at large to understand the feelings and the aspirations of the Asian political scientists, to appreciate their contribution to the discipline, and to provide the environment for a more complete integration of the Asians into the mainstream of the political science profession in North America.

Chapter 2

ASIAN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN NORTH AMERICA: THEIR ASPIRATIONS AND PROBLEMS

YASUMASA KURODA

1. INTRODUCTION

A sizable number of foreign-born political scientists in North America have certain feelings in regard to the status accorded them in the political science profession which they feel should be articulated in order to rectify that status. Of particular concern is the status of foreign-born political scientists of Asian and African origins, for although foreign-born political scientists of European origins undoubtedly have problems, these are not as serious as those faced by Afro-Asian political scientists, as the success of such figures as Karl Deutsch, Hans Morgenthau, Henry Kissinger and Heinz Eulau would seem to indicate.

As scholars who believe in empirical research, we recognize that it is necessary first to systematically examine the status of the foreign-born political scientists if any serious demands are to be made of those who are in the position to do something about the status of the foreign-borns.

This is a report on a preliminary study of the status of foreign-born political scientists of Asian origin who reside in North America. Two major questions with which this study was concerned with are: (1) What are the goals of the above-mentioned group? (2) What are some of the unique problems they face that are not shared by native-born American political scientists?

There were a number of serious problems involved in launching such a study without any funds. For example, it was not difficult to define the universe of our subject abstractly, but it was not an easy task to define the universe operationally. Attempts were made to reduce these problems to a minimum, keeping costs as low as possible.

The *universe* of subjects is operationally defined to include all foreign-born political scientists with Asian names listed in the 1968 Biographical Directory of the American Political Science

This chapter was originally prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 1971.

Association who (a) were then residing in the United States and its territories or in Canada, and (b) had completed their graduate education to the extent that they had left their graduate school and were holding a teaching, research or administrative position at a higher learning institution. All those for whom information was incomplete were eliminated. Graduate students were excluded because of the likelihood that they would have left the reported place of residence by March 1972 when our survey was conducted. Persons born in Asia but having non-Asian names — such as Fred Riggs and Totten Anderson, for example — were excluded. Asia was defined to include the entire Asian continent with the exception of Eastern Russia.

Lane reports that the average member of the Association moves about every three years.¹ Therefore, total dependence upon the 1968 Directory was obviously not the ideal way of obtaining the subjects, but in view of the minimum resources and time at my disposal, it was considered the most efficient method possible of obtaining the sample or the population. The present study can, at least, be used as the basis for a more comprehensive study in the future.

In going through the Directory twice, I counted 177 members who fell in the universe as outlined above. A decision then was made to send out a questionnaire to all 177 rather than obtain a sample from the universe. An average mail-back questionnaire is expected to yield anywhere from 20 to 60% cooperation. Conscious efforts were made to keep the questionnaire short and concise, and I am happy to report a high rate of cooperation among those who were reached through the mails. Sixty-six questionnaires were returned to the sender, marked either "address unknown" or "moved." Sixty-two respondents returned their questionnaires. All but one or two of them asked to receive a copy of the paper when it became available for distribution. Forty-eight persons failed to return their questionnaire even after the second wave of questionnaires was sent to all who had not responded within a month.

Efforts were made to see if those who responded had any characteristics that were different from those who had failed to respond or who could not be reached. Variables available from the *1968 Directory* such as country origin, highest degree obtained, place of residence, and age were run against the response variable. The results showed no appreciable differences among the

1. Robert Lane, "Open Letter to Members of the Association," PS Vol. IV, No. 2 (Spring 1971), pp. 147-51.

three groups, i.e., those who returned the questionnaire, those who failed to return the questionnaire, and those whom we were unable to reach.

2. THE FINDINGS

The first part of this section reports on the aggregate characteristics of the respondents, while the second part reports the findings from the analysis of the questionnaires.

Country Origin. The Asian nations included stretch from the Far to the Near East. Fifteen nations are represented in our study. Koreans top the list with 55 persons, constituting nearly one-third of the total. Chinese including Taiwanese (7) constitute the second largest group, with a total of 50. The third group consists of Indians and Pakistanis (28). The rest of the nations are represented by ten or fewer respondents as follows: Japan (10), Iraq (7), Palestine (6), Lebanon (5), Iran (4), Jordan (4), Israel (3), Malaysia (2), Philippines (2) and Vietnam (1).

Korea, with a relatively small population in East Asia, has produced a remarkable number of political scientists in North America. Her neighbor Japan has sent only ten political scientists. In South Korea persons with American Ph.D. degrees are leading figures among the political scientists, while in Japan all productive political scientists, with the exception of one prominent scholar, are domestically trained, although many of them have done some study abroad without going through graduate training as such.²

Age. The oldest subject was born in 1900 and the youngest in 1940. The mode subject was born in 1933. Thus, the large majority of the subjects are in their late 30's at this time. They, therefore, are not in the highest possible position in their profession.

Place of Residence. Our subjects were found to be located in 38 of the 50 states in the United States as well as in Guam, and Canada. New York State had the largest number of subjects, namely 25, while California had 16, Massachusetts 10, and Pennsylvania and Virginia 9 each. With the possible exception of Massachusetts, the figures tend to correlate with the size of the state. I received the impression while going through the Directory that an overwhelming number of subjects were serving as

2. Yasumasa Kuroda, "Recent Japanese Advances in Human Sciences," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. VII, No. 6 (February 1964), pp. 3-8; Yasumasa Kuroda, "Recent Japanese Advances in Political Science," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. XII, No. 3 (January-February 1969), pp. 3-10.

chairman of their department in small colleges throughout the country. A few respondents held positions at the nation's major universities.

Highest Degree. Approximately 70% of the subjects had obtained a Ph.D. degree or its equivalent by 1967, while the remaining 30% had completed their Master's degree or its equivalent. It is speculated that many of the latter were completing their Ph.D. dissertation.

The above aggregate characteristics of the subjects were obtained from the *Directory*. We are now ready to report the findings from the returned questionnaires.

Citizenship. Twenty-nine out of the 62 respondents who returned the questionnaire reported that they are the U.S. citizens, while the remaining 33 respondents remain citizens of their country of origin. It would probably be safe to estimate that about one-half of the foreign-born political scientists of Asian origins in North America are naturalized citizens of the United States. Two Canadian residents returned the questionnaire, both of whom turned out to be non-citizens.

Intention to Stay in North America. To the question "Are you intending to stay in the United States (Canada)?," 76% of the respondents (N=47) answered "Yes." Ten respondents, constituting 16% of the respondents, indicated that they had no interest in staying in North America. The five remaining respondents (8%) reported that they did not really know. Consequently, we would conclude that roughly three-fourths of the foreign-born political scientists of Asian origin in North America are likely to stay for the rest of their life in North America.

Goals. We asked bluntly what the respondent's goals were as a political scientist. The most popular answer was "teaching and research" (N=29). Other goals were mentioned much less frequently in the answers to this open-ended question, as follows: "research publication" 8, "research and policy change" 5, "teaching" 4, "contribute to policy change" 4, "to teach at a leading university" 2, "to be a good political scientist" 2, and "miscellaneous" 4. Thus, the most valued goal of the subjects would seem to be a combination of research publication and teaching. If we were to separate research from teaching and other

goals, the respondents would seem to value research the most, teaching second, and political engineering third.

Problems. The respondents were asked to list specific problems they had encountered in their attempts to achieve the goals they had just described. Of the 56 who answered the question, 15 (27%) said that they had encountered no problems. Of the rest 19 mentioned one problem, 14 two problems, 3 three problems, and 5 four or more problems (Table 1).

Table 1. Problems Mentioned

Problem Areas	Problems Mentioned				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Total
1. Research funds	16	5	0	1	22
2. Job difficulties	9	6	0	0	15
3. Subtle racial (ethnic) discrimination (slower promotion, lower pay, etc.)	10	0	1	0	11
4. Environmental support (e.g., no colleagues to talk to, poor libraries)	2	3	0	1	6
5. Professional activities (e.g., difficult to get on the APSA panel)	1	0	2	1	4
6. Promotion	1	2	0	0	3
7. Salary	0	0	2	0	2
8. Miscellaneous	4	7	4	2	16

Some respondents appear to have been influenced by the examples given in my question, which read "What specific problems (e.g., research funds, job, etc.) have you encountered in your attempts to achieve these goals?" The difficulty of getting research funds is mentioned most often (22 times); next are problems in getting a good job (15 times) and racial discrimination as manifested in slower promotion and lower pay (11 times). Six persons complained about their inability to find anyone to talk to about their research activities or libraries to go to for these activities. The language problem was mentioned by only one respondent. Thus, the three major problems facing Asian political scientists in North America are the lack of research funds, difficulties in getting a good position, and subtle discrimination against them. Those who mentioned racial or ethnic discrimination invariably qualified their statement by adding an adjective

such as "subtle" or stating that this is something that cannot be proved but that is felt to exist.

Unique Problems. The last question asked was, "Do you feel that you, as a foreign-born political scientist, have any special problems that are not shared by other political scientists?" One-third of the respondents responded negatively to this question. Three respondents said that foreign-born political scientists might have some advantages over the native-born, although the same three acknowledged that there are problems unique to the foreign-born. Their answer was thus, in a way, "yes and no." See Table 2.

Table 2. Unique Problems Faced

Problems	Problems Mentioned				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
1. Subtle racial discrimination	8	4	1	1	14
2. Language difficulties	6	1	1	1	9
3. Not being fully understood because of cultural differences	5	1	0	0	6
4. Barrier between Asians and indigenous Americans	4	2	0	0	6
5. Research grants to citizens only	4	1	0	0	5
6. Lower salary	3	1	1	0	5
7. Slower promotion	1	4	0	0	5
8. Job difficulties	2	1	0	0	3
9. Miscellaneous	3	4	4	2	13

Among those who said that there are problems, 7 mentioned nothing specific, 15 mentioned one problem, 11 specified two problems, and 6 cited three or more problems. Table 2 displays the frequency distribution of each problem mentioned by the respondents. The most often mentioned problem is definitely subtle racial or ethnic discrimination, cited 14 times; this is followed by language difficulties, cited 9 times. Other problems frequently mentioned are: problems of not being fully understood by others because of cultural differences (6 times), felt barrier between Asians and the native-born (6 times), lower salary (5 times), slower promotion (5 times), lack of research grants for non-citizens (5 times), job difficulties in general (3 times), and other miscellaneous problems (13 times). These categories, with the exception of the miscellaneous category, can be divided into three groups. First, categories 1 (lower salary), 2 (slower promotion), 3 (racial

discrimination), and 4 (job difficulties), as presented in Table 2, are problems the respondents feel exist because they are Asians vis-à-vis white Americans. The respondents feel their salary is low in relation to others in the department because they are racially and culturally different. In this sense, the large majority of the unique problems faced by Asian political scientists appear to be based on the question of racial discrimination. The second group of problems seem to derive from the cultural adjustment process. The respondents continue to feel that there are barriers of some sort between them and others. These problems ought to be distinguished from the problems of racial discrimination, although the two groups are closely related. The last group of problems is that of language difficulties faced by foreign-born political scientists whose native tongue is not English.

In view of the fact that the total number of responses was only 62, any attempt to analyze the data faces the problem of small *N*'s. We did analyze the data as much as we could. However, the findings are not as meaningful as we had hoped they would be because of the small number of respondents involved. For this reason, rather than presenting the findings in tables, a decision was made to provide a series of propositions which we believe would be statistically significant if a sufficient number of the respondents were involved in the analysis.

3. PROPOSITIONS

On the basis of preliminary data analyses of the data, the following propositions are offered for further inquiry.

U.S. Citizenship

1.1. Those respondents with a Ph.D. degree are more likely to become citizens than those with a Master's degree.

1.2. Those of the foreign-born who are U.S. citizens are more likely to plan to stay in the United States than are citizens of other countries.

1.3. Those who are not U.S. citizens are more likely to perceive racial discrimination and research funding as problems than are citizens.

Future Plans

2.1. Korean political scientists are least likely to plan on staying in the United States.

2.2. The older the respondent, the more likely it is that he plans to stay in North America.

2.3. Those who plan to stay in North America tend to see fewer problems than those who plan to repatriate.

2.4. Those who do not plan to stay in North America are more likely to perceive of the lack of research funds as a problem than are those who plan to stay in North America.

2.5. Those who plan to stay in North America are more likely to perceive of getting a good job as a problem than those who do not plan to stay.

Major Problems

3.1. Respondents with Ph.D.'s tend to perceive more problems than those respondents without Ph.D.'s.

3.2. Non-citizen respondents are more likely to perceive of the lack of research funds as a problem than are U.S. citizens.

Unique Problems

4.1. East Asians and South Asians are more likely to perceive unique problems than are West Asians.

4.2. Respondents with Ph.D.'s are more likely to perceive unique problems than those without Ph.D.'s.

4.3. Those who perceive problems which might be shared by others are more likely also to perceive problems that are unique to foreign-born political scientists in North America.

4.4. The younger the respondent, the more likely he is to perceive unique problems.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present preliminary inquiry into the status of Asian political scientists in North America found that nearly 60% of the Asia-born political scientists teaching in North America are either Koreans or Chinese, including those from Taiwan. The great majority of these respondents were born in the 1930s. They appear to be located most frequently in relatively unknown colleges in North America. Two-thirds of them possess Ph.D. degrees. About one-half of them are U.S. citizens. Two-thirds of them intend to stay in North America.

Their aspirations seem to vary little from those of any other political scientists in North America. They want first to engage in

research activities. Second, they want to teach and third, they are interested in political engineering.

The major problems faced by political scientists of Asian origin are lack of research funds, difficulties in obtaining a good position, and subtle racial discrimination. The major unique problems not shared by other political scientists in North America consist of racial discrimination, cultural adjustment problems and language problems.

The present preliminary inquiry into the status of the foreign-born did point to certain unique problems we are faced with which our indigenous colleagues are not confronted with. The problems appear to be of sufficient magnitude to require a more systematic investigation and subsequent action to rectify the status of the foreign-born in North America today. Second, the nature of the problems of racial discrimination is such that no systematic inquiry is likely to produce sufficient evidence in favor of foreign-borns who feel discriminated against.

Chapter 3**KOREAN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN NORTH
AMERICA: THEIR STATUS
AND ASPIRATIONS****SE-JIN KIM AND SUNG CHUL YANG**

War often serves as a catalyst in transforming the basic socio-political structures of the affected nations. This was certainly the case in South Korea. The Korean War of 1950-53 led to the dismantling of the traditional socio-political system based on the landed gentry classes. The American presence in South Korea during and after the war had a significant impact on the course of South Korean nation-building. An unexpected result of U.S. involvement in Korea has been the massive influx of Korean students to American institutions of higher learning. Some came in search of American education, which epitomized modern science and technology and also was considered the key to success in the ear of pax-Americana; others came in order to avoid the hardship of Korean military service, since military deferment was given to students going abroad until 1959. Still others came because it was the popular thing to do for young persons with proper family background. In the years following the termination of the Korean War, nearly one thousand students came annually to the United States.

During the past twenty years, nearly fifty thousand Korean students have matriculated in American colleges and universities. According to preliminary studies by the South Korean government, some 1,300 of these students have obtained terminal or professional degrees in their areas of specialization; another 2,000 have received Master's degrees. One would have expected that production of such a large number of highly educated persons would be a boon to any developing country. This certainly should have been the case in Korea, where under Japanese colonial rule Koreans had been kept deliberately undereducated. Quite contrary to expectations, however, nearly two-thirds of American-educated Korean Ph.D.'s have chosen to stay in the U.S. rather than return

This chapter was originally prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, August 1974.

to their homeland. In the 1960s, when the U.S. was experiencing unprecedented expansion in education and industry, these individuals easily found employment in their chosen professions.

The deteriorating political situation in South Korea has further tempted Korean professionals to remain in the U.S. The decision to do so has been facilitated by the liberalization of American immigration laws in the 1960s. (The old quota system, which limited Korean immigration to 100 per year, came to an end in 1968 as a result of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965.) Once these Korean intellectuals became comfortably settled in American economic life, the idea of returning to a politically unstable and economically uncertain South Korea became repugnant. This was particularly so among those who have specialized in social sciences and humanities, disciplines which the South Korean Government regards unnecessary to the task of modernizing the country.

After ten to twenty years of American life, first as foreign students and subsequently as permanent residents or naturalized citizens, Korean intellectuals are now at the crossroads. The initial euphoria of academic success and professional placement has begun to wane. Koreans are experiencing limitations in upward mobility in this Darwinistic world of competition and indifference. Indeed, Korean intellectuals are in this dilemma just at the time when there is evidence of growing resistance to foreign-born persons lacking an electoral constituency. The euphemism known as Equal Opportunity Employer has a negative effect on employment and promotion when applied to Asian-Americans, except in Hawaii and California.

The present study was undertaken out of concern for the predicament in which many Korean intellectuals now find themselves. Its purpose was to ascertain the status and aspirations of specifically Korean political scientists, since it is in this discipline that Korean academicians are most heavily concentrated in North America. Some specific questions to be raised in this study are: (1) how Korean political scientists perceive the relationship between effort and reward in academia; (2) what kinds of difficulties and limitations they face in and out of the academic marketplace; (3) wherein lie their future professional goals; (4) why they choose to remain in the United States; and (5) how active they are in scholarly research and publication.

To collect relevant data for this study, a short survey was conducted in May and June of 1974. Questionnaires were sent to all known Koreans now engaged in teaching or research in North

America. Of the 110 persons polled, 39 responded, making this sample representative of 35.5% of those holding teaching positions. These 39 comprise 41.1% of those holding Ph.D. degrees. Though not representative of the entire body of Korean political scientists, the data from which this paper is written should be considered statistically significant. This survey was supplemented by extensive informal talks with persons supportive of this study. More than a dozen persons supplied sensitive information not called for in the questionnaire.

Let us first look at a statistical and biographical profile of Korean political scientists (Tables 1-3). The latest directory of the

Table 1. Institutions Awarding Doctoral Degrees in Political Science to Koreans Teaching in North America, 1974

Columbia University	9	Tulane	1
N. Y. U.	7	U. C. — Berkeley	1
University of Pennsylvania	7	Chicago	1
University of Maryland	5	Connecticut	1
Southern California	5	Cornell	1
American University	4	Florida	1
Massachusetts	4	Hawaii	1
Cincinnati	3	Iowa	1
Claremont	3	Johns Hopkins	1
Georgetown	3	Kansas	1
Illinois	3	Kentucky	1
Minnesota	3	Charles (Czechoslovakia)	1
Rutgers	3	Missouri	1
Southern Illinois University	3	Oklahoma	1
Fletcher School	2	Oregon	1
George Washington	2	Princeton	1
Indiana	2	U. C. L. A.	1
Michigan	2	Stanford	1
Nebraska	2	Virginia	1
Syracuse	1		

There are also about 19 Ph.D. candidates (A. B. D.'s) teaching in the U.S.

Table 2. Korean Political Scientists with
U.S. Ph.D. Degrees, Now Residing
in Korea

Current Affiliations			
University			
Seoul National University	6		
Korea University	3		
Yonsei University	3		
Foreign Studies University	2		
Sokang University	1		
Chungang University	1		
Kookmin University	1		
Sookmyung University	1		
Pusan University	1		
Members of the Korean National Assembly	3		
Administration and Diplomacy	7		
Private Business or Institute	6		
Total	36		
Institutions Awarding Ph.D. Degrees			
American University	6	Hawaii	1
Yale	3	U. C. L. A.	1
New York University	3	Columbia	1
Michigan	3	Florida	1
Minnesota	2	Pennsylvania	1
Harvard	1	Fletcher School of Diplomacy	1
Princeton	1	Oregon	1
U. C. — Berkeley	1	Indiana	1
Illinois	1	Oklahoma	1
George Washington	1	Duke	1
Tulane	1	Unknown	5
Pittsburg	1		
Total		Total	36

Association of Korean Political Scientists in North America (formed in 1972) lists 132 members on its mailing list. The officers of the AKPSNA believe that there may be another ten or so unidentified Korean scholars. Among the identified persons, 95 hold doctoral degrees, 91 of whom are now engaged in teaching, 1

in researching, and 3 in business. Another 10 persons are teaching at the college level without completing their terminal degrees. The remaining persons are either graduate students or non-teaching individuals engaged in research and/or other activities.

Table 3. Number of Years of Teaching

	Frequency	Percentage
1-3 years	5	12.8
4-5 years	10	25.7
7-9 years	12	30.8
10 or more years	11	28.2
No answer	1	2.6
Total	39	100

Koreans are much younger on the average than their American counterparts or other ethnic groups. More than three-fourths of the Korean political scientists are in their thirty's; three persons are known to be above fifty years of age. The median age falls in the neighborhood of 35. This comparative youthfulness is reflected in the relatively few years during which Koreans have held teaching positions. Seventy percent of Korean political scientists have taught nine years or less; only 28% have taught ten or more years.

It should be noted that virtually all these Korean political scientists received their high school education in Korea and that nearly half of them completed their undergraduate education in Korea. This means that to half of the sample, American education means exclusively graduate work. By the time these Korean entered the U.S., they were mature persons with basically fixed personalities and value systems. Their limited exposure to American life during the formative years is significant for its relationship to social adaptability and professional advancement.

Let us turn to the academic specializations and scholarly productivity of Korean political scientists (Table 4). As one would expect, there is a heavy concentration on non-American studies. The fields of international relations (22: 56.4%), Asian studies (17: 43.9%), and comparative Government (16: 41.0%) yield a combined percentage of 77.5, while the percentage for American studies shows only 16.9. This same emphasis on non-American studies is also reflected in research interests and publication. Of 28 books

published by Korean political scientists in the United States during the past 15 Years, none deals with American studies and all but two deal with Asian studies.¹

Table 4. Academic Specializations

	Frequency	Relative Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
International relations	22	30.9	30.0
Asian studies	17	23.9	54.8
Comparative government	16	22.5	77.3
Public administration	5	7.0	84.3
American government	7	9.8	94.2
Methodology and theory	2	2.8	97.1
No answer	2	2.8	100.0
Total	71*	100.0	100.0

*More than one area of specialization by most respondents.

With respect to scholarly productivity in general, Korean scholars show a high degree of activity. As Tables 5 and 6 show, production of articles, papers and books is indeed impressive, particularly in view of the brief professional experience of most of the authors. Scholarly output may be even more voluminous in the future. (Respondents indicate a heavy emphasis on research: 89.7% spend one-fourth or more of their time in research, while only 3 persons or 7.7% are completely inactive in this regard.)

Korean political scientists do not report problems regarding their competence in research methodology. Only three persons (7.7%) acknowledged this as a "very serious" or "serious" problem, while 35 persons (89.8%) felt it was a minor problem or no problem at all. The youthfulness of the Korean scholars may explain their confidence in this area, since their training is comparatively recent and is likely to have exposed them to current research techniques. With regard to linguistic difficulty as a constraint in research activities, no one recognized language as a very serious problem and only 6 (15.4%) admitted it as a serious problem. The

1. It is important to note here that a majority of the published books and articles are descriptive works based upon non-empirical data. Generally, these articles have appeared in journals dealing area studies rather than such discipline oriented journals as *American Political Science Review* and *Journal of Politics*.

remaining 33 persons (84.6%) feel that they have little or no difficulty in linguistic ability. A noteworthy point here is that the younger scholars feel a greater competence in language than their elder colleagues.

Table 5. Scholarly Books Published in the United States by Korean Political Scientists 1960-1974

University Press	
University of California (Berkeley)	6
Princeton University Press	2
Cornell University Press	1
University of North Carolina Press	1
New York University Press	1
University of Alabama Press	1
Louisiana State University Press	1
University of Hawaii Press	1
Total	14
Research Institute	
Research Institute on Korean Affairs	2
Korea Research and Publications (Western Michigan University)	6
Institute on Asian Studies	2
Total	10
Commercial Press	
Praeger	3
Pegasus	1
Total	4
Grand Total	28

While methodological and linguistic competence are not considered significant obstacles to scholarship, the lack of research money, time, data and assistants are reported as problems by Korean political scientists. On the availability of research funds, 26 respondents (66.7%) report "very serious" or "serious" difficulty, while one person has none and 12 persons have minor problems. A similar response is expressed on the availability of research time. While 25 persons (64.1%) are experiencing a "very serious" to "serious" shortage of time, only

three persons face no such problem. To a lesser but still serious extent, problems are reported concerning the availability of research data and 51.3% consider personnel support for research as either a "very serious" or "serious" problem.

Table 6. Publication Records

	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9 or more	No answer	Total
Articles	9(23.1)	11(28.2)	4(10.3)	4(10.3)	9(23.1)	2(5.1)	39(100)
Books and Monographs	1 11(28.2)	2 2(5.1)	3 5(12.8)	4 2(5.1)	5 3(7.7)	No answer (no book) 16(41.0)	39(100)
Papers	0-2 10(25.6)	3-4 10(25.6)	5-6 3(7.7)	7-8 5(12.8)	9 or more 6(15.4)	No answer (No paper) 5(12.8)	39(100)

It is logical to ask how American-born scholars feel about the availability of logistical support as the principal constraint upon research activities in political science. Although there are no data on this issue, it would seem that the difficulties reported by the Koreans are probably shared by their American counterparts. In other words, the Koreans probably do not fare worse than any others.

The Koreans are much more involved in teaching and/or researching than in administration (Table 7). Given their relatively brief careers in teaching and their cultural backgrounds, this is not at all surprising. Recognizing the various constraints upon the non-native born American with regard to in administrative participation, one respondent selected advancement in administration as his first choice for future career development.

Table 7. Breakdown of Professional Workload

	100%	75%	50%	25%	0%	No answer	Total
Teaching	3(7.7)	17(43.6)	10(25.6)	9(23.1)	0	0	39(100)
Research	0(0.0)	2(5.1)	9(25.1)	24(11.5)	3(7.7)	1(2.0)	39(100)
Administration	0(0.0)	2(5.1)	4(10.3)	11(28.2)	13(33.3)	9(23.1)	39(100)

Korean political scientists are well represented in professional organizations. Thirty-four (87.6%) belong to the American Political Science Association (there are 89 identified APSA members according to the 1973 APSA directory) and 31 or 79.9% belong to

the Association for Asian Studies, the principle multidisciplinary organization for the scholars specializing in Asian Studies.

In concluding the discussion of the present status of Korean political scientists in North America, a note on the repatriated Korean political scientists must be added. As shown in Table 2, 36, or about one-fourth of the Korean Ph.D.'s in political science, have returned to Korea. Most of them have taken positions in the academic world or in government. While no clear pattern on repatriation can be observed, it is generally known that some returned scholars have had serious second thoughts on their decision to return. This matter remains a subject for a further study.

Having surveyed the general status of Korean political scientists in North America, let us now examine what caused them to remain in a "foreign country" and what they envisage for their future.

DECISIONS TO REMAIN IN THE U.S.

Among several theories suggested to explain the migration of intellectuals from one country to another, the particular approach by Enrique Oteiza seems most appropriate for this study.² According to Oteiza, migration takes place when what is known as the Preference Differential shows a positive score. A positive score occurs when the combined value advantages supersede the combined value disadvantages in the following four differentials: (1) the Income (or wage) Differential for a given profession between the countries of emigration and immigration; (2) the Logistical Support Differential, or the comparative availability of support to allow a person to work effectively in the country of origin or destination; (3) the Macro-Economic Differential or the average wages of professionals in comparison to the national average per capital income and (4) the Socio-Political Differential, or the relative predictability of political and institutional stability, the ability to participate in and criticize the political process, and the perceived criteria in employment and promotion in the country of origin as compared to country of destination.

For this particular study, Income and Socio-Political Differentials are considered the most relevant factors. With regard to the

2. Enrique Oteiza, "A Differential Push-Pull Approach," in Walter Adams, ed., *The Brain Drain* (New York: MacMillan, 1968), pp. 120-134. Another very useful construct is presented in an article by Yochanan Comay, "Migration of Professionals: An Empirical Analysis," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. V, No. 3 (August 1972), pp. 419-29.

latter, a wider range of issues will be covered than what is suggested by Oteiza.

Income Differential

As shown in Table 8, a vast income differential of 5 to 1 in favor of the U.S. currently exists in the academic profession of the two countries. (This figure incidently represents a significant improvement over the early 1960s, when the ratio was nearly 10 to 1.³) According to the findings, however, the income differential is not as important to the decision to remain in the U.S. as the ratio would indicate. Economic security was a "strongly influential" factor to only 13 persons (33.3%), while it was either minor or no factor at all to 15 persons (38.5%). (Another nine acknowledged salary differential as "mildly influential.")

Table 8. Income Differential (Median) of University Professors in the United States and Korea

	U.S.*(A)	Korea**(B)	A/B
Professor	18,000-18,999	3,600	5
Associate Professor	14,000-14,999	2,400	5.8
Professor			
Assistant Professor	11,000-11,999	1,800	6.1
Professor			
Instructor or Lecturer	10,000-10,999	1,500	6.6
Lecturer			

*Universities with 15 or less faculty members having graduate programs. See 1972-73 Survey of Departments, American Political Science Association, 111-19.

**On the basis of interviews with several Korean faculty members recently arrived in the United States.

One can hypothesize several explanations for this deemphasis on income. Of some significance is the fact that the majority of Koreans who came to this country in the 1950s and early 1960s were from fairly well-established families; without such a background, going abroad was extremely difficult. Many of these families now have become quite well-to-do as a result of Korean economic expansion, so that their sons in America need to have

3. Income Differential was indeed a major factor in migrating to the U.S. in the early to middle 1960s. For a discussion of economic plight returned students, see Charles P. Kindleberger, "Study Abroad and Emigration," in Walter Adams, *The Brain Drain*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 135-155. The case of a Korean student is particularly illuminating.

little concern for their economic security should they return home. Furthermore, in real terms, the salary differential itself is not so pronounced as it seems on paper. General low prices for basic necessities and plentiful opportunity to earn extra income through writing and consulting may further narrow the gap in terms of real income. For these reasons, income differential is an important but not decisive factor for the majority of Korean scholars who choose to stay in America.

Politico-Social Differential

There are four major areas in this category: freedom from political constraint and opportunity to make political input; ability to meet family responsibilities; opportunity to contribute to the academic world; and ability to obtain employment and advance in the profession.⁴ With regard to political input and political freedom survey responses were largely as expected: only 4 persons (10.3%) answered that their decision to stay in America was "strongly" or "mildly" influenced by greater opportunities to exercise leadership and/or by greater opportunities to make political input, while nearly three-fourths of the 39 respondents discounted these opportunities in the United States all together. Obviously, most Koreans believe that the opportunity to provide input for the political process in the adopted country is very limited. On the other hand, the Koreans' desire to be free from negative political constraints is very strong: 23 persons (59.0%) answered that their decision to remain in this country is strongly or mildly influenced by their wish to be free from political and governmental harassments and 24 persons (61.5%) indicated that their decision to remain in the U.S. was influenced in varying degrees by the current political situation in Korea. The survey shows a positive correlation between the degree to which subjects feel disillusioned over the political situation in Korea and their academic productivity. This would indicate a growing estrangement between the Korean scholars in America and the Korean ruling elites.

The overwhelming majority, 30 (77.0%) rejected as not influential to their decision to remain in the U.S. their ability to meet or avoid family responsibilities. Further evidence of weakening ties with families in Korea can be found in low degree

4. For discussion of both economic and non-economic factors for international migration, see S. Watanabe, "Brain Drain from Developing to Developed Countries," *International Labor Review*, Vol. 99 (April 1969), pp. 401-33. Also V. M. Dandekar, "India," in Walter Adams, *The Brain Drain*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 203-232.

of family cohesion and a high degree of independence. Only 11 persons considered separation from families as very serious (4) or serious (7) problem. This was no problem to 28 persons (71.8%). With regard to social adaption to the new country, only 2 admitted having any serious problem, while 25 (64.1%) claimed to have no problem at all.

In sum, any anticipated psychic costs arising from the weakening of familiar and social ties to country of birth and difficulties in social adaption in the adopted country, do not seem to be significant to the Koreans who remain in the United States.

The ability to meet intra-family responsibilities was considered an influential factor in the decision of most Koreans to remain here. A total of 65.8% of the respondents indicated that the decision to remain in this country was influenced in some measure by their wish to educate their children in America. The ability to provide optimal education for one's children stands out as a major factor in weighing the comparative social differential. It is worth noting that the weakening of ties with families in Korea and increasing concern for the education of children in this country represent the abandonment of the Confucian value system in favor of the achievement-oriented, western value system so typical of the American middle class.

Within the category of politico-social differential is the perceived ability to obtain one's choice of employment and to advance in the chosen profession. Employment preference was of more concern to Koreans than comparative availability or accessibility to employment in the two countries. The fact that the majority of Korean political scientists opted for teaching position in this country in the 1960s when jobs were plentiful in both countries attests to this observation. Academic positions in America were much preferred in those days because they were more prestigious and assured better economic security than those in Korea. Also there is a factor of novelty to professorship in America. Only two respondents failed to indicate that job preference was a factor in the decision to remain in this country. In a related question, only three persons expressed definite willingness to return if they were offered a comparable job. On the other hand, the Korean's decision to remain in this country is less influenced by the anticipation of advancement through personal merit. In a weighted score, the influence ratios of 115:2 for the employment factor and 74:4 for the advancement factor are shown in the decision to remain in this country. The significance of a

very high job preference differential and a relatively high advancement differential is that such assessments are given by Koreans, in spite of their recognition of varying degrees of discrimination in the profession. In fact, the majority (51.4 versus 48.6) feels that they are in some measure discriminated against in promotion, salaries, and other professional opportunities.⁵ The importance of these findings is that discrimination is felt more strongly by those who are highly active in publication than those who are inactive. In a companion question as to whether subjects felt appropriately rewarded for their efforts, only five persons gave "definitely" affirmative answers, while seven gave "generally" negative answers. There were 19 (48.7%) "generally" affirmative answers and 8 (20.5%) "neither yes nor no" answers. One observation that can be drawn from the foregoing is that although Koreans have been less assertive hitherto in expecting professional advancement commensurate with efforts, they are likely to become increasingly vociferous in demanding unbiased advancement opportunity in this age of equal rights. This is particularly true because many Koreans have acquired U.S. citizenship with the intention of residing in this country permanently.

Professional Aspirations

Opportunity to contribute to the development of one's academic specialization is another factor in the more general category of politico-social differential. In the case of the Korean political scientists, it is more appropriate to discuss professional aspirations rather than opportunity.

As stated earlier, most Korean political scientists commenced their professional life in America without a clear intent of becoming learned scholars in the discipline. Rather, they reached where they are now fortuitously. Once lodged in the thicket of academia, they had to meet the challenges which came their way; many succeeded with distinction. As shown earlier, the academic output of the Korean scholars is impressive by any standard.

Now with some years of teaching and/or researching in America behind them, what do the Koreans envisage as their career goals? To ascertain future career aspirations, three related questions were asked: (1) To what do you aspire in terms of your future career goals?; (2) How much is your decision to stay in

5. The author is aware of one active lawsuit involving a Korean political scientist and a state university under the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972.

North America influenced by the opportunity to contribute to the development of your specialization?; (3) Would you return to Korea if you were offered a comparable position? As Table 9 indicates, on the question of future professional career advancement, 26 persons (66.7%) gave as their first choice "to become productive scholars," and 6 respondents preferred to become practicing politicians. On the question of climbing the administrative ladder, only one person indicated this as the first choice, and 7 persons (17.9%) selected this answer as the second choice. Not surprisingly, no one chose "position in the government" (U.S.) as the primary career objective.

A high level of commitment to productive scholarship is further evidenced by the answer given to the second question: How much is your decision to stay in North America influenced by the opportunity to contribute to the development of your specialization? Twenty-eight persons (71.1%) rated this as either a strongly or moderately influential factor, while only 3 persons (7.7%) listed it as uninfluential. Six persons did not consider this influential, but a factor nevertheless; 2 persons failed to answer. Dedication to scholarship as an important factor in the decision to remain in America is clearly substantiated by the publication record of Korean scientists. Positive correlation between academic performance and high propensity to remain in America is further borne out by the question concerning willingness to return to Korea if offered a comparable position. Twenty-one persons (53.9%) expressed their unwillingness to return even if they were offered a comparable position, while 14 persons (35.9%) expressed definite (3 persons) or probable (11 persons) willingness to return to Korea under such a condition. The significance of this high degree of reluctance to return to Korea is that unwillingness is positively correlated with academic productivity; the more productive, the less willing to return.⁶

In sum, the perceived differential in the ability to pursue scholarly objectives in the two countries exerted a major influence in Koreans' decision to live in America. The repatriation of Korean political scientists under the prevailing political climate seems highly unlikely.

Revelations from the foregoing discussion of differentials notwithstanding, the ultimate outcome of the Preference Differential may be decided by the "happiness differential." To ascertain

6. A weak correlation is observed in the willingness to return and the number of papers presented.

Table 9. To what Do You Aspire in Terms of
Your Future Career Goal?
Rank from 1 to 6

	First Preference	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	No Answer	Total
To become a productive scholar	26(66.7)	4(10.3)	3(7.7)	2(5.1)	2(5.1)		2(5.1)	39(100.0)
To move up the administrative ladder	1(2.6)	7(17.9)	10(25.6)	6(15.4)	5(12.8)	1(2.6)	9(23.1)	39(100.0)
To become a practicing politician	6(15.4)		4(10.3)	5(12.8)	9(23.1)	5(12.8)	10(25.6)	39(100.0)
To assume a (U.S.) government position		8(20.5)	6(15.4)	12(30.8)	3(7.7)		10(25.6)	39(100.0)
To remain where you are	3(7.7)	11(28.2)	6(15.4)	3(7.7)	6(15.4)	3(7.7)	7(17.9)	39(100.0)
To seek a new career		5(12.8)		2(5.1)	4(10.3)	9(23.1)	19(48.7)	39(100.0)

the Koreans' total assessment of their lives in this country, the following question was asked: "In general, are you happy with where you are and what you are doing?"

As shown in Table 10, Korean political scientists are generally happy with their profession in this country. They clearly discern overwhelming advantages in this country for the pursuance of their personal lives and professional objectives. Because the positive score of the Preference Differential is unlikely to be changed in the foreseeable future, the Koreans now involved in academic life are destined to remain in this country either indefinitely or permanently.

Table 10. "Happiness Differential" Data

	Frequency	Relative Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Definitely yes (1)	4	10.3	10.3
Generally yes (2)	21	53.8	64.1
Neither yes nor no (3)	8	20.5	84.6
Generally no (4)	5	12.8	97.4
Definitely no (5)	1	2.6	100.0
	39	100.0	100.0
Median: 2.23 Mean: 2.47			

CONCLUSION

During the past 15 years, the Korean political scientists emerged as a significant academic force both in terms of number and academic productivity. Now more than 100 Koreans are engaged in teaching and/or researching in the discipline and related areas. They are producing dozens of books, scores of articles, and hundreds of papers. Still, despite numerical strength in academic output, the Koreans' presence in the discipline is not fully felt. The lag in recognition and advancement in the program may be in part explained by the narrow specialization of the Korean scholars, namely on Korea, and limited reliance upon rigorous and sophisticated methodological techniques. Now that many Korean scholars express high competence in methodology and unabated commitment to scholarly achievement, considerable improvement in their professional status is foreseen. The formation in 1972 of the Association of the Korean Political Scientists in North America indicated a trend whereby Korean political scientists will be more assertive in their expectation for recognition in the profession.

Koreans who have undergone the successful transition from foreign students to immigrant scholars in spite of linguistic and cultural constraints, are destined to become an important academic ethnic group not only in political science but in other disciplines as well. But, on the other hand, they should not take their present positions for granted particularly at a time when financial support to and students' interest in liberal arts education is declining sharply. One caveat is that the Koreans, if they are to survive and thrive in the future, must begin diversification of their academic expertise so as to make themselves indispensable in the profession. The influx of Koreans to America was an unexpected and fortuitous by-product of the Korean War. Given the seemingly permanent settlement of Koreans in America, one can now speak of a Korean-American cultural group which is likely to develop into a major ethnic subculture, warranting more systematic study in the years ahead.⁷

7. For a discussion of the Third Culture in this world of cross-acculturation, see John Useem, John D. Donaghue, and Ruth Hill Unseem, "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture," a paper delivered at the 1962 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C., September 5-8, 1962.

Chapter 4

ASIAN-BORN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS VIEWED FROM
THE VANTAGE POINT OF DEPARTMENT
CHAIRPERSONS

YONG SOON YIM

I

The status of ethnic minority groups has been one of the most controversial social issues of the last thirty years in the United States. Consequently, there have been numerous studies done by scholars on the status of minority groups in this country. In this respect, the study of minority politics has gained in popularity, especially in political science literature. Even in professional groups, various studies have focused on various ethnic groups such as the studies done by Professors Wilson Record¹ and Oswald Hall.² They are, however, exclusively focused on a limited number of ethnic groups such as Afro-American and Jewish groups in this country.

Although there has been a remarkable increase in the number of immigrants from Asia as a result of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965, systematic studies on the status of the Asian background ethnic group are very scarce. Furthermore, even though there are visible signs that many Asian immigrants are engaged in highly professional occupations such as medicine, science, and higher education, a more systematic study on how well and to what extent these Asian professionals are accepted by their American colleagues is, again, lagging far behind.

Even in the field of political science, the activities of Asian-born political scientists are quite visible. Although a few of them are engaged in fields other than higher education, most of them are involved either in teaching situations in various colleges or in research projects in various institutions affiliated with higher

This chapter was originally prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, September 1975.

1. See, Wilson Record, "Response of Sociologists to Black Studies," *Journal of Higher Education* (May, 1974), pp. 364-391.

2. Oswald Hall, "Informal Organization of the Medical Profession," *The Professionalization*, edited by H. Vollmer and D. Mills (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 329-333.

education in this country. Therefore, it is quite safe to assume that most Asian political scientists hold a teaching position in various colleges.

The existence of such a large number of Asian political scientists contributes, on the one hand, to the development of the field, and on the other hand, to the creation of some problems, particularly at a time when positions in higher education are very difficult to obtain. It could, therefore, be hypothesized that as more Asian political scientists compete for jobs, strong perceptions and opinions about them may be nurtured by their colleagues. In this regard, this study is an effort to discover (a) how well the Asian political scientists perform their given functions, and (b) to what extent and how well Asian political scientists are received by various institutions of higher education in this country. This examination will hopefully lead to increased understanding of the status of the Asian ethnic group in the academic profession. One way to measure how well Asian political scientists are accepted by their American colleagues in this country, is to investigate how the chairmen of a number of political science departments perceive Asian political scientists regarding their ability to perform their academic duties. The underlying hypothesis is that the chairman's perceptions concerning Asian political scientists in the department influences the status of each Asian faculty member.

II

The chairman of a political science department plays several important roles. The chairman is the person who has the most information concerning the university's resources. He will, therefore, be the prime conduit for such information to the department members. The chairman is the department allocator for existing university resources. The chairman also evaluates each faculty member's teaching and research abilities so that he is in the position to supervise the professional activities of each faculty member. The chairman at times advises and encourages his staff members. The chairman may also discipline faculty members through his recommendations concerning tenure and promotion. Lastly, the chairman has great influence concerning the rehiring of non-tenured faculty and salary increases.³

3. I have interviewed several chairmen of political science departments concerning their perceptions of their role as chairmen.

Since the chairman plays such vital roles in the department, his perceptions about Asian-born political scientists may well indicate the degree of success or failure of Asian political scientists in this country. It may, as well, also indicate the pattern of future prospects for Asian political scientists in this society. In this respect, this inquiry raises a few questions: (1) How productive are Asian political scientists in their research activities? (2) What conditions, if any, limit their research activities? (3) How well do they manage their professional lives? (4) What are the major hindrances to an Asian faculty member's professional advancement? (5) How adaptive are they in their social and professional environments? (6) What is the college administration's attitude toward Asian political scientists?

III

In order for this study to be based on relevant data, a brief nation-wide survey was conducted from March to August 1975. Questionnaires were distributed randomly throughout the country to the chairmen of political science departments. Five hundred sets of questionnaires were sent to various regions. Recipients of the questionnaires were selected from *The Directory of Department Chairpersons: 1974-1975* published by the American Political Science Association. Of the 185 questionnaires returned, 108 chairpersons expressed that they had had experience with Asian political scientists as a chairman of the department. Some reported their experiences as a former employer, but most of them indicated that they currently have Asian political scientists as their regular faculty members. Although the experiences of 108 chairmen may not represent the entire spectrum of opinion about ethnic political scientists in this country, the data should be considered significant.

Let us first look at a biographical profile of Asian political scientists. Contrary to the study done by Professors Se-Jin Kim and Sung Chul Yang,⁴ the ages of Asian political scientists are somewhat well distributed in various age categories. According to Kim and Yang, more than three-fourths of Korean political scientists are in their thirty's. As can be seen on Table 1, however, the age structure of Asian political scientists as a whole is

4. Se-Jin Kim and Sung Chul Yang, "Korean Political Scientists: Their Status and Aspiration," a paper delivered at the annual meeting of American Political Science Association, Chicago, August 1974; see Chapter 3 of this volume.

variable ranging from almost 47% in their thirty's to almost 47% in their forty's or older.

Table 1. Age Structure of Asian Political Scientists

Age	Percent
29 or less	5.6
30 - 34	23.1
35 - 39	24.1
40 - 44	27.8
45 or more	19.4

In educational training, Asian political scientists predominantly received their undergraduate degree from their native land. In contrast to their undergraduate years, they generally received their terminal degree in the United States. The significance of the latter fact is that most Asian political scientists were already mature when they came to this country.

The teaching experience of Asian political scientists in this country, as can be seen in Table 2 is variable. The highest percentage is in the category of 10 or more years of teaching, which is about 36.2%. The lowest percentage is in the category of 1-3 years teaching in the United States. About 22.8% is represented in both of the categories of 4-6 years and 7-9 years.

Table 2. Number of Years of Teaching in America

Years	Percent
1 - 3	18.0
4 - 6	22.8
7 - 9	22.8
10 or more	36.2

This significance of the length of teaching experience is well reflected in the order of rank in political science departments. As Table 3 indicates, full professors comprise 32.2%, and associate professors comprise 32.2%. Therefore, the percentage of combined ranks between full and associate professors is 64.4. Assistant professors comprise 26.9%, and instructors comprise merely 4.3%.

With respect to the academic specialization, as one would expect, there is a heavy concentration on non-American studies. As Table 4 indicates, Asian areas specialists comprise 29% of the

sample. The areas of international relations and comparative politics other than Asia are 24.5% and 20.8%, respectively. The combined percentage of areas in American Government and Public Law is only about 17%. Thus the total cumulative percentage of non-American areas of specialization is 83%.⁵ This emphasis on non-American studies is understandable because most of these Asian political scientists came to this country when they were relatively mature and imbued with certain types of cultural heritages from their homeland. It is, therefore, very comfortable for them to study those areas to which they have been well exposed.

Table 3. Rank Order of Asian Political Scientists

Rank	Percent
Full Professor	32.2
Associate Professor	32.2
Assistant Professor	26.9
Instructor	4.3
Part-time Lecturer	3.5
Full-time Lecturer	0.9

Table 4. Fields of Specialization

Fields	Percent
American Government	8.3
Public Administration and Law	8.7
Political Theory	8.7
International Relations	24.5
Comparative Politics (other than Asia)	20.8
Asian Areas	29.0

Perhaps another reason Asian political scientists avoid American studies is that they feel they can contribute more to the political science community by studying areas where they have cultural and linguistic advantages in addition to individual abilities.

5. Kim and Yang's study (note 4, *supra*) on Korean political scientists also shows almost the same percentage of non-American studies, which is about 16.9%.

6. I have questioned a number of Asian political scientists about why they specialized in Asian studies or international relations. Most of the answers I have received confirmed my contentions. On a few occasions some answered that their desire to contribute something to their native land prompted them to specialize in such areas.

In terms of scholarly activities, as can be seen on Table 5, Asian political scientists in their departments are either very productive (50%) or somewhat productive (25.5%). The combined totals of the categories of a little productive, very little, and not all are only about 24.5%. Thus, it would be safe to assert that most chairmen feel their Asian colleagues are productive, at least in terms of research.

Table 5. Research Productivity

Degree of Productivity	Percent
Very much	50.0
Somewhat	25.5
A little	7.8
Very little	11.1
Not at all	5.6

Let us turn to various aspects of the limitations that Asian scholars may or may not face in doing their research. Department chairmen were asked, "what conditions, if any, limit Asian political scientists' research activity?" In answering the question, the chairmen expressed the belief that availability of funds may be a very serious problem for Asian political scientists. The combined totals of the categories of very much and somewhat is 69.5%. With the financial resources of educational institutions deteriorating, the problem of obtaining research funds is an almost universal experience among political scientists in this nation. Another factor hampering research activity is the lack of time. This is not an exclusive problem affecting only Asian political science faculty members in American higher educational institutions; it is a universal problem affecting almost all faculty members. It is, therefore, quite understandable that most chairmen of political science departments consider the lack of time needed for research as one of the major problems. The availability of time, however, appears to be somewhat less of a problem than that of research funds, as can be seen on Table 6.

A surprisingly small number of chairmen indicated language difficulty as one of the major problems for Asian political scientists. Only about 8.6% of the Asian faculty is reported to have either a serious problem (2.9%) or some problem (5.7%). More than 67% of Asian political scientists are reported by the chairmen to have no problem with the language in doing research. The

research methodology also appears to present no problem for Asian political scientists. It is not, at least, perceived as a serious problem by the respondents. About 50.7% reported their Asian faculty members had no problem at all with methodology. Another 22% of the sample reported very little, if any, problem with research methodology. Only 3% reported their Asian colleagues to have a serious problem with methodology.

Table 6. The Conditions That Limit Asian Political Scientists' Research Activity (in percentage)

Category	Very Much	Some-what	A Little	Very Little	Not at All
Availability of funds	34.1	35.4	15.9	6.1	8.5
Language difficulty	2.9	5.7	12.9	11.4	69.1
Research methodology	3.0	10.5	13.4	22.4	50.7
Availability of research data	5.6	19.7	26.8	15.5	32.4
Availability of time (teaching load)	31.2	32.5	19.5	6.3	12.5

While methodological and linguistic abilities are not considered to be significant problems affecting scholarship, the availability of research data is shown to be somewhat of a problem. Almost 25% of the respondents indicated very much difficulty or somewhat of a difficulty regarding the obtaining of reliable research data by Asian political scientists. Primarily, this is because many Asian scholars are engaged in research with closed societies such as the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, and North Korea. It is well known that research materials from these countries are neither reliable nor abundant.

Let us look at the professional life of Asian political scientists (Table 7). It appears that most chairmen are satisfied with the

Table 7. Professional Performance. Response to Query, "Are you pleased with your Asian faculty member?"

Categories	Percent
Definitely yes	55.9
Generally yes	28.5
Undecided	3.6
Generally no	9.5
Definitely no	2.5

professional performance of Asian faculty members, although there is a reported case which strongly indicates dissatisfaction with an Asian faculty member. One chairman stated:

Our one Asian political scientist was a major mistake. As a bleeding heart liberal I have come to the conclusion our man would not have made it in his home society any better than he did with us. Typical of his problem, which I never could comprehend, was his belief that Mayor Daley of Chicago was a great populist leader who could win the presidential nomination and election. He just was never in the main stream of anything, professionally or otherwise.

This is an exceptional case. By and large most chairmen reported that they are definitely satisfied (55.9%) with Asian faculty. The combined total of the two categories of positive answers is about 84.4%. The combined total of negative responses is only about 12%. Such a small number of negative feelings could be found in any ethnic group in political science faculties.

In terms of professional rewards to Asian political scientists, most chairmen again indicated that Asian political scientists are very well rewarded for their work. As Table 8 clearly indicates, almost 86% of the respondents feel that Asian political scientists are being appropriately rewarded by their profession. Only a small number (6.4%) of the respondents consider that Asian political scientists are inappropriately rewarded.

Table 8. The Professional Reward. Response to Query, "Do you think they are being appropriately rewarded?"

Categories	Percent
Definitely yes	51.9
Generally yes	33.9
Undecided	7.7
Generally no	5.2
Definitely no	1.3

Let us turn to a somewhat different dimension of the question. As Table 9 indicates, a question was asked, "Would you hire an Asian-born scholar again as a member of your faculty if you had a chance?" This was obviously an irritating question to quite a number of chairpersons who are perhaps highly conscious of such social issues. Let's quote some of those responses. One of them stated that "not because he/she was Asian born but because

he/she would be the best choice for the job." One chairman responded with a serious statement that "we are color blind, we do not bother with national origin." A third respondent also clearly stated that "we do not care where people are born."

As those various statements demonstrate most respondents (about 88.6%) answered with a positive attitude toward hiring Asian political scientists as a member of their faculty in the future. About 11.3%, however, can be construed as having a somewhat negative attitude toward hiring Asian political scientists in the future. One respondent quite frankly answered the question by stating, "no — due to pressure of hiring American-born minority persons (black, female, Chicano, etc.)." One chairman also indicated that "the state Assembly makes it hard to hire an Asian-born scholar."

Table 9. Response to Query, "Would You Hire an Asian-Born Scholar Again as a Member of Your Faculty if You Had a Chance?"

Categories	Percent
Definitely yes	59.5
Generally yes	29.1
Undecided	10.1
Generally no	1.2
Definitely no	0.0

These two brief remarks clearly show that there are some pressures building up to curtail equal opportunity in hiring Asian-born political scientists in this country.

Let us turn to the consideration of an Asian faculty member's opportunity for promotion. As can be seen on Table 10, a question was asked about various conditions that might hinder the promotion of Asian political scientists in institutions of higher learning. Various categories of the question were presented in terms of linguistic limitation, competence in the field, social adaptation, and professional university relationships. The variable answers indicate areas affecting the success of Asian political scientists. According to Table 10, competence in the field appears to be the least problem for Asian political scientists. Almost three-fourths of the respondents (73.4%) do not consider lack of competence in the field as a problem among the Asian faculty. About 12.7% of the chairmen consider it as a very little problem. The combined negative responses of 8.8% show that lack of

competence in the discipline cause some problems to a very small percentage of the Asian faculty.

Table 10. The Major Hindrances to Asian Faculty's Promotion (in percentage)

Category	Very Much	Some-what	A Little	Very Little	Not at All
Ethnic bias	1.2	4.9	9.9	16.1	67.9
Linguistic limitation	4.7	8.3	15.4	19.0	52.4
Lack of competence in the field	6.3	2.5	5.1	12.7	73.4
Poor social adaptation	3.9	7.7	6.4	19.2	62.8
Poor university ties	0.0	9.3	9.3	19.6	61.8

The ethnic bias against Asians cannot be neglected in the consideration of the professional life of the political scientists. It is, however, a minor problem to the concerned chairmen. More than 84% of the respondents expressed the belief that ethnic bias does not cause a serious problem in regard to the promotion of Asian political scientists.

The social adaptation of Asian political scientists appears to cause a minor problem. A few respondents (about 11.6%) indicated that the social adaptation of Asian faculty members could be some hindrance to promotion. The shy and self-abnegating attitude among Asians perhaps occasionally works against them in a society where an aggressive and open attitude is a prevalent behavioral pattern.

The most serious problem for the Asian faculty seems to be the linguistic limitation. Although the majority of the chairmen state that the linguistic limitation does not cause any problem at all to their Asian faculty members, a substantial portion of respondents (about 13%) believes linguistic limitation to be a serious problem affecting the promotion of Asian political scientists in their department. About 15.4% of the respondents reported that language causes a minor problem to Asian faculty members. Since English is not the native language of most Asian-born political scientists, it is quite obvious that the linguistic limitations of Asian political scientists would create a problem of comprehension to many students. This in turn would not only discourage the students from enrolling in the Asian faculty member's class; it might also produce a less effective teaching evaluation on the Asian faculty member. This would create some hindrance to the promotional consideration given that Asian professor.

The frequency of attendance at professional meetings is also one of the vital aspects of professional life for a political scientist. By attending professional meetings, each faculty member not only has a chance to meet with distinguished scholars, he also has the opportunity to improve himself professionally. It may also indicate to his chairman a degree of academic activity. As Table 11 indicates, about 23% of Asian political scientists attend professional conferences very frequently. Therefore, more than 61% of them actively participate in various professional meetings. About 6.6% are reported to have a negligible attendance at professional meetings. Almost 32% belong to the category of "neither frequently nor infrequently." All of these statistics show that Asian political scientists by and large do participate in professional conferences.

Table 11. Attendance of Professional Meetings

Category	Percent
Very frequently (more than 3 times a year)	23.0
Rather frequently (at least one national and one regional meeting per year)	38.5
Neither frequently nor infrequently (one meeting a year, regional or national)	31.9
Rather infrequently (once in two years)	5.5
Very infrequently (once in three to four years)	1.1

With respect to their participation in university activities, Asian political scientists show a lower degree of visibility in comparison to other aspects of professional life (Table 12). Nowadays, particularly in the teaching profession, participation in various university committees has become an intrinsic part of academic life for any faculty member. Most faculty members, therefore, have at least a few university committee assignments during their career. These committee assignments frequently help faculty members to become acquainted with colleagues in other departments. Furthermore, committee assignments very often provide an opportunity to learn university politics. Through his committee activity, a faculty member may well establish an access to the power center of university politics. The implications of committee activities are so obvious they do not require any further explanation.

In this important area of university activities, about 19.4% of Asian-born political scientists are reported to belong to more than

three different university committees. Almost 26% of them participate in more than two university committees. About 38.7% are reported to participate in at least one university committee. A surprisingly high proportion (about 16.1%), however, are reported to have no committee assignments at all in the university. In sum, participation in university committees among Asian-born political scientists is rather low in comparison to their other academic activities.

Table 12. Participation in University Activities

Category	Percent
Very active (belong to more than 3 university committees)	19.4
Active (more than two committees)	25.8
Fairly active (more than one committee)	38.7
Inactive (none)	16.1

The community participation of Asian-born political scientists is much lower than their participation in university committees. As Table 13 clearly indicates, only 20.7% of Asian-born political scientists are reported to have participated actively in various community activities. About 31% of the respondents believe that Asian political scientists have some exposure in community activities. Almost 21% of Asian political scientists participate a little in community activities. More than 27% of Asian-born political scientists are reported to have almost no participation in community activities. This lack of participation in community activities on the part of Asian political scientists again reflects the behavioral pattern of Asians.

Table 13. Participation in Community Activities

Category	Percent
Very much	20.7
Some	31.0
A little	20.7
Very little	13.8
Not at all	13.8

The social adaptation of immigrated ethnic groups is indeed a barometer to the success or failure of the foreigners in the new society. In this respect, the degree of social adaptation of Asian

political scientists can be construed as an indicator of their professional success in this country (Table 14). Most of the chairmen do not consider their Asian faculty members' ability to adapt to American society as a problem. Although more than 18% of the respondents selected the category of "not serious but a problem," the serious cases are essentially limited to a small percentage.

It appears, nevertheless, that the spouse's adjustment to American life may have been more difficult than that of their husbands. The percentage of respondents selecting the category of "no problem" for the spouses is substantially lower (52.3%) than that of their mates (73.1%). More than 36% of the spouses are reported to have faced some difficulties in adjusting to their life in this society.

Table 14. Social Adaptation (in percentage)

Category	Very Serious	Serious	Not Serious But Problem	No Problem	No Opinion
Their ability to adapt to American society	2.2	4.4	18.1	73.1	2.2
Spouse's adjustment to American life	5.0	1.2	30.0	52.5	11.3
Ability to associate with friends within the department	2.3	2.3	19.2	76.2	0.0
Ability to adapt to their superior	2.2	5.8	9.3	81.4	1.2

It is also quite important that one can associate with friends and adapt to his superiors in any profession. In these areas, the Asian scholar's ability to associate with friends within the political science department is slightly lower than that of his ability to adapt to his superior. As can be seen from Table 14, a substantial number of Asian political scientists do have some difficulty, perhaps not serious, in associating with their colleagues within the department.

Let us turn, finally, to the university administration's attitude toward Asian-born political scientists (Table 15). This is, of course, an area where a thorough in-depth study is required in order to understand the administration's attitude toward the Asian scholar. This is, however, merely a study of how the chairperson perceives the administration's attitude toward Asian-born political scientists in terms of tenure, promotion, allocation of research funds and salary. Occasionally, this was a response which

indicated prejudice. One chairperson states that "when I became chairman I found the dean had a slight prejudice against our Asian-born. Have new dean now. All is well I have been able to bring faculty member's salary up to that of his equals." This is a rare statement concerning Asian political scientists. Let's quote one of the more typical statements: "no better, no worse than any other member of the departmental faculty." Even though there are some variances in each category, as can be seen on Table 15, the above statement reflects the most common sentiments about administrative attitudes toward Asian political scientists expressed by the chairpersons. As Table 15 clearly indicates, most chairmen of political science departments believe that Asian-born political scientists are relatively well treated by the college administration in terms of tenure, promotion, research funds, and salary. The greatest reported discrimination against Asian faculty is in the category of salary. It is, however, an almost negligible 3.7%, a total that could not be construed as discrimination against Asian scholars, if one compares it with some of the other areas.

Table 15. The Administration's Attitude

Category	Excep- tionally Well	Very Well	Rela- tively Well	Dis- crimi- nated	Seriously Discrimi- nated
Tenure	35.0	44.2	18.2	0.0	2.6
Promotion	29.4	42.7	26.8	0.0	1.1
Research funds	25.0	38.9	34.7	0.0	1.4
Salary	23.7	46.2	26.2	2.5	1.2

IV

Since World War II, Asian-born political scientists in the U.S. have emerged as a significant academic force, both in terms of numbers and academic productivity. Asians, who have undergone by and large the successful transition from cultural constraints, have become an important academic ethnic group, not only in political science but other disciplines as well. This study clearly indicates that the story of Asian political scientists in this country is a success story.

It should be noted that, throughout this study, the chairpersons, who play a pivotal role for the future development of Asian political scientists, have a generally good perception of Asian faculty members in their departments. There are, as might be

expected in a large sample, a few hostile statements about Asian political scientists. However, this percentage is so small that it cannot overshadow the picture of entire political science departments in this country well satisfied with their Asian colleagues.

The political scientists, unlike their Asian peer groups in some other professions, do not face great difficulties integrating with and adapting to the social environment in the institutions of higher education. Perhaps this is true because they are trained in the quintessential act of "who gets what, how, when, where and why." They are, therefore, capable of coping with the problems that may arise within the institution.

Asian scholars are by and large very productive academically. Therefore, it would be safe to assume that their future may be as good as any other ethnic group in the same profession. Particularly considering the fact that the profession of political science harbors one of the most liberal communities in this country, the future of Asian political scientists may well be better than that of most other non-American ethnic professions in this country.

This explanation, however, does not mean that Asian political scientists should take present positions for granted, particularly at a time when financial support to and the students' interest in liberal arts education are gradually declining. There are, however, a few things that can be done in order to improve the Asian political scientist's current status within the institution. The Asian faculty should be encouraged to participate in the various university committees more actively. It is also imperative for the Asians to participate in community activities more actively, and more positively.

There are, of course, many other things that can be done to improve the current status of the Asian political scientists in this country. That fact alone warrants that a more systematic study of the ethnic groups in the academic world should be written.

Chapter 5

FOREIGN-BORN POLITICAL SCIENTISTS IN NORTH AMERICA: A PROFILE

MADAN LAL GOEL AND YASUMASA KURODA

1. INTRODUCTION

As a step toward fulfilling the objective of ascertaining the current status of foreign-born political scientists, set forth by the Caucus of Foreign-Born Political Scientists in North America established at the 1970 APSA meeting in Los Angeles, a survey of foreign-born political scientists was carried out in the spring of 1973. This is a preliminary report of the survey's findings.

The definition of who constitutes foreign-born political scientists is a difficult one to operationalize. It should logically include all those who were born outside of North America regardless of their parents' citizenship or racial background. However, normally we do not consider Professor Edwin O. Reischauer as being foreign-born just because he was born in Japan or Professor Fred W. Riggs as being foreign-born simply because he was born in China. Some of the best-known political scientists are also foreign-born immigrants such as Henry Kissinger, Hans Morgenthau, Karl Deutsch and Heinz Eulau. However, these men do not share the kinds of problems some African or Asian political scientists experience due to various differences. For this survey, we solicited the assistance of the American Political Science Association, which in turn sent our letters to department chairpersons all over the country asking them to provide the Association with names of foreign-born faculty and graduate students. Many responded while others ignored these letters. We received nearly 1,000 names of faculty and graduate students who are said to be foreign-born. With the exception of one known case, all these persons turned out to be foreign-born but in some cases the list sent by chairpersons

This chapter, which was originally presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, September 1973, is based on a survey supported by University Research Council at the University of West Florida for which we are grateful. The authors, however, are solely responsible for data analysis and interpretation.

included foreign-born individuals of American parentage. We used this list of close to 1,000 names as the universe of our inquiry for this survey. Consequently, we cannot say that we have a very clearly drawn definition of the universe. In addition to this list, those who have attended our Caucus meeting in the past were added to the list. In many cases, these overlapped. One caution to mention here is that the APSA office sent a letter requesting the list of foreign-born to all departments in the United States only, and not in Canada. There are a few foreign-born political scientists now living in Canada included in our survey, but they were mostly those who moved to Canada since the list was prepared.

The questionnaire, a letter from both of us, and an envelope with stamps were sent out to 466 faculty members and 496 graduate students during the spring of 1973. A high 43% or 202 faculty members returned the questionnaires while only 17.5% ($N=87$) graduate students did so. First class mail was used to send out the questionnaire so that it would be forwarded to a new address if necessary. A surprisingly small number of the questionnaires came back marked "address unknown" ($N=16$ for faculty and $N=49$ for graduate students.) Mail-back questionnaires are expected to yield a low return rate, particularly when they are administered to a random sample of the population. Selltitz et al. estimate the return rate to be anywhere between 10 and 50%.¹ For some reason, we received a high return from faculty members² and a low return rate from graduate students. Obviously, one of the reasons is that graduate students move around more often than do faculty members, and the questionnaires may have been lost in the mail by being forwarded from one place to another. We are, thus, in a peculiar way, dealing with a portion of the universe who were willing to fill out questionnaires. Some were even conscientious enough to return the questionnaires from Africa and other foreign countries, where they were located at the time of our survey. It may be mentioned that persons who returned our questionnaires are more likely to be sympathetic to the Foreign-

1. Claire Selltitz et al. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. Revised One-Volume Edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 241.

2. The response rate for the faculty is very good. Comparison may be made with the Philip E. and Jean M. Converse study on "The Status of Women as Students and Professionals in Political Science," *PS IV:3* (Summer, 1971), pp. 328-348. In this study the response rate for male professionals was 36.5%, and for female professionals, 43.2%.

Born Caucus program and more likely to perceive problems than are those who did not respond, although we cannot be quite sure that this in fact is the case.

There were 39 questions asked of all faculty members. In addition to this basic set of questions, 13 questions were asked of our student respondents concerning their problems. Responses to these questions produced a vast amount of information that cannot be reported in this brief report. Consequently, we decided to simply give a descriptive reporting in this paper of how the respondents answered each question. The reporting of the survey's findings thus begins with a profile of our respondents, giving the reader some idea of what the respondents are like in terms of their demographic characteristics and other related dimensions. This will be followed by their view of the profession from several different perspectives. The last part of the findings will report on the question of how our racial and ethnic background affects our professional life outlook and experience.

2. A PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

A collective profile of the respondents is given here first. It consists mostly of demographic data on the respondents who return the questionnaires. Wherever data are available, we have compared the foreign-born group with the characteristics of the entire political science profession in the U.S.

2.1 Age

How old are our respondents? We asked them to tell us the year of their birth (Table 1). The oldest respondent, who is now retired, was born in 1884 while the youngest faculty member informs us that he was born in 1950. However, the bulk of the foreign-born political science faculty in the United States were born in the 1930s. Those who were born in the 1930s constitute 45.0% of the faculty respondents. Of course, the majority of student respondents (84%) were born in the 1940s. We may conclude that foreign-born political scientists are rather a young group, their median age being 40 years. When compared with the overall professional membership in the U.S., the average foreign-born faculty is, however, three years older than the average political scientist working in the U.S. According to an analysis of data by Earl Baker, the average political scientist in America is a 37-year-old Ph. D., whose main activity is teaching. Baker's data

came from the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel.³

It may be mentioned here that age is tied to the national origin of our respondents. The East European stock is older than other nationality groups in our survey. The average East European political scientist is about 50 years of age. If we exclude this group from our calculations, median age for a composite of other nationalities computes to 36 years.

2.2 Sex

Women are poorly represented among foreign-born political scientists. Less than 8% of the respondents are women. The poor representation of women in the foreign-born group, however, is not untypical of the profession as a whole, where women constitute only 10% of the membership.⁴

2.3 Immigration Status

Of those who responded to the questionnaire, 42.5% of them are already U.S. citizens, while 33.5% are permanent residents of the U.S. The remaining 24%, consisting largely of graduate students, are nonimmigrants who are on student visas in the United States. Consequently, it is safe to assume that most of our foreign-born political scientists (faculty) are U.S. citizens while a minority of them are U.S. permanent residents, many of whom will probably become citizens in due time.

2.4 Number of Years in the U.S.

A majority 63% of the respondents have been in this country for 11 years or more (Table 2). There are not too many, however, who have been here over 30 years.

2.5 Future Plans

We asked the respondents to tell us whether or not they intend to stay in the United States permanently. A majority of them (54.2%) responded positively to the question, with 16.8% giving the

3. In 1970, 6,493 political scientists were in the Register, up from 5,176 in 1968. See Earl M. Baker, "The Political Science Profession in 1970: Basic Characteristics," *PS* VI:1 (Winter, 1971), pp. 33-39.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 37. Also see Everett C. Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset, "American Political Scientists: Portrait of a Profession," a paper delivered at the

Table 1. Birth-Year for Faculty

Birth-Year	<i>N</i>	%
1909 or before	10	5.0
1910	1	0.5
11	2	1.0
12	5	2.5
13	1	0.5
15	2	1.0
16	1	0.5
17	1	0.5
18	4	2.0
19	3	1.5
20	4	2.0
21	4	2.0
22	7	3.5
23	5	2.5
24	5	2.5
25	3	1.5
26	3	1.5
27	6	3.0
28	7	3.5
29	3	1.5
30	7	3.5
31	7	3.5
32	9	4.5
33	13	6.5
34	8	4.0
35	9	4.5
36	13	6.5
37	12	6.0
38	12	6.0
39	5	2.5
40	7	3.5
41	2	1.0
42	4	2.0
43	6	3.0
44	1	0.5
45	3	1.5
46	3	1.5
47	1	0.5
50	1	0.5
Total	200	100.0

Table 2. No. of Years in U.S.

Years in U.S.	<i>N</i>	%
01	2	0.7
02	17	6.0
03	19	6.7
04	15	5.3
05	15	5.3
06	16	5.7
07	10	3.5
08	14	5.0
09	8	2.8
10	18	6.4
11	5	1.8
12	17	6.0
13	10	3.5
14	5	1.8
15	10	3.5
16	8	2.8
17	6	2.1
18	7	2.5
19	6	2.1
20	7	2.5
21	7	2.5
22	7	2.5
23	10	3.5
24	8	2.8
25	4	1.4
26	6	2.1
27	1	0.4
28	1	0.4
29	1	0.4
30	1	0.4
33	4	1.4
34	3	1.1
35	2	0.7
36	5	1.8
37	1	0.4
40	1	0.4
45	1	0.4
47	1	0.4
49	1	0.4
50	1	0.4
67	1	0.4
Total	282	282

1973 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, Table 3. Their data are derived from the Carnegie Faculty Survey, 1969.

negative response while 29% of them have yet to decide on the question.

These figures change when controlled on faculty-student status; i.e., a greater portion of the faculty plan to stay (69.5%) than graduate students, among whom only 18.6% plan to stay here permanently. Conversely, a small portion of the faculty members, consisting of only 5.5% plan to leave for home, while 43.0% of the students intend to go home.

2.6 National Origin

The respondents were asked to state the country of their origin (Table 3). With the exception of eight respondents who declined to identify their national origin, the respondents identified themselves as being from 59 different countries.

As can be seen in Table 3, the East Asians constitute the largest group, with 24.9% of the total respondents followed by Western Europeans (20%). The third largest regional group hails from South and Southeast Asian countries, who compose 16.2% of the respondents. East Europeans are next with 13.1%. West Asians (Middle East) are represented by 11.6% of the respondents. The remaining respondents are from Latin America, Africa and three former British colonies, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

As was also the case in an earlier study,⁵ Koreans are the largest group of foreign-born political scientists in the United States. There are 32 of them, composing 11.4%. A combined group of Chinese from Hong Kong, Taiwan and China constitutes 11.0% of the total foreign-born political scientists. The third largest nationality group is the Germans ($N=27$, 9.6%), followed closely by those who are from India ($N=23$, 8.2%). The rest of the nationalities represented are much smaller in number. Those Germans who are now teaching political science in the United States include refugees from Nazi Germany.

If our respondents represent all foreign-born political scientists in the U.S., slightly over one-half are Asians (52%), about 40% Europeans, and a small minority are from African and Latin American countries.

5. Yasumasa Kuroda, "Asian Political Scientists in North America: Their Aspirations and Problems." Prepared for delivery at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, September 7-11, 1971.

2.7 Highest Degree

Another question asked was what is the highest degree the subjects now hold. In nine out of ten cases, foreign-born faculty members are likely to have the terminal degree in political science. Only 3.5% of the faculty in the sample had only the M.A. degree; 87.1% had finished Ph.D.'s, while 9.5% were completing their dissertations. When compared with the profession at large, the foreign-born groups is much better educated, at least in terms of having received the highest degrees. In the profession, only 61% of the political scientists had the Ph.D. degrees in a 1970 survey, while 38% had M.A.'s.⁶

2.8 Major Field

We asked the respondents to identify the major field of their specialization and provided them with five alternatives, namely American government and politics (9.8%), international relations (45.3%), comparative government and politics (32.6%), theory and methodology (5.6%) and public administration (6.7%). There were some respondents who chose more than two fields of specialization, in which case we were forced to take only one of them for data tabulation. We chose the first response category marked closest to the top. The alternatives were given in the order given above. These breakdowns are in marked contrast to those prevailing in the rest of the profession. If we take the proportion of Ph.D.'s awarded in 1972 as a reflection of the following in the various subfields, the breakdowns in the U.S. are as follows: American politics, constitutional law, and state and local politics, 32.9%; international relations, 10.8%; foreign and comparative politics, 32.5%; theory and methodology, 14.2%; and public administration, 9.5%.⁷ The foreign-born political scientists are most heavily concentrated in International Relations and Comparative Politics (78%), with International Relations being specially popular (45%). As compared with the rest of the profession, very few foreign-born members choose to specialize in understanding the politics of their adopted land, the politics and government of the United States. It is perhaps natural for immigrants to be more internationally oriented and thus choose international relations and comparative politics for specialization.

6. Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

7. Stephen Blank, "Data on Dissertations in Foreign and Comparative Government by World Area: 1965-1972," *PS V:4* (Fall, 1972), p. 429.

2.9 Academic Rank

To the question of academic rank now held, 8.7% responded that they are currently unemployed, most of whom are graduate students, 14.4% were assistants or fellows, 3.8% instructors or lecturers, 20.9% assistant professors, 26.6% associate professors, and 25.1% full professors, and one respondent retired. In view of the fact that most of the respondents are in their 30s or early 40s, the distribution of these academic rankings does not seem to be out of line to any significant extent.

2.10 Tenure Status

Excluded in this question were of course, graduate students. A fairly large portion, consisting of 64.6%, are tenured faculty while 35.4% are still trying to obtain job security.

2.11 Years of Professional Experience

A question was asked to find out how many years the respondents had been teaching after leaving their last graduate school. A good majority of the respondents have been teaching less than 10 years (61.9%). Twenty-eight percent of them have been out of graduate school for more than 10 years but less than 20 years. About 10 of them have taught for more than 20 years. Those graduate students who are still at graduate schools are not included in this question.

2.12 English Language Proficiency

We asked them to rate their own spoken language proficiency into the following categories: (1) excellent, as good as that of native Americans (64.3%); (2) very good, no difficulty in being understood (31.8%); (3) some difficulty in being understood (3.9%); and (4) substantial difficulty in being understood (0%). A sizable majority of the respondents (64.3%) feel that their English is as good as that of native-born Americans. One-third of the respondents feel no serious handicaps. A very small minority confess to having some difficulty in being understood. No one claims to have substantial difficulty. If anyone did, it would seem that he could not even be a graduate student. We must keep in mind that these are self-assessments of their English language ability and these, therefore, may not coincide with the judgment of native Americans. As we are all aware, it is not an easy task to eliminate our

foreign accents altogether. Even Dr. Henry Kissinger speaks with an accent after having been in this country for over three decades.

Table 3. National Origin

Nation	N	%	Nation	N	%
01 China/Taiwan/ Hongkong	31	11.0%	50 Poland	8	2.8%
02 Korea	32	11.4	51 Lithuania	1	0.4
03 Japan	7	2.5	52 Russia	2	0.7
East Asians	70	24.9%	53 Latvia	1	0.4
10 India	23	8.2%	54 Yugoslavia	4	1.4
11 Pakistan	4	1.4	55 Hungary	8	2.8
12 Philippines	9	3.2	56 Romania	1	0.4
13 Malaysia	1	0.4	57 Czechoslovakia	9	3.2
14 Indonesia	1	0.4	58 Ukraine	2	0.7
15 Ceylon	1	0.4	East Europeans	37	13.1%
16 Thailand	2	0.7	60 Greece	3	1.1%
17 Burma	1	0.4	61 Cyprus	2	0.7
18 Nepal	2	0.7	Mediterraneans	5	1.8%
19 Bangladesh	1	0.4	70 Venezuela	1	0.4
Southeast Asians	45	16.2%	71 Bahamas	1	0.4
20 Palestine	6	2.1	72 Cuba	3	1.1
21 Iran	7	2.5	73 Columbia	1	0.4
22 Israel	4	1.4	74 Argentina	3	1.1
23 Jordan	3	1.1	75 Dominican Rep.	1	0.4
24 Syria	1	0.4	76 Brazil	2	0.7
25 Egypt	2	0.7	Latin Americans	12	4.5%
26 Saudi Arabia	1	0.4	80 Australia	1	0.4
27 Turkey	2	0.7	81 New Zealand	3	1.1
28 Iraq	3	1.1	82 Canada	11	3.9
29 Tunisia	1	0.4	Bri. Com. Wealth	15	5.4%
30 Libya	1	0.4	90 Ethiopia	1	0.4
31 Afghanistan	1	0.4	91 Ghana	2	0.7
West Asians	32	11.6%	92 Nigeria	6	2.1
40 Netherland	2	0.7	Africans	9	3.2
41 Britain	10	3.6	N.A.	8	
42 Switzerland	3	1.1	Total	289	100.7%
43 Denmark	2	0.7			
44 France	4	1.4			
45 Italy	4	1.4			
46 Sweden	1	0.4			
47 N. Ireland	1	0.4			
48 Germany	27	9.6			
49 Austria	2	0.7			
West Europeans	56	20.0%			

2.13 Institution Type

Two types of institutions with which the respondents are associated and with which they were asked to identify themselves were "public" and "private" institutions. Sixty-one percent of them said that they are with public and 39% with private. These percentages do not appear to significantly diverge from patterns in the rest of the discipline.⁸

2.14 Department Size and the Highest Degree Offered

The next two questions had to do with how large a department the respondent was affiliated with and if the Ph.D degree was offered there. An indicator used to measure the size of the department is the number of faculty members. As one would expect, the size of the department the respondents are affiliated with varies in relation to whether or not a respondent is a faculty member or student. Normally students would be at larger departments where Ph.D degrees are offered, while some faculty members teach at small liberal arts colleges and other small institutions where no graduate education in political science is offered. Those who are located in departments consisting of less than five faculty members accounted for 14.3% of the respondents as a whole, with 19.5% for the faculty group and 1.2% for the student group. Those who are in departments with between six and ten faculty members constituted 19.6% of the total group with 23.5% for the faculty and 10.0% for the students. The next size department ranging in number of faculty members from 11 to 20 accounted for 29.6% of the total group with 31.0% for the faculty and 26.2% for the students. The largest groups consisted of 36.4% of the whole group in departments which have more than 20 faculty members. A majority of the graduate students (62.5%) are at these large institutions while 26.0% of the faculty group are.

In terms of the highest degree offered, slightly over one-third (34.7%) of the faculty members teach at universities where Ph.D training is given; 31.2% are in universities offering the M.A. and 29.6% are at institutions offering the B.A. The remaining (4.5%) are located at places where no separate major in political science is available. Among students, as one would expect, 90% are located at Ph.D granting institutions.

8. In a sample in 1969, 66.6% of male professionals and 58.6% of female professionals reported teaching in public institutions. See Philip E. and Jean M. Converse, *op. cit.*, p. 341.

2.15 Income

Since the graduate students' income level is expected to be much lower than that of the faculty members, figures given below include only the faculty: \$5,000 to 9,000, 2.5%; \$9,001 to 12,000, 18.0%; \$12,001 to 15,000, 31.0%; \$15,001 to 18,000, 19.0%; \$19,001 to 21,000, 11.0%; and over \$21,000, 18.5%. A majority of the graduate students (67.8%) have an income below \$5,000.

The median as well as the average salary for foreign-born faculty is about \$15,000 for a calendar year. This figure is hard to compare with the prevailing salaries in the profession. Baker reported a median salary of \$13,100 for U.S. political scientists in 1969.⁹ But this figure represents remuneration for a 9 month academic year, whereas we inquired about the gross *annual* salary. Also, our questionnaires were filled in 1973, three years after the data used by Baker were gathered. Perhaps a better comparison is with the samples in the Converse study conducted in 1969. In this study, men reported an average annual gross salary of \$17,000, and females of \$10,500.¹⁰ These figures pertain to 1969 so that gross salaries were likely to be still higher in 1973. If these data are comparable, then the foreign-born faculty on the average earn considerably less than American-born males, although they are better off than females; since females constitute such a small proportion of the political science profession (10%), the meaningful comparison is only with the male sample.

2.16 Publications

Publication constitutes a key aspect in the life of political scientists. How productive are foreign-born political scientists? We asked them to tell us how many articles, monographs and books they have published.

Only 26.9% of the faculty had not had any articles published. The rest of them have had one or more articles published. Those who have one to five published articles to their credit make up 41.8% of the faculty members. The remaining persons having published more than five articles line up as follows: 11 to 15 articles (16.9%), 16 to 20 articles (5.5%), 21 to 30 articles (2.5%) and over 31 articles (5.5%).

We found that only 54.3% of the graduate students have not had any articles published. We are uncertain about what they

9. Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

10. Philip and Jean Converse, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

have included in this response; they may have included some articles that did not appear in normal academic journals. We had not expected so many of them to have had publication records while still in graduate school.

As for monographs, 58.3% of the faculty have had no monographs published with 21.1% of them having had one monograph published. The rest of the faculty listed two or more monographs. Approximately 25% of the graduate students claim to have had one or more monographs published.

Books are the most difficult to get published. Slightly over half of the faculty (59.6%) claim no authorship of a book. Nearly one-fifth (19.2%) of the faculty have published one book; 8.1%, 2 books; 5.1%, 3 books; 3.5%, 4 books; 0.5%, 5 books; 1.0%, 6 books; and 3.0%, 8 or more books. A few students reported that they have had a book published.

3. PROFESSIONAL LIFE

After having presented a profile of the respondents, we are now ready to discuss how they view their professional life. Graduate student respondents were welcomed to respond to these questions if they felt they were qualified to do so, and some did respond. Those graduate students who are teaching assistants and who otherwise are engaged in similar activities probably felt that they were no longer simply students but professionals engaged in teaching and research. In any case, the total number of cases involved in each question is provided.

3.1 Satisfaction with Present Employment

In order to ascertain the extent of the respondents' satisfaction with their professional life in different areas, the following question was asked: "Are you reasonably satisfied with your present employment in terms of the following criteria?" (1) salary, (2) professional environment and working conditions, and (3) social and political environment. The respondents showed the least satisfaction with salary, 58.1% ($N=234$) being satisfied, followed by social and political environment with 69.5% ($N=234$). The largest percentage of respondents were satisfied with their professional environment and working conditions (73.9%, $N=233$).

When further asked to express an overall happiness or unhappiness with their present employment, a majority of them (56.6%, $N=237$) expressed that they are "reasonably happy." Nearly 22% of them said they were "very happy." A low 3% of

them showed strong dissatisfaction by choosing to report that they were "very unhappy" with their present employment, while 18.4% were "somewhat unhappy." Consequently, one may conclude that a good majority of foreign-born political scientists are happy with their employment in their adopted land. They are most satisfied with their working conditions followed by the social and political environment. Named as the least satisfactory area is that of salary.

Concerning dissatisfaction with the salary, we cannot be sure if this feeling is based on objective criteria. A comparison of foreign-born faculty salaries with salaries of the male sample in the Converse study indicated a significant differential. It is also true that a vast majority of the foreign-born faculty (87%) hold the Ph.D degree, as compared with only 61% among those contained in the National Register. If such comparison across different studies are valid, and they may not be, then the feeling of dissatisfaction on salaries among the foreign-born faculty would seem to be justified.

3.2 Professional Goals

The respondents were asked to identify their important professional goals by choosing one of the following alternatives: (1) teaching and research (64.2%, $N=279$), (2) teaching (8.2%), (3) contribution to policy change (7.2%), (4) research publication (4.3%), (5) research and policy change (7.2%), (6) teaching at a leading university (6.1%), (7) others (2.9%). By far the most popular choice is a combination of teaching and research. Small minorities prefer to work toward a single goal of teaching, research or policy change. A still smaller minority of the respondents are interested in obtaining a teaching position at a leading university as their professional goal. There are no significant differences between those who pursue a single goal of teaching, research or policy change. As far as our respondents are concerned, the two major goals of their professional life are teaching and research. This coincides with an earlier pilot study carried out by one of the authors of this report.¹¹

3.3 Specific Problems

There are always some problems that face anyone who seeks professional goals of the nature just described. The subjects were

11. Kuroda, *op. cit.*

to cite two problems in the pursuit of their professional goals and were provided with the following alternative answers: (1) research funds (56.2%, $N=210$; 3.1%, $N=129$), (2) job difficulties (14.3%; 14.7%), (3) subtle racial or ethnic discrimination (7.6%; 16.3%), (4) environmental support (11.0%; 24.8%), (5) professional activities such as difficulties experienced in getting on the APSA program (1.4%; 15.5%), (6) promotion (1.9%; 7.8%), (7) salary (2.9%; 10.1%), and (8) others (4.8%; 7.8%). The first figures given in parentheses indicate the first response and the second denotes the second response category they checked.

First of all, the number of those who responded to the question decreased almost to one-half from the first to the second; i.e., only about half of the respondents checked two answer categories ($N=129$). Inasmuch as those response categories being placed toward the top are selected as the first response when they checked two answers, the following combined percentages of the two may give a balanced view of the respondents' perspectives: (1) research funds (59.3%), (2) job difficulties (29.0%), (3) subtle racial discrimination (23.9%), (4) environmental support (35.8%), (5) professional activities (16.9%), (6) promotion (9.7%), (7) salary (13.0%) and (8) others (12.6%). The order in frequency of problems faced by our respondents is: (1) research funds, (2) environmental support, (3) job difficulties, (4) subtle racial discrimination, (5) professional activities, (6) salary, (7) others and (8) promotion. The lack of research funds may be a common problem for many political scientists, but the fact that certain government fellowships and research funds are given only to citizens of the U.S. may constitute the basic reason for a high percentage of the respondents' claim that this is their number one problem. Environmental problems faced by our respondents may be unique in the sense that many of our respondents report difficulty in finding congenial colleagues and friends with whom they can interact. Part of this difficulty is a result of differences between culture and personality of foreign-born professionals and those of the host country. Difficulties one experiences in obtaining jobs are a common problem for the indigenous colleagues as well as the foreign-borns. This is a problem which is getting worse at this time in our profession. The fourth problem our respondents point out is racial or ethnic discrimination. An obvious problem here is that no one openly declares that one hates foreign-born political scientists or this or that racial group. Whether or not such a situation exists is an empirical problem difficult to ascertain. An important thing is that a minority of our respondents *feel* there is

subtle racial discrimination. Difficulties experienced in their attempts to get on panels may be shared by many members of our profession due to the lack of influential friends. Salary and promotion are mentioned very seldom as a barrier in the pursuit of their professional goals. Naturally, the nature of the problems faced by foreign-born political scientists may vary in accordance with racial and cultural backgrounds of the respondents. To some, Europeans speaking English with an accent are "charming" while the accent of Asians or Africans may be considered "inscrutable" and "foreign." In order to sharpen our inquiry along this line, a question was asked to ascertain unique problems faced by foreign-borns in the United States.

3.4 Unique Problems

The first question was: "In your opinion, do the foreign-born political scientists, as compared with those born in the United States, find it harder or easier to get suitable employment in this country?" Response categories provided for and responses received are as follows: (1) a great deal harder (27.8%, $N=252$), (2) somewhat harder (38.9%), (3) no significant difference (29.8%), (4) somewhat easier for foreign-born (3.6%), (5) and a great deal easier for foreign-born (0%).

Nearly one-third of the respondents find that their problems in employment competitions are greater than for their native-born colleagues. Well over one-third feel it is somewhat harder to get jobs. Another one-third inform us that there are no differences. A very small minority (3.6%) report that they have found job hunting easier because they were foreign-born. We find it difficult to explain why some would say foreign-born political scientists find it easier to find a good job. We may add here that none of our Asian and African respondents thought so when this question was run against the nationality factor.

The next question was more personal. We requested subjects to indicate the degree of problems they themselves have encountered in eight different areas because of their foreign birth. Table 4 indicates the extent to which our respondents feel a disadvantage because of their foreign birth. The areas in which they are most likely to encounter unique problems are three: 40% of them feel they have been discriminated against in the matters of job applications, teaching positions and research grants. In other areas, a substantial minority, consisting about one-fifth to one third, feel that they have been placed in a disadvantageous

position because of their foreign birth. Perhaps it is important to note that more than half of them feel either that there was no discrimination or that their foreign birth status was irrelevant. However, it should be kept in mind that these include a substantial number of Europeans who can be expected not to have serious problems. Data not shown here indicate that East, South, and West Asians feel different about these problem areas. At least one-half of them feel that they have encountered problems because of their foreign birth.

Table 4. Degrees of Problems (Faculty) (in percentage)

Problem Areas	Blatant	Moderate	None	Not Relevant	Total %	<i>N</i>
Job applications	11.6	31.0	42.1	15.3	100	216
Securing teaching Positions	11.9	34.2	40.6	13.2	100	219
Salary	7.0	23.4	50.0	19.6	100	214
Promotion	7.1	22.6	50.5	19.8	100	212
Tenure	3.8	10.5	58.1	27.6	100	210
Fringe benefits	3.3	8.6	63.8	24.3	100	210
Research grants	12.8	26.6	40.8	19.7	100	218
Publications	7.5	18.2	49.1	25.2	100	214

3.5 Quota System

There has been a feeling among some foreign-born political scientists that there is an unspoken quota system prevailing in many departments, where the department may be happy to have one foreign-born colleague but not too many, particularly if additional ones are from the same country. A question was asked to check the prevalence of such a feeling. Our survey results show that this is an opinion of a minority of the respondents. Only 13.9% said that such a situation exists. Over one-half (54.2%) said that there is no such quota operating, while 31.9% said they are uncertain about the possibility.

3.6 Attitude toward the Caucus

The last question included for faculty members was their attitude toward the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS). In the recent years, the discipline of political science has seen a great

deal of controversy and dissension. In particular, the CNPS has advocated a number of reforms within the governance of our profession. We were interested in finding out the sympathy or lack of it for the Caucus program among our faculty sample. Over one-half (60.2%) said that they are either "highly" or "somewhat" sympathetic toward the Caucus. About one-fourth (24.2%) report that they are either "highly" or "somewhat" unsympathetic toward the Caucus; 15.6% remain neutral. This attitude, which will be discussed later, is highly a function of the national origin of our faculty.

4. GRADUATE STUDENTS

There were special questions that were asked of our graduate students who are in graduate school. Even if some are still working toward a degree, they were classified as faculty if they have already left school and are teaching at some other university or college. Consequently, only those graduate students who are in graduate schools are classified in our survey as graduate students.

4.1 Financial Aid

Of 84 answering the question of whether they are receiving any financial aid for their education, only 17.9% said no. A majority of them (57.1%) are on a departmental fellowship or assistantship. Nine and one-half percent of them are supported by U.S. government scholarships of one sort or another. A very small 3.6% report that they are supported by their home governments abroad. The remaining 11.9% have financial support from a variety of sources.

4.2 Future Plans

The next question concerns their plans for the future. Do they plan to stay here? The answer was divided, to say the least. The following were their responses: No (28.2%); Not yet certain (25.9%); Yes, for a few years (32.9%); and Yes, permanently (12.9%). A rather small segment of them are determined to stay in the United States while the large majority of them are uncertain, assuming that the two middle groups, who may go home or stay here depending upon how the situation prevails itself upon their graduation, are among the uncertain. The difficulty of finding a college teaching position was strongly expressed, particularly by those who were looking for a position this past year. In any case,

our hypothesis is that many may go home if the present job market situation continues. In fact, these foreign-born graduates will have no choice but to go home, since they may find it extremely difficult to find a job in the U.S.

4.3 Unique Problems

A similar question to one asked the faculty was asked of the students in order to discover the extent to which they personally experienced any problems because of their status as a foreign student.

Table 5 indicates that the biggest problems they faced are those of financial aid and part-time employment. Over one-half of

Table 5. Degrees of Problems (Students) (in percentage)

Problems Areas	Blatant	Moderate	None	Not Relevant	Total %	N
Admission to School	7.1	29.8	56.0	7.1	100	84
Financial Aid	30.5	31.7	29.3	8.5	100	82
Part-time employment	21.5	31.6	31.6	15.2	100	79
Students' attitudes	6.1	29.3	57.3	7.3	100	82
Professors' attitudes	3.7	34.1	59.8	2.4	100	82
Job recommendations	5.1	19.2	50.0	25.6	100	78

the respondents felt that they had been discriminated against on these two questions. In other areas, only about one-third of them felt moderate discrimination. Now we must keep in mind that these constitute self-assessments and do not necessarily coincide with what the university authorities say about their employment practices. It is against university regulations to discriminate against anyone because of race or culture. But the fact is that some individuals continue to *feel* that they have been discriminated against. The question is how does one make them feel that they receive equal treatment.

4.4 Employment Perspective

An attempt was made to find out if the respondents were actively seeking employment this past year. Of 84 respondents, a

majority of them (67.9%) were not. Only 13.1% of them were looking for full-time employment while 19.0% were interested in seeking part-time employment only. We asked a further question of those who said they were seeking employment either full-time or part-time.

Of 27 respondents who answered affirmatively, 44.4% had not been invited to any interviews. The following is a frequency distribution of how often the rest of them were invited for interviews: one (7.4%), two (25.9%), three (7.2%), four (7.4%), and five or more (7.4%).

This concludes a description of our respondents' responses to the survey questions. The next section of our report will be an attempt to examine how differences in nationality affect our professional life perspectives.

5. NATIONALITIES

This section explores differences and similarities found among different nationalities (See Table 6). To what extent and in what areas are these foreign-born political scientists different from or similar to each other? This is the question to which we address ourselves.

5.1 U.S. Citizenship

Table 6 shows how each variable relates to nationalities divided into five groups. The data demonstrate a distinctive difference between Asians and Europeans. Asians are almost twice less likely to be U.S. citizens. Approximately 40% of all Asian groups are U.S. citizens, while nearly 100% of East Europeans are.

5.2 Academic Ranking

East Europeans are most likely to be full professors (48.6%), a function of their longer service, as will be seen below. East and South Asians (Southeast Asians included) are least likely to hold full professorships. West Asians (the Middle Easterners) and West Europeans number about the same on this question.

5.3 Tenure Status

One would expect some degree of association between professorial rank and tenure status, which there is, but not a very

neat association, as can be seen in Table 6. As expected, 85.3% of East Europeans are tenured as opposed to 63.8% of East Asians. However, a high 82.5 of West Europeans are tenured and only 57.9% of West Asians are tenured. A relatively high 75% of South Asians are tenured.

5.4 Years of Professional Experience

As one could infer from the data presented thus far, East Europeans have longer years of professional experience than any other nationality. A high 85.4% of them have 10 years or more of professional experience, while only one-third to a half of the rest of the nationality groups have more than 10 years of teaching experience.

5.5 Language Proficiency

We asked each respondent to rate his own spoken English language proficiency. This, then, is a result of self-assessment of the respondent's ability to orally communicate with students and colleagues. We found a rather interesting result. We, of course, are not certain as to how the results relate to the objective fact of language proficiency. Oddly enough, South Asians (80%) and West Europeans (80.5%) are the most likely to state that their spoken English is excellent and as good as that of the natives. East Asians and East Europeans are low in the percentage of respondents claiming that their English is as good as that of their American colleagues. In fact, only about a half of them do so. West Asians rank somewhere between these two groups. We realize that those with European language backgrounds would find it easier to learn English than, say, East Asians, whose languages are completely different from the English language.

5.6 Highest Degree Awarded by their Department

Many research-oriented scholars desire to find their positions at places where a Ph.D. is offered. Table 6 shows percentages of those respondents who departments give Ph.D. training. For some reason, South Asians are least likely to be located in Ph.D. offering departments, with only 4.2% of them so located, as opposed to West Europeans, 56.1% of whom are so located. East Asians and East Europeans do not fare very well on this questions, with 27.7% and 34.3% respectively.

Table 6. Nationalities

Nationalities	Variables % (N)	Variables % (N)	Variables % (N)
	% of U.S. citizens	% of full professors	% of tenured faculty
East Asians	42.9% (49)	27.7% (47)	63.8% (47)
South Asians	44.9% (25)	28.0% (25)	75.0% (25)
West Asians	42.1% (19)	36.8% (19)	57.9% (19)
West Europeans	75.6% (41)	37.5% (40)	82.5% (40)
East Europeans	94.1% (34)	48.6% (35)	85.3% (34)
	% of experience over 10 years	% of "excellent" English	% of Ph.D. awarding dept.
East Asians	38.5% (49)	50.0% (48)	27.7% (47)
South Asians	32.0% (25)	80.0% (25)	4.2% (24)
West Asians	42.1% (19)	68.4% (19)	42.1% (19)
West Europeans	49.1 (39)	80.5% (41)	56.1% (41)
East Europeans	85.4% (34)	54.3% (35)	34.3% (35)
	% of faculty with \$15,000 or more	% teaching at less than 5,000 students	% of faculty with 1 or more books
East Asians	44.9% (49)	36.2% (47)	35.4% (48)
South Asians	36.0% (25)	45.8% (24)	29.2% (24)
West Asians	44.4% (18)	10.5% (19)	47.4% (19)
West Europeans	67.5% (40)	14.6% (41)	47.5% (40)
East Europeans	54.3% (35)	31.4% (35)	51.4% (35)
	% of mentioned racial problems	% feeling a great deal harder	% of Pro and Anti Caucus
East Asians	7.3% (41)	45.7% (46)	Pro% 66.7 Anti% 14.6 (48)
South Asians	12.5% (24)	43.5% (23)	72.2 2.8 (36)
West Asians	18.8% (16)	50.0% (18)	64.7 0 (17)
West Europeans	6.1% (33)	2.6% (38)	55.8 39.5 (43)
East Europeans	7.4% (27)	2.9% (34)	32.4 52.9 (34)

5.7 Income

The level of income seems to vary by nationalities. The West Europeans are best paid, with 67.5% receiving over \$15,000, while only 36.0% of South Asians receive over that amount.

5.8 University Size

The size of institutions, as measured by the number of students enrolled, offers another indication of the type of place different nationalities work. West Asians and West Europeans are

least likely to teach at smaller institutions, where there are less than 5,000 students. Again South Asians are most likely to be found at these small institutions, as indicated in a high 45.8%. Nearly one-half of the South Asians teach at institutions that are smaller than 5,000 in student body. This coincides with the level of income to some extent.

5.9 Productivity

A very rough indicator of productivity is used here by separating those who have published at least one book from those who have not. Table 6 shows no appreciable differences among scholars from different countries as far as the publication of books is concerned. The least productive are those from South Asia, followed by East Asians. The variation in productivity is a function of rank, numbers of years of experience, and the quality of teaching institution. A greater proportion of East Europeans are full professors, have longer professional experience and teach at relatively larger schools. In contrast, the South Asians are likely to occupy lower academic ranks, have shorter work experience and teach at smaller non-Ph.D. awarding institutions.

5.10 Subtle Racial Discrimination

When the respondents were asked to pick two problems that they felt they have encountered in their pursuit of professional career, some of them chose race problems as one from among eight alternatives. Table 6 presents percentages of those who mentioned the race problem as the first problem. Percentages of those who report having encountered racial discrimination are small, but it seems to be a common experience among all foreign-born political scientists. Among them, however, South Asians and West Asians are twice as likely to mention the race issue as the other nationality groups.

5.11 Harder for Foreign-Born?

This question was solicited in order to investigate the feeling of the respondents concerning their attempts to find suitable employment. Do they find their job hunting easier or more difficult as compared with those who are born in the United States? We already know that more than half of them believe that they will find it harder than their indigenous colleagues. Is this common among all nationalities? That is the question we answer

now. The simple answer is that about one-half of all Asians find that job hunting is "a great deal harder," while less than 3% of the Europeans felt the same.

Asians, whether they are from the Middle East or the Far East, find it equally difficult to perform their jobs. Europeans do not find it difficult. Cultural, linguistic, racial and other factors probably account for this difference among different nationalities on this question. Naturally, some attribute this difficulty to the question of race, but the majority of Asians prefer not to attribute it to that, as our finding in Section 5.10 shows.

5.12 Attitudes Toward the Caucus

Last to be dealt with is the question of the respondents' attitudes toward the Caucus for a New Political Science. Table 6 makes it quite clear that the attitudes toward the Caucus vary by nationality. Asians as a whole are much more favorably disposed toward the Caucus, with well over one-half of them being sympathetic to the Caucus' cause, while East Europeans are least supportive of the Caucus.

Who are most likely to be unsympathetic? Over one-half (52.9%) of the East Europeans are unsympathetic, followed by 39.5% of the West Europeans. Among Asians, East Asians are more likely to be against the Caucus, with 14.6% of them being unsympathetic, followed by a very small percentage of South Asians (2.8%). No West Asians showed any antipathy toward the Caucus.

6. SUMMARY

This study leads the authors to conclude that foreign-born political scientists are not dramatically different from American-born professionals concerning their background characteristics. In terms of their attitudes, they were found to be least satisfied with the salaries they were receiving. A special problem that they mention concerns receiving research grants. This view may be based on the fact that many immigrant political scientists cannot qualify for so many of the research awards since these often carry citizenship requirements. A large porportion of the respondents also feel that it is much harder for the foreign-born, as compared with those born in the U.S., to find suitable employment in the United States.

Significant differences appear when the respondents' national origins are taken into account. In general, the Asian political

scientists are less well paid, reflecting in part their shorter work experience. They are also more likely to teach at smaller and non-Ph.D. awarding schools (especially South Asians). They are more critical of the prevailing practices in the profession than are Europeans. A sizable portion feels that foreign-born political scientists find it much harder to get suitable employment. Finally, Asian political scientists are found to be much more favorably disposed toward the Caucus for a New Political Science than are other nationality groups.

Chapter 6

FOREIGN-BORN POLITICAL SCIENCE GRADUATE STUDENTS IN NORTH AMERICA: AN INTERPRETIVE SUMMARY OF AN EXPLORATORY DEPTH INTERVIEW SURVEY

AKIRA KUBOTA

"I have received your letter requesting an interview," wrote a potential respondent. "Although I am not really foreign-born, I feel very much alienated, and if it is useful, I am willing to give you an interview." Subsequently I met this subject at a noisy basement coffee shop of a student union building of a large American midwestern university. She was blond and slender, and as it turned out, she was of the East European stock. The interview was pleasant and informative, and toward the end of this interview, I said, "I remember you stating that you were alienated in your letter accepting the interview. What did you mean by being alienated?" The subject quickly brushed aside my question and said, "Oh, no. I just thought that I might be able to get your attention by saying something like that. No, I am more or less satisfied with the conditions of my graduate work here."

It is hard to say how typical this image of foreign students is in North America, and I obviously did not use a modern scientific sampling technique to select this particular episode. Yet it is probably fair to assume that this is *one* of the images of foreign students held by the North American public, and there is of course little question that some — and probably not all — foreign students encounter some serious difficulties in their academic lives in North America. Thus although the extent of "alienation," "difficulty" or "maladjustment" may vary a great deal from individual to individual depending on one's psychological and constitutional make-up, national and ethnic background, pre-North American training, linguistic ability, North American university and social settings, and other factors, it may be reasonable to hypothesize that the above negative image of foreign-born political science graduate students has some empiri-

This chapter was originally prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, September 2-6, 1975.

cal validity. The basic objective of this study is to identify and analyze the type of problem foreign-born political science students generally encounter during their graduate work in North America and to search for possible solutions to these problems.

What follows is an interpretive summary of exploratory depth interviews with some 35 foreign-born political science graduate students enrolled in eight major and minor universities in the midwestern states of the United States and Ontario in Canada. On the average these interviews lasted for approximately one hour, although in a few cases the interview and post-interview conversation lasted as long as three or four hours. Since I was not able to allocate all of my time solely for these interviews in any given period of time, I took these interviews over the period of seven months beginning in February 1975 and ending in August 1975. These interviews covered such items as reasons for choosing political science as the field of graduate work, the command of the English language, scholarships, fellowships, teaching and research assistantships, reactions to courses and instructors, thesis supervision, repatriation, naturalization, employment and career prospects, living accommodations, social relations and others.

Table 1 sets forth a breakdown of the national origins of the students interviewed for this study. Approximately 75% of our sample were enrolled in Ph.D. programs, and approximately 25% of it were enrolled in M.A. programs. Approximately 80% of our sample were males whereas approximately 20% of it were females.

The lists of foreign-born political science graduate students were obtained from the political science departments of the universities included in the sample of this study. Yet the degree of cooperation I received in this respect varied greatly between Canada and the United States. All the Canadian political science departments were highly cooperative, and they promptly provided me with the lists. On the other hand, some American political science departments were clearly reluctant. One department chairman insisted that I should supply him with a document proving that I was engaged in bona fide research. Another chairman did not even bother to reply to my request, although I wrote him on three different occasions. (Immediately prior to this survey, I had contacted the same chairman on an entirely different matter, and at that time there was no communication problem.) In all cases, however, I was eventually able to obtain from one source or another some sort of listing, e.g., a list of all political science graduate students rather than an exclusive list of all foreign-born political science graduate students. Although

these lists — as an experienced researcher would often quickly discover — tended to be outdated and incomplete, they nevertheless appeared to provide a sufficient basis for an exploratory study such as this one.

Table 1. A Breakdown of the National Origins of the Students Interviewed for this Study. For our purpose, China and Taiwan are separated.

France	Egypt
Germany	Israel
	Lebanon
Greece	
Lithuania	India
Poland	Pakistan
Turkey	
	China
Australia	Hong Kong
	Korea
Brazil	Taiwan
Cuba	
Uruguay	Ghana
	Kenya
Guyana	Namibia
Jamaica	Nigeria
Trinidad	Sudan

All the students I have interviewed were quite friendly and cooperative. At one extreme, a few students said that these interviews gave them an opportunity to get off their chests the frustration that they had felt for a long period of time. At another extreme, a few said that they did not really have any serious problems in their graduate work in North America, and they even apologized to me for not being a “good” sample for this study. Some students said that they were basically guests in North America, and that they had no right to complain about their conditions here. Still other students, as will be seen presently, showed clearly bitter feelings about some of their experiences in North America. Some respondents enjoyed lengthy post-interview conversations with me, and these conversations covered such topics as student-professor relations, the current status of the academic job market, the merits and demerits of behavioral

research, the study of values in political science, their personal histories and experiences (or even marital or sex problems), the Arab-Israeli conflict, their graduate programs and thesis work, my research interest and publishing plans, etc. In general, I did not have any substantial communication problems in these interviews. A few appeared to misunderstand a few of my questions, and I had to restate my original questions. A few had a problem of not being fully articulate on the topics that they were discussing, but in most cases I was able to overcome these difficulties by supplying additional probing questions.

This article consists of two major parts: (1) a summary of responses on such topics as reasons for choosing political science as the field of graduate work, the command of the English language, financial aids, reactions to courses and instructors, thesis supervision, employment and career prospects, plans for repatriation or naturalization, social relations, etc., and (2) a list of recommendations for dealing with the problems identified in this survey. These recommendations were partially drafted by the respondents of this study and partially by myself.

Several basic rules governing the research work of this study may be clarified at the beginning of this article. First, since I have promised the strictest confidentiality of the data to be furnished by our respondents, I will necessarily omit the type of information which may reveal the identity of the respondent. I will, however, attempt to provide sufficient factual background information so as to facilitate a proper understanding of the nature of the problems to be discussed below.

Second, by and large I will not critically appraise the quality or truthfulness of the responses given in these interviews. Because of the time and financial constraints of this study, it was clearly out of the question to verify the information provided by the respondents of this study. Although some of the responses may appear excessively emotional or virtually incredible from the standpoint of native-born professors and students, I have assumed it to be my responsibility to report the responses of this study as accurately and faithfully as possible. Whether or not many of the problems reported in their survey do in fact exist must be further investigated in future research.

Third, the present study is a non-statistical study, and what I mean by "interpretive summary" is to carry out a *qualitative* analysis of the data gathered in this study and to present a comprehensive description of the status of foreign-born political science graduate students in North America.

Fourth and finally, the basic objective of this paper is to conduct an exploratory study on the status of foreign-born political science graduate students and to provide a basis for further discussion and research on this general topic. Obviously, much research needs to be carried out in this area, and it is hoped that this small study will serve as a stimulant for further efforts in this area.

The early family or personal histories of foreign-born political science graduate students often strongly influenced their decision to study political science at the graduate level. A fairly large group of our sample indicated that either their parents or other close relatives were active or strongly interested in politics as they were growing up, and that these parental or relatives' roles had a direct bearing on their subsequent decision to study political science at the graduate level. There were also a few rather unusual cases of early personal political history. One Latin American student stated that he was involved in guerilla activities when he was young, and that he has always been interested in politics. An African respondent said that because of his early political activities, he was currently barred from his own country, and that this was the direct cause of his decision to study political science. An East European student said that since her family kept moving from one country to another when she was growing up, she had always been interested in other nations and governments.

A large proportion of foreign-born political science graduate students cited relatively pragmatic reasons for choosing political science as the field of their graduate work. Many of those who were from developing nations said that they came to North America to study political science so that once they complete their graduate work, they can return to their own countries and can help their countries economically and politically. Students from the Middle Eastern nations often stated that they began to study political science either to understand or to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict. Some Korean students regarded studying political science primarily as a means of social advancement. Apparently in Korea political science is looked upon as an attractive elite training route leading to prominent social, economic and political position in Korean society; very roughly, what studying political science means to Koreans is analogous to what going to Harvard or Yale Law School means to North Americans.

There were a small group of foreign-born political science graduate students who were primarily attracted to the academic study of politics and the position of a university professor. This

group marked a sharp contrast to the majority of foreign-born political science graduate students who were chiefly attracted to active political participation and only secondarily to teaching and/or research. These academically oriented students tended to be more Americanized or Canadianized than the others. Their command of English tended to be excellent, and their value preferences tended to resemble those of the comparable Americans or Canadians. Insofar as I could determine on the basis of my interviews with them, they appeared to be highly intelligent and to be quite successful in their graduate work.

A large bulk of foreign-born political science graduate students reported that they found little problem in the command of the English language, and this was rather surprising to me personally. Some of them admitted that writing took up a great deal of their time, but at the same time they pointed out that writing was also a problem for native-born North American students.

The degree of linguistic proficiency appeared to be correlated to (1) the length of study in North America and (2) pre-North American linguistic background and training. Those who had been here for a long period of time — especially those who began at the high school or undergraduate level here — tended to be quite fluent in English. Some of them may retain some slight non-North American linguistic influences, but they apparently have little difficulty in reading, writing and hearing. There were a few in our sample who came to North America at the grade school level, and their mastery of the English language was virtually indistinguishable from that of the comparable North American graduate student. (Many of these early arrivals had already become permanent residents, landed immigrants or naturalized citizens.)

Pre-North American linguistic background and training also seemed to play a major role in the degree of proficiency in the English language. Quite obviously for those for whom English is the mother tongue, the command of the English language is no problem. However, a difficulty in the matter of the mother tongue is that it is not always clear as to which language is one's mother tongue, and this is particularly true of the cases of those who came from the non-white former British colonies, i.e., India, Pakistan, much of Africa, and the West Indies. Those who came from these areas generally received all or much of their education in English, but many of them apparently spoke languages other than English in their homes. Although there were a few whose

command of English was even better than that of a North American with an equivalent level of education, many of them appeared to retain a small or moderate degree of non-English linguistic influence. Also, there were a few who attended American or British missionary and similar schools in developing nations, and their mastery of the English language appeared to be excellent.

Some of our respondents revealed enormously diversified linguistic backgrounds. A Jewish respondent told me that he had lived in Europe, Latin America, Israel and the United States, thus requiring him to speak French, Portuguese, Spanish, Hebrew and English. In addition, he indicated that he really thought that his mother tongue was Yiddish. Although he retains some slight non-North American accent, in terms of the ability to articulate or grammatical accuracy, his English could be favorably compared with that of the best of the native-born political science graduate students.

A relatively large number of North and East Asians — Japanese, Koreans and Chinese — reported more or less serious linguistic difficulties, and one obvious reason appeared to be the fact that the North Asian languages are generally radically different from the English language. Many of them reported that they could not really overcome their linguistic barrier in written essay tests, oral tests, or seminar discussions, and that they could express their academic accomplishment only by writing research or term papers. There were, however, a few exceptions to this general pattern, and in one case the student said that he majored in English (rather than political science) at the undergraduate level and worked as an interpreter before coming to North America to study political science at the graduate level.

Some Europeans — especially Southern and Eastern Europeans — reported some moderate or slight linguistic problems. However, the average students — and particularly the West Europeans — appeared to be high in terms of the command of English, and some appeared to be as good as native-born North Americans.

If I were asked to present an estimated ordering of national origins in terms of the degree of proficiency in English, I would probably reply as shown in Table 2.

I must emphasize that there is a large amount of individual variation within each of these national origins, and there is little question that some of my respondents do not neatly fit into this list at all.

Table 2. National Origin and Proficiency in English

Most Proficient:	1. Britons, Irishmen
	2. Australians, New Zealanders, White South Africans
	3. West Europeans
	4. Indians, Pakistanis, West Indians, Non-White Africans, Israelis
	5. Latin Americans, Middle Easterners, East Europeans, South Europeans
Least Proficient:	6. North Asians, Southeast Asians

Although foreign-born political science graduate students tended to dismiss the language problem, a relatively large number of them readily admitted that finances were a major problem for them. Except for a very few who were fully supported by their parents or close relatives, our respondents were dependent upon either fellowships, teaching assistantships or incomes from a variety of manual or clerical jobs. One or two respondents indicated that they were not likely to have enough income to continue their graduate work and were likely to abandon it in the near future.

A fairly large number of our respondents reported that they held part-time or full-time jobs. This was fairly common among those who attended public universities, but it was also found among those who attended expensive private universities. The types of jobs that they held were highly diverse — construction worker, salesman, taxi-driver, bar-tender, cook, porter, clerk, automobile assembly-line worker, receptionist, library assistant, etc. It appears that in the United States it was relatively easy to find these jobs, but it was considerably more difficult in Canada. Canada recently adopted a policy of filling a job with a citizen or landed immigrant first, thus making it virtually impossible for one with a student visa to obtain a job there.

In order to work in the United States, a student with a student visa must obtain a work permit, and in addition for certain job classifications, he is required to obtain special licenses (e.g., cab-driver, real estate salesman). Some of our respondents appeared to be ignoring these legal requirements, although I tried not to make any special effort to probe this area. In fact, one of our respondents emphasized that in order for a foreign student to

complete his graduate work successfully, he must know a variety of techniques to get around a series of institutionalized handicaps placed on his status as a foreigner. If this is indeed the case, their shaky legal basis makes them vulnerable to the employers' natural tendency to impose on them substandard wages. At least it was fairly clear that the amounts of wages that foreign students earned generally did not properly reflect their educational backgrounds.

Of those who were receiving fellowships and other financial aids, many indicated that the availability of financial assistance often dictated their ultimate choices of universities. In other words, the universities that they finally chose were not as good as those they really wanted to attend, but a lack of financial support at those superior universities compelled them to settle for inferior universities where financial assistance was more readily available.

Although a fairly large number of our respondents indicated that they had been fairly and equitably treated in terms of financial assistance, some of them clearly indicated their dissatisfaction. There were three types of complaints with respect to financial assistance: (1) legalized barriers, (2) the amounts of aid, and (3) the selection processes.

There are two major explicit and legalized disadvantages imposed on those who are in North America on the basis of student visa: (1) many major — especially government-sponsored — fellowship and loan programs are not available to foreign students, and (2) since foreign students are considered non-residents, they are often asked to pay more expensive out-of-state tuitions by state-supported institutions. Because of these two major restrictions, foreign students often must perform considerably better than native-born students in order to obtain the same level of financial assistance. Although many of our respondents appeared to accept these barriers grudgingly, a number of them expressed bitter feelings with respect to the two other types of complaints which will be explained below.

A second type of grievance was that the amount of assistance was clearly inadequate. Many foreign students indicated that even when they were given aids, the amounts of these aids tended to be a bare minimum so that they were compelled to live under a set of conditions which were clearly below those under which most comparable native-born North Americans live. One of the reasons for this, as I have explained already, is that foreign-born student visa students were disqualified from high-paying fellowship and

loan programs. This situation created a resentment among foreign-born students in that they were accorded a substandard status and they were compelled to take additional income-producing jobs.

Third, two or three of our respondents bitterly complained about the processes by which financial aids were distributed. One student charged that a major factor in getting a major fellowship was the student's personal relationship with his mentor, and that in cultivating a relationship of this sort native-born students generally had a clear advantage over foreign-born students. Another student was clearly agitated when he related to me the circumstances surrounding his application for a thesis research fellowship. Although he thought that he was academically fully qualified, the fellowship was given to someone else who was less qualified, and this respondent was forced to give up his original thesis topic. Also, he made it fairly clear that it was his conclusion that his application was rejected because of his race.

Although finances appeared to be a very important problem for our respondents, a large group of them nevertheless insisted that finances were not the most important factor in successfully completing their graduate work. They pointed out that a more important factor was the sense of determination — the determination to obtain a graduate degree in political science. These students argued that once a student was fully committed to graduate work in political science, his financing was somehow taken care of in one way or another, and that finance was not a really insurmountable factor. Another sizable group indicated that both aptitude and determination were equally important. According to this group, no matter how bright a person is, he can not succeed in political science unless he is seriously interested in it, and no matter how hard one studies, he can not succeed in political science unless he shows some promise in it. Virtually all of our respondents placed the mastery of the language well below the above three factors — finances, aptitude, and determination. In other words, most of our respondents were convinced that English did not play a major role in successfully completing their graduate work.

Insofar as courses and instructors in political science are concerned, our respondents generally gave me relatively favorable reactions. Moreover, most responses on these items did not seem peculiar to foreign students. There were, however, a few negative comments on courses and instructors, and probably we are already familiar with most of these grievances: (1) courses were

too quantitative and behavioral; (2) although many foreign students were not interested in black studies, they were in some cases compelled to take courses covering this topic; (3) students had no more than minimal contact with the thesis advisor or other professors; (4) students had a difficulty of finding a thesis advisor for some highly specialized topic, e.g., the Cyprus crisis, domestic politics in some small, newly independent Asian nations; (5) some instructors simply read old lecture notes year after year; (6) some instructors did not make an adequate effort to explain political science terminology and especially behavioral jargon; (7) some instructors did not sufficiently prepare and organize their courses; (8) there was a lack of coordination and cooperation among instructors (and in some cases open conflicts among them) which tended to disrupt the programs that the students were pursuing; (9) some instructors were excessively involved in research and not sufficiently interested in teaching, etc.

There were, however, some complaints which appeared to be typical manifestations of what may be called the foreign-student syndrome: (1) not enough instructors were invited from abroad to teach courses in North America; (2) not enough emphasis was placed on foreign government courses; (3) North American political science courses tended to be excessively conservative and status quo oriented; (4) native-born North American political scientists tended to apply North American theoretical frameworks to non-western areas, even when the frameworks were grossly inappropriate; (5) native-born instructors tended to be closed-minded toward some of the interpretations presented by foreign-born students, and this was particularly true in the cases of left-wing political views; (6) some students reported that because of their non-Anglo Saxon spelling names, they tended to be discriminated against in tests and papers; (7) some complained that area courses were exclusively taught by native-born North American instructors; (8) some felt it strange that some native-born North American area specialists (e.g., Chinese or Japanese politics specialists) could barely speak the languages of the areas (e.g., Chinese or Japanese), etc.

There are a few isolated cases of extreme difficulty in terms of instructor-student relationship. One student from the Caribbean reported that as soon as an instructor discovered that he was partially black, the instructor abruptly changed his attitude toward him. This instructor became unreasonably harsh toward him and began to make a consistent effort to make him feel that something was wrong with him. The student felt that he was

clearly discriminated against, for example, in the marks that he received for his papers.

Another student felt that he was skillfully manipulated by his advisor and was compelled to select a topic in the area which the advisor himself was conducting research. Still another student reported that he was induced to turn over some of his research findings to his thesis advisor since both of them were conducting research in the same area. In addition, although his advisor controlled a large amount of research funds in this area, the advisor did not give him any financial assistance. There were a few cases where respondents felt that they were coerced to go through an unnecessarily long series of revisions of their theses.

On the other hand, many Arab and Moslem students felt that they did not encounter any special difficulty in working under Jewish instructors and as a matter of fact some Arab and Moslem students reported that they were writing theses under Jewish instructors. These Arab and Moslem students admitted that they could not discuss the Arab-Israeli conflict with their Jewish instructors. However, as long as they were able to avoid this issue, they seemed confident that they could get along with their Jewish advisors.

Some of our respondents reported that they were seriously worried about the tight job market in North America at the present moment. They cited the cases of fresh foreign-born political science Ph.D.'s who could not find any teaching jobs in North America and seemed to be convinced that they would probably face the same fate. A few of them said that whenever the squeeze was on, foreigners were bound to be the first victims. One student told me that because of the depressing job outlook, he was beginning to lose incentive in his graduate work, and he recently started to drink a great deal although he had never drunk much in his life.

I countered these responses by saying that the American immigration regulations stipulated that a job must be filled by an American citizen, and only when no qualified American is available, may a non-citizen be appointed. (I also cited comparable regulations for the Canadian situation.) These respondents, however, insisted that regulations of this sort might be appropriate for longshoremen, truck-drivers, and assembly-line workers, but they were clearly inappropriate for academic university positions. For the position of a professor, an overriding factor is academic excellence, and a factor such as citizenship must be regarded as irrelevant. Also a few of our respondents pointed out

to me that the term "qualified for the position" was often very loosely used so that on the one hand one native-born candidate or another was bound to be considered to be "qualified for the position," and on the other hand many foreign-born candidates were considered to be "overqualified for the position," thus being excluded from any serious consideration for the position. One respondent attempted to persuade me that the citizenship issue was in fact often invoked so as to camouflage a clearly discriminatory hiring practice.

It must, however, be emphasized that for the large bulk of foreign-born political science students, seeking *permanent* teaching positions in North America was not their first career choice. For them the first choice was to go back to their native countries and to go into politics. Those who were committed to the course of a permanent teaching position in North America consisted of those few who were highly successful in their graduate work and were highly Americanized or Canadianized in terms of speech, mannerisms and values. On the other hand, a clear majority of our respondents were far less assimilated, and many of those in this group retained an unmistakable sense of their original national identities. For them it is unthinkable to remain in North America indefinitely. Many of those in this group said that although upon repatriation they might initially teach at college or conduct research, they ultimately hoped to actively participate in the political process of their own nations. An interesting phenomenon in this connection is that an overwhelming majority of our respondents reported that their thesis research primarily dealt with the politics of their nations or the problems pertaining to the area in which their nations were located.

In terms of social relations, however, a considerable degree of separation appeared to exist. Many reported that it was generally easier and more enjoyable to socialize with those who were from their own countries or from the same geographical area. There were of course exceptions to this general pattern, and this was particularly true for those who came to North America when they were very young and for those who came from European nations. Some non-white respondents indicated that although many native-born students were very friendly toward foreign-born students, it was generally difficult to establish a truly meaningful relationship with them. Still others indicated that there definitely existed some gap between foreign-born and native-born students. Although it was difficult to precisely define such a gap, there was little question that it was not the sort of gap which could be easily

overcome. A relatively large group of our respondents indicated that they had been simply too busy in their study and work to pay much attention to social relations, and what this inevitably meant was that their minimum social relations were entirely confined to their own countrymen.

Many of our respondents said that they had attended parties given by native-born North Americans, and a fair number of them indicated that they often did not enjoy these parties. One reason they cited was that they were more or less ignored and isolated in these parties, and another reason was that since they did not know how they were expected to behave on these occasions, they felt uncomfortable under these circumstances. On the other hand, many of them indicated that since they did not encounter these problems at the parties given by their countrymen, they could truly relax and enjoy themselves at these parties.

Some students from developing nations pointed out to me that one major barrier against the development of close social relations with native-born North Americans was the fact that the latter tended to be either virtually ignorant about or generally negative toward the developing nations and their cultures. Since this type of blank or negative national image manifested itself in the remarks and assumptions made by native-born North Americans, foreign-born students tended to be discouraged from exploring close relationships with North Americans. According to one African student, North Americans tended to judge nations in terms of economic development, and since Africa is not very developed, they tended to have a low estimate of the ability of the African people. Another student from a developing nation indicated whenever North American students did not know him well, they tended to underestimate his academic ability, and when they discovered that he was highly capable, they tended to say that they were surprised. Through these contacts he began to realize that he was almost always evaluated in terms of his people or his nation and not in terms of his being a fully dignified individual, and he was sometimes irritated by this practice.

A few highly negative views on social relations were expressed by African students. One African student said that in recent years Africans were rarely invited to the homes of North Americans, and even when Africans invited them to their homes, North Americans generally did not reciprocate such a gesture of friendliness. When North Americans did take initiative of inviting Africans to their homes, there were often pragmatic reasons for such an invitation, such as the host seeking to gather first-hand

information on Africa for his coming trip to that continent. Another African indicated that since he was unable to have any meaningful relationship with most people on the campus or in the small city in which the university was located, he felt that he was in a mental cage, and that this type of social and mental condition was seriously disrupting his performance as a graduate student.

Almost all respondents appeared to approve of greater interaction among foreign-born students and native-born students. Some students even indicated that if one stuck only with his own ethnic group, something must be wrong with him. One non-white student stated that he felt perfectly comfortable in mingling with all sorts of groups, and that he often deliberately chose to live with native-born North Americans and other foreign-born students. At the same time, however, he admitted that he sometimes felt very lonely because he was separated from his family and his fiancée, and that loneliness is one of the most serious problems for foreign students.

Let us now turn to a critical review of a few general characteristics of the responses obtained in these interviews. First, although I have thus far tended to focus on the negative aspects of the lives of foreign-born political science graduate students in North America, it is certainly unfair to give an impression that North American universities are utterly failing in dealing with a series of special problems faced by foreign-born political science graduate students. I have largely omitted the positive aspects of their lives simply because the basic objective of this study was to identify the primary problems faced by foreign-born political science graduate students and to look for solutions to these problems.

In order to restore a proper balance, let me discuss a few additional, general patterns. There is little question that most of our respondents thought that the quality of graduate political science training in North America was quite high, and that they learned a great deal by coming to North America. In addition, many of them expressed a view that it was beneficial for them to be exposed to foreign culture and people.

Another important fact which needs to be pointed out is that among foreign-born political science graduate students those who have experienced very serious problems which may be attributed to their non-native status appeared to be in a minority. Approximately a quarter of our sample reported no problem which may be classified as a manifestation of the foreign-student syndrome;

about half reported either minor or moderate problems of this type; and about a quarter reported major problems of this type.

An example of a foreign-born political science graduate student who faced no problem is the case of a German student. Since he was brought over to North America when he was very young, he was virtually indistinguishable from native-born students, and probably he thought that he was more North American than German. He was quite intelligent, and since his grades were very high, he had received a number of scholarships and fellowships. However, he did have a problem: he began to realize that he should have studied psychology rather than political science because he found that his basic educational need, as he put it, was to discover himself, and that for that purpose the former was clearly preferable to the latter.

An example of a foreign student facing minor or moderate problems is the case of a French student. Since she came to North America fairly late, she retained some French accent in her English and had some problem in writing in English and especially with the differences in the sentence structure of the two languages. However, other than this problem she seemed to be doing well in her political science graduate work. She had received some major fellowships, and she very much enjoyed teaching courses as a teaching assistant.

An example of a foreign student with a major problem was the case of an African student. Although his application for a research fellowship was turned down, an application by a student who was academically inferior to him was accepted, and he was more or less convinced that this was due to his ethnic background. Also, he had had other bitter personal experiences in North America. For some utterly incomprehensible reason, the immigration officials did not permit his fiancée to enter North America, and he generally felt that his social and personal life had been virtually unbearable in North America.

To be sure, the record is not perfect; I have pointed out throughout this paper that foreign-born political science graduate students did face a variety of problems to varying degrees. Despite the fact that no national organization or effective local pressure group was actively looking into their interests, the total picture is not completely bleak, and it is certainly not as negative as the episode presented at the outset of this article may signify.

Moreover, even if some systematic effort to assist foreign students were in fact being made, it would probably be enormously difficult to solve all the problems reported in this study

largely because of the diversity of the foreign-born political science graduate students in North America in terms of their racial-ethnic backgrounds, their degrees of the mastery of English, their thesis topics, and their career-occupational outlooks. Although I have not gathered any hard data on this point, it is probably true that no nation or nations have ever been as successful as North America in training foreign-born political scientists.

A disturbing problem is, however, that the data gathered by this survey tends to indicate that color of one's skin is considerably correlated to the degree of satisfaction with graduate work in North America. In other words, the darker the color of one's skin is, the more unhappy he is likely to be in carrying out graduate work in North America. This pattern emerges in two aspects of our data: (1) whether or not the respondent became agitated during the interview and expressed some degree of bitterness in describing some of the events, and (2) the degree of social separation. Although, as it is true in most correlations obtained in social research, there were many exceptions to this general pattern, it appears fairly safe to conclude that the factor of color tends to play some recognizable role in the degree of satisfaction found among foreign-born political science students carrying out graduate work in North America.

However, the nature of the specific event about which the respondent expressed his bitterness varied from individual to individual. A respondent felt bitter when he received a B instead of an A for his paper, although he was firmly convinced that this was an A paper, and he could not avoid a conclusion that this was caused by the factor of his being black. A student felt deeply upset because his instructor often questioned and demolished some of the basic assumptions of his political ideology and made him feel that his intellectual capacity was clearly limited. A respondent felt bitter when he was not given a research fellowship although the same fellowship was given to those who were clearly academically inferior to him. Still another student felt seriously frustrated when many of his countrymen could not get a teaching job in the present depressed academic market in North America.

As far as social relations are concerned, color appeared to play a major role. While white foreign-born students tended to maintain a certain amount of close social relations with native-born North Americans, non-white foreign-born students generally maintained no more than superficial relations with them. But this general pattern seemed to be influenced by two additional factors:

the length of stay in North America and proficiency in English. Those who came to North America when they were very young tended to have developed close relations with native-born North Americans. Particularly, those who came from Europe when they were very young did not seem to be suffering from social isolation any more than native-born North Americans. An interesting characteristic with respect to social relations is that although black foreign-born students tended to be decisively more bitter than yellow or brown foreign-born students, yellow and brown foreign-born students appeared to be nearly as isolated as black foreign-born students.

There are two additional pieces of evidence which tend to accentuate the role of color in the lives of foreign-born political science graduate students. One is what may be called the "jungle" syndrome which was reported by a recognizable number of black students. According to them, some of their white instructors almost automatically came to a conclusion that their mental capability must be grossly substandard as soon as they saw dark-skinned students. One student reported to me that his friend recently decided to leave North America because his advisor kept reminding him that he was not sure whether or not he was academically capable to taking some of the most elementary courses in his field of specialization.

The other is the preference of some black foreign-born students to have as little contact with white instructors as possible. According to these students, white instructors did not understand the ideological underpinnings and cultural background of black foreign-born students, and it would be a waste of time to deal with these instructors. One black student said that he has never been to the home of any white professor, but he has constantly been to the homes of black instructors and talked with them regularly to seek their advice on a wide variety of matters. This student said that although black instructors tended to be hard on marking vis-à-vis black students, it was much easier for him to get along with black instructors. It should, however, be emphasized that this type of preference was expressed by only a few of the black students and certainly not by all black students. Yet it seems undeniable that there exists some definite and serious problem with respect to communication and mutual understanding between foreign-born black students and native-born North American white instructors.

Having discussed the question of color, it may be appropriate to touch on the matter of sex briefly. As I indicated earlier, about

20% of the sample of this study were females, but I did not encounter any particularly emotional or bitter statement on this subject. It is of course entirely conceivable that many of the female respondents did not see it fit to discuss such a matter with a male interviewer. Many female respondents, however, did mention a variety of problems which were peculiar to female students. A student said that she thought it was very nasty when she read a critique of her research fellowship proposal stating that a proposal like this could only be accepted because it was written by a woman. A respondent said that it was more difficult for a female scholar to publish in a leading academic journal than for a comparable male scholar. A female student said that her husband preferred her to stay home and to take care of household matters rather than to pursue her graduate work. A female respondent said that in her native nation, women's views were not taken seriously, and that this was one of the reasons why she was determined to obtain a Ph.D. In general, a lower proportion of female students indicated a strong desire to teach in North America, and some female respondents even in fact indicated that a permanent career position was a more serious matter for their husbands than for them.

As stated at the outset of this article, it is not the purpose of this study to investigate and prove or disprove the truthfulness of the variety of statements made by the respondents to this study. In terms of the time and financial restrictions placed on this study, it was clearly beyond the scope of this study to deal with such a problem. Instead, the objective of this study is to obtain the descriptions by foreign-born political science graduate students of their graduate work in North America and to summarize them as faithfully and accurately as possible.

Having said so, however, I must hasten to add that presenting this type of research posture does not fully solve the question of the truthfulness of the responses. This is particularly true for those who might take a defensive position on many of the problems identified in this study, i.e., instructors, university officials and North Americans in general. Some of them may argue that unless some of these statements were definitively proved, these statements would be basically useless, and that there is no need to write a report on it such as the present article. In other words, truthfulness will probably continue to be a major issue for critics of this type of research; they may find it impossible to dispell a supposition that these responses might be

based on sheer imagination and that there is no need to take these responses seriously.

There is of course no simple and completely satisfactory answer to this question within the present framework of this study. There are, however, a variety of partial answers to this question, and let me cite a few of them. First, there is always a certain amount of measurement error in any survey research project, and I do not think that the present study is an exception to this general rule. The real issue is how large the measurement error is, and not whether there is any measurement error at all. It is hard to say whether the amount of measurement error in this survey is greater than that in a typical large-scale academic public opinion survey. It is, however, worthwhile to point out that the amount of measurement error in a standard academic public opinion survey appears to be considerably larger than is formally admitted today. Since survey research is one of the principal tools of behavioral research, there is in fact a strong tendency to gloss over its serious limitations. I have spent more than a decade in analyzing survey data, and on the basis of my personal experience, I am inclined to believe that the whole matter of measurement error is a much more serious problem than many practitioners of survey research are currently willing to recognize.

Second, I generally doubt that any of the respondents in this survey supplied me with any deliberately falsified information. All the students I interviewed in this study appeared to be highly honorable, and because of the particular sequence of questions used in our interviews, it is very difficult to generate a long string of contrived information. If there were any factors which might have contributed to the distortion of information, they were probably ego defense, rationalization, and the like. Most of us have a natural tendency to defend and justify our views, behavior and status, and this is also true for those who are working very hard to obtain a graduate degree in political science. As long as one is convinced that a student can accomplish his educational objective, he is likely to minimize the extent of difficulties which stand in the way of that objective. It is understandable for many foreign students to underestimate their real limitations in such areas as the command of English, finance, aptitude, and others. By the same token, once a student comes to a conclusion that he can no longer accomplish his academic objective, he is bound to exaggerate the magnitude of the difficulties he has encountered in his graduate work, e.g., the unreasonableness of his instructors,

and the rigidity of university officials, the bigotry of the society, etc.

Third, even if the present study were supported by ample manpower and limitless research funds, it would probably be futile to launch a systematic formal investigation to ascertain the truthfulness of the individual statements supplied by our respondents. If we did, we would probably end up with some sort of backlash. To begin with, many political science departments and their faculty members are virtually certain to refuse to cooperate with such a formal investigation. I have already indicated that some departments showed a negative attitude toward even this type of less threatening survey. Similarly, many foreign-born political science graduate students may decline to cooperate with such an investigation. As one respondent put it, after all, all the marks, financial aids, and the degree itself were controlled by the faculty members, and therefore they were quite understandably afraid of any reprisal by the faculty members. If so, many students would assume that cooperation with such a formal investigation will probably make their lives more difficult and not easier.

Probably one productive approach to the present problem of truthfulness is to treat some of the highly negative responses as *attitudes* rather than as the unconditionally truthful statements of factual information, and to identify and neutralize the type of factors which have contributed to the generation of these highly negative attitudes. Since instructors, university officials and others who are closely involved in the affairs of foreign students tend to be highly educated and intelligent, many of them must be enlightened and open-minded enough to be willing to look into the causes of the highly negative attitudes and to search for some solutions to these problems in some rational and humane manner. It appears to me that if instructors, university officials and North Americans in general can in fact take such a constructive posture, a large proportion — if not all — of the problems reported by foreign-born political science students may be largely ameliorated or solved.

A word on the respondents who supplied basic material for this study: in many ways I enjoyed meeting with these students, and I was certainly impressed by all of them. I have little doubt that the level of the next generation of foreign-born political scientists will be quite high. But the specific way in which they impressed me varied from individual to individual. Some spoke English better than a typical native-born North American

political science graduate student; some appeared to be exceptionally intelligent; some presented me a moving life history including a series of migrations and the Nazi holocaust; some showed a burning desire to contribute to the economic and political development of their native nations; some made it plain that they thoroughly enjoyed talking with me while others appeared highly appreciative of the type of research work I was engaged in; and some seemed to be coping with enormously difficult — or almost hopeless — situations in a highly rational and dignified manner. In short, the kind of interview experience I have obtained in this fieldwork seemed well worth the several hundred man-hours of my personal time and several hundred dollars of my personal funds that I have contributed to this project.

Finally let me cite a few specific recommendations which have grown out of this study. These recommendations were partially originated by the respondents of this study and partially by myself:

1. Incoming foreign students — especially those who have never been exposed to the North American type of education — should be given some special guidance and assistance on such basic and mechanical matters as how to organize one's graduate study program, how to select courses, how to write a research paper, how to handle reading assignments, etc.

2. Some effort should be made to consolidate all the available information on scholarships, fellowships and other financial aids so that foreign students do not have to spend an inordinate amount of time in gathering information on financial assistance.

3. It is desirable for each political science department to hold an annual discussion session where the political science professors and the foreign-born political science graduate students attend and exchange their views on important matters affecting all of them. An implicit assumption for this type of gathering is that many native-born North American professors are not fully aware of the problems faced by foreign-born students, and that a meeting of this sort will constitute a first step in solving some of these problems.

4. It is desirable to hold a convention of foreign-born political science graduate students, and such a convention may be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of either the American or Canadian Political Science Association.

5. Political science departments should make a greater effort to hire foreign-born professors. As shown in this study, some foreign-born political science graduate students are apparently unable to establish a meaningful relationship with native-born North American professors, and this is particularly urgent in a department where there is a relatively large number of foreign students.

6. Some lobbying effort should be made to make it easier for foreign students to obtain part-time or full-time jobs — to make it easier to obtain a work permit in the United States, and to exempt students from the present Canadian rules of hiring citizens and landed immigrants first. The impact of this type of relaxation on the North American labor market is minimal while the gain in terms of training future political and intellectual leaders is immeasurable.

7. Any qualified foreign-born political science graduate student should be given a teaching position in North America regardless of his citizenship status. In filling the position of university professor, the key criterion is academic excellence, and the citizenship status should be considered irrelevant (unless of course there is an excessive degree of concentration of foreign professors, as is the case with American professors in Canada).

8. It is desirable for professors to invite all the foreign-born political science graduate students once or twice a year to their homes. If professors take turns, and if the department is large, each professor does not have to throw this type of party but once in every 5, 10 or 20 years.

9. It is desirable for foreign-born political science graduate students to invite all the native-born North American political science graduate students to a special party once a year. It appears that some foreign-born students are sufficiently talented to be able to organize an extremely enjoyable and interesting party for those who have lived only in North America.

10. Most key positions of the International House or comparable institutions should be staffed by foreign-born personnel. There is clearly a limit to the extent to which native-born North Americans can understand the problems faced by foreign students.

11. The American and Canadian Political Science Associations should establish a special committee to facilitate the placement of foreign-born political science Ph.D.'s in North American universities.

These are some of the tentative suggestions which emerged from the present study. Needless to say, the above list is only exploratory, and it is merely intended to serve as a basis for further discussion and research on this general topic.

Chapter 7

COLLECTIVE REFLECTIONS

Reflections on the Road Ahead*

YUNG-HWAN JO

There appears to be no problem of "underutilization" of political scientists born in Asia. The Asian political scientists are better represented in the American profession than either women or blacks. In an age of growing tolerance, understanding, and opportunity, well-trained Asians, American born or otherwise, are emerging as recognized contributors to American education, art and science, business and industry, and so on.

Yet, despite their superior education and occupational status, economically Asians in general fall below whites, though they are relatively well off compared to blacks and Chicanos.¹ By far a larger number of Asian political scientists are perceived to have had a harder time in professional advancement, compared to those scholars born in Europe.² In addition to what Louis Knowles calls "institutional racism in America,"³ the Asian scholars' greater difficulty in adjusting to American life and society, as well as the social distance they maintain from their white colleagues, have probably contributed to their slower professional development.

Wei Yung seems to wonder if, given more time, the right conditions and greater efforts, Asian political scientists could produce among its ranks scholars of distinction equal to Karl W. Deutsch, Heinz Eulau, Henry Kissinger (and now Zbigniew Brzezinski).⁴ No one can conjecture conclusively on this possibility, but Wei could be reminded that the crucial variable separating those European-born scholars from the Asians is that the former

* Thanks are due to Kay Cho, Asian-American Community Mental Health Training Center, Los Angeles, California, for providing me with relevant materials recently published.

1. Dean Lon, *Prestige with Limitations: Realities of the Chinese-American Elite* (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1976), preface ff.

2. See Chapter 5 by Goel and Kuroda of this study.

3. See Lewis Knowles, *Institutional Racism in America* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969).

4. Chapter 1 of this study.

have usually identified with the mainstream of American society whereas the latter could not.

This is not a call for a melting-pot theory, but acculturation, assimilation and integration, as well as the concomitant achievement and success, are two-way processes. The Asian minority must be more willing to take part and assume its place in the establishment of this society. Hard work alone is not enough for recognition. The paper by Kim and Yang bespeaks a long and difficult road ahead for many Korean colleagues. A sizable number of the latter group not only identify closely with Korea, if not with its government, but also wish to return there if they can obtain suitable employment. Small wonder that none of those cited in the above study would choose a position in the government of the United States as their primary career objective.⁵ (It is indeed fortunate that the Carter Administration is likely to be spared the difficult task of screening out potential "scholar-agents" who might attempt to infiltrate the American government.) How can one achieve much in a career viewed as "transient" in a society whose government is viewed as "still foreign" in a country where there is still a tendency to regard "less (or non-)" white as less loyal Americans?

In the long run, the lack of a career plan or life goal is likely to be a greater hindrance to professional advancement than a narrow or less demanding area of specialization.

Having thus sketched some problems and challenges confronting the Asian political scientists, I would like to turn to the following questions: (1) What kinds of meaningful roles can we play in the education field and for the betterment of this society and even the world at large, and (2) How can we go about achieving these goals?

Militant ethnic politics aside, we have to identify ourselves as a part and an elite of the Asian-American minority, as well as being the educators with a cultural background in Asia where 60% of the world's population resides. Hence on the question of discrimination, we have to relate to other minority scholars and elites. As Asian-American educators, we have a role to play in fostering an understanding of that majority of the world's population.

Asian elites have a propensity to avoid the spotlight and to work quietly either within the ethnic community, as in the case of most community leaders, or within their own departments of their

5. Chapter 3 of this study.

educational institutions; this is the case with most of us. Hence we are often stereotyped as "the successful model minority," "the most silent minority," and "the quiet American," and so on. Little visibility and these stereotypes have lulled the American public into considering Asian-American concerns as secondary to the problems of blacks and Chicanos. According to a study proposed by a HEW official, "the evidence clearly revealed that Asian-Americans have been the recipients of benighted neglect in employment, funding, social services and benefits from Federal, state, local and private agencies."⁶

Just as Korean political scientists had shown little interest in government service in Washington, educated Asian-Americans too are least attracted to and are generally ignored by the managerial positions of the federal government. Between 1972 and 1974, 54 minorities were recruited under a highly successful Special Management Training Program at mid- and senior-level grades for managerial positions (GS11-13) in (federal) district offices.⁷ This program was intended to improve minority representation in the government, but Asian-Americans were not at all visible in the program.

In California, where the enrollment rates of college-aged Asians are among the highest of any population, Asian-Americans are even ignored in the governing boards of educational institutions. No Asians were represented in the California State Board of Education, the Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Board of Governors of the California Community College.⁸

If Asian-Americans are deficient in the political skills necessary to eliminate structural constraints, in overcoming internal differences which prevent them from acting collectively, and in externalizing the social contradictions they have traditionally and passively accepted, is it not likely that Asians specializing in the study of politics are better equipped to provide them with intellectual guidance in these fields? Cannot some of us conduct research on the dynamics of interpersonal relations at the top levels and thereby demonstrate the factors and the scope of

6. Tom Owen, "Asian-Americans: A case of Benighted Neglect," a paper presented at the National Conference of Social Welfare, 1975, p. 65. Owen is a community service officer, SSA, HEW.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

8. Kenji Murase, "The Relevance of Asian-Americans to Social Work Education," unpublished paper (1975), p. 24.

the less-than-equal chance of promotion at top levels for Asian-American technical and professional persons?⁹ How about reexamining the hypothesis of the "meek and mild" personality of the Asian-American which is attributed to the history and circumstances surrounding Asians?¹⁰ Can't the "will" react to the social forces and thus shape the history through cumulative influences?

Turning to our role as educators, Asian-American political scientists and scholars are catalysts and a component in that crucial relationship between Asia, the world's majority population, and the United States, the world's greatest economic power. This relationship will shape much of the future political world. In view of our dual background and our familiarity with both the East and the West, our professional activities could contribute and enhance the American ability to relate itself to Asia and also to a deeper understanding of America's diverse heritage.

For most Asian-Americans, neither the choice of sticking to the Asian tradition by rejecting American/Western influences nor that of immersing himself in Western ways by avoiding other Asians and denying the Asian in himself poses a satisfactory solution to his personal dilemmas. Both options would be too emotionally and psychologically draining. Here too we could serve as a model of cultural pluralism. Most of us could relate to the old country as well as to the new and maintain an equilibrium between the two different psycho-cultural systems.

By having our students and the public exposed to what is to them "non-cognate" cultures of Asia, we in effect prepare them to improve cultural pluralism, and to be less susceptible to cultural shocks by way of greater mental flexibility. A success story of Japanese capitalism without the Western ideal of individualism would be a good example to demonstrate that Asian ideals of personal ties to the family, community, and employer-company can be assets rather than hindrances to development. Hence, by having a positive identity about our cultural origin, we can contribute to an authentic, creative and dynamic pluralism in America.

9. See William T. Liu, "Asian-American Research: Views of a Sociologist," *Asian Studies Occasional Report*, No. 2, 1975 (Arizona State University, Center for Asian Studies).

10. See Jerry Surh, "Asian Identity and Politics," *Amerasia Journal*, Fall 1974, pp. 169-72.

11. Cf. Florence Yoshiwara, "Success Through Education," *Church and Society*, January-February 1974, p. 31.

On relating ourselves to the Asian-American communities, I cannot think of any that requires more intellectual guidance or leadership than the Korean ghetto of nearly 100,000 in Los Angeles. There appears to be much more emphasis on programs relating to the country they left than to their newly adopted country — even though they pledged to reside here permanently and become American citizens. There is no English paper printed for the Korean-Americans, but three Korean daily papers are duplicated in Los Angeles which include local editions with news for Koreans in America. In addition there are several weekly Korean language papers in Los Angeles. Contrast this with the fact that there are only two daily English papers for the rest of the Americans in the Los Angeles area. Not a single one among the more than 100 Korean Christian churches offer English services for second-generation Koreans. The gravity of their economic conditions can be seen by the 1970 census data showing that only 0.3% of the Los Angeles Koreans earns \$10,000 or more, in spite of the fact that most of those over the age of 25 have completed at least four years of college education and that 90% of the Korean female workers were employed as sewing operators, a majority of them with a college degree.¹² Yet seven or eight Koreans night clubs are flooded nightly by these Koreans. The prospects for their economic future are not bright in terms of these indicators, and neither are the eventual prospects for heightening their personal consciousness, identity, and pride in themselves.

A challenge, therefore, for those more privileged living in such a community, as well as for us, is to preserve a “triadic” relationship between the dominant majority and the ethnic minority, and help the latter relate to the rest effectively. Just as Asian minorities are in a better position to understand the plight of other minorities, so are its elite who have successfully struggled through the system to be in a better position more capable of lubricating the machinery for reducing the contradictions between the majority and the minority. A substantial short-run remedy for “underutilization” of Asian immigrants is to overcome language difficulties and to receive vocational training or reorientation. But a long-run remedy must be found through a process of acquiring the skills necessary to adjust and participate more effectively in the political sphere dominated currently by the Anglo majority. It will be next to impossible if most of the elite of the Asian-

12. Figures cited in Eui-Young Yu, “Koreans in America: An Emerging Ethnic Minority,” a paper presented at the American Sociological Meeting (1976), pp. 12-17.

American community remain indifferent, even disdainful, toward political activity, to make desirable changes for those who total only a little over 1% of the entire U.S. population.

In spite of the popular image of Asian-Americans being highly successful as educational and professional achievers, Asian communities, as well as we Asian scholars in our own profession, have lacked the leadership of a national figure. What about the future? Are we likely to have figures "bigger" than Senators Inouye and Hayakawa, thus equalling Martin Luther King and Zbigniew Brzezinski? In terms of the emerging trends, we are not more likely to have such national figures unless the integrity of our political system improves drastically.

In part because of their greater economic and security value, we are likely to encourage our children to enter the physical sciences and to have occupations in skilled or technical trades. A Berkeley survey showed that Asian-Americans in general exhibited less interest in careers in the social sciences than in the physical sciences or skilled and technical trades.¹³ Recent and future immigrants from Asia and hence future Asian-Americans are not likely to be attracted to the fields of humanities and social sciences. Hence, from the standpoint of providing leadership for Asian American communities, the challenge facing us as Asian political scientists is far greater than heretofore recognized, in that we might remain in the foreseeable future the small, privileged and *concerned* minority willing to provide leadership roles for our fellow Asian-Americans.

As Nathaniel Wagner has stated, on the whole, for Asian minorities and Asian scholars too, things are likely to be better in terms of increased occupational and economic opportunities, but they are also likely to be getting worse in view of their rising expectations since progress tends to accelerate our level of anticipation.¹⁴ In the meantime, we are likely to remain less vocal than other minorities. Yet we also want to be more visible and effective as members of this society. How can we do this without coordinating individual Asian-American efforts? Our Asian political scientists group is in a way filling this need for national Asian-American organizations. In addition to our American Political Science Association, similar Asian-American caucuses can be found in such national professional organizations

13. Sue Stanley and Nathaniel Wagner, eds., *Asian Americans, Psychological Perspectives* (Ben Lomond, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1973), pp. 145-146.

14. Cited in Lan, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

as the American Sociological Association, the American Psychological Association and the American Public Health Association, to name a few.

Let's Fight for Equal Opportunity

KARL G. LI

It is unfortunate that professional working opportunities are very limited for Asian political scientists in America. The choice is almost exclusively restricted to the areas of teaching and research. In spite of their scholastic achievement, Asian political scientists do not receive nearly as much recognition as they deserve.

The solutions to these unmerited situations for Asian political scientists are limited. But several approaches are possible. First, we political scientists must get together and form a visible interest group to safeguard our interest in both academic communities and Federal agencies. Second, we must develop this interest group into a pressure group whereby we can demand equality, or at least equal opportunity to pursue equality in a more forceful manner. Third, we should explore our career horizons in a more pragmatic perspective. That is, Asian political scientists should actively engage in politics, either pursuing elective offices or seeking executive or managerial careers with the Federal agencies.

Asians are generally too modest and proud to ask for recognition. As political scientists, we cannot afford such negative and unaggressive attitudes and practices. Most elective offices are usually filled by individuals with a background in legal training, but this should by no means prohibit political scientists from seeking elective offices. It is about time for us, as political scientists, to take a hard look at this unpromising phenomenon. We must begin to pursue our recognition somewhere. It is now the time and point from which to start.

Another alternative to seeking elective office is to seek employment with the Federal agencies. Presently, those so employed are few in number, and almost all of them are in the positions which are most likely to be research-oriented and non-management-oriented. There are less than ten Asian political

scientists working in the forces of 400,000 Federal employees in the Washington, D.C., area, according to the recent survey by the newly-established Asian/Pacific American Federal Employee Council. If, as individuals, we can be outstanding teachers and researchers, we also can be equally outstanding politicians and Federal employees. Of course, it is difficult for any Asian political scientist to obtain a high position in the government, not even employment with any Federal agency through affirmative action plans, as Asians are not included in affirmative action plans in practice. But we must actively seek recognition and equal opportunity from academic communities, political arenas, and Federal agencies. We must forget any petty jealousies and differences or diversities in thinking and philosophy among us in order to build a united front to achieve our common interests.

We, as Asian political scientists, can no longer afford to sit still in the top of an empty ivory tower and live with an idealistic fantasy. We are facing systematic discrimination and elimination both professionally and ethnically in America. We should get together, assert ourselves, and map out direction for the future. We do not ask for mercy or favoritism on the ground of being a minority, but we should demand an equal opportunity. The United States is a democratic country, but by no means will all democratic practices automatically apply to us; we must fight for them. Most of all, we must be involved in all policy-input processes concerning us.

A Scotch-Irish Perspective

THEODORE H. MCNELLY

At the outset, I should like to enter a caveat. As an American political scientist specializing in Asian politics, I write with a certain bias. American specialists on Asia, unlike many of the nonspecialists, usually have in their backgrounds experiences which have brought them into contact with Asia and Asians that makes them want to know them better. Like many senior American experts on Asia, I come from a family with a missionary background and I was involved in language and intelligence work during World War II. Although I have no Asian

blood, my mother was born in Japan, and I have lived five years in that country out of a total of ten years of living outside of the United States. Sometimes I fancy that I am less provincially American than some of my colleagues, who may be less sensitized to cultural differences. It should also be said that non-Asian experts on Asia, perhaps more than other political scientists, are placed in competitive as well as in cooperative relations with Asian political scientists. Also, non-Asians may sometimes have been guilty of taking undue credit for research and linguistic work actually performed by Asians. Many Asian specialists on Asia are professionally more qualified than non-Asians, who in spite of years of language study are not linguistically competent.

There is confusion in my mind about what an Asian political scientist is. It seems to be assumed that he is someone of Asian or part-Asian ethnic background. Some were born in Asia, some were not. However, some of these people are American citizens either by reason of birth or naturalization, whereas others may not be American citizens even though they have lived in the United States for many years. I know a professor in a leading Japanese university who was born in Los Angeles, was brought up in Japan and voted there, and later formally renounced his American citizenship at the last minute in order to be eligible for a Fulbright scholarship for study in America.

I am inclined to take the citizenship question rather seriously, because I wish to know whether the Asian political scientist is one of us (an American, to be treated with all of the rights and privileges due to Americans) or is a guest in this country to be treated as such. I am certain that Asian political scientists are also keenly aware of this identity question; but the matter of their identity may sometimes be a source of confusion for the Americans who have to deal with them. I am certain that many Asian-Americans are deeply distressed when their fellow Americans treat them as aliens and outsiders rather than as Americans with all the rights of American citizens.

Of course, according to the old "melting-pot" ideal, foreigners coming to America may become citizens and become assimilated to the extent that they or their children completely lose their identity as outsiders. However, people of the yellow race cannot change the color of their skin and through generations may be recognizable as members of a minority ethnic group. It must be said, however, that American society, especially urban and college communities, seems less conscious of the Mongoloid race in its midst than it used to be. The college campus is full of people of

many backgrounds, and ethnicity is often, if not usually, less salient in our minds than whether or not the person is professionally competent or a good student.

It is perhaps significant that we use the expression Asian-American political scientist but almost never use the parallel term European-American political scientist. Most Americans seem to discern national differentiations among Europeans, but Asians all seem to be lumped together. This must come as something of a shock to patriotic Chinese, Japanese, Koreans and Indians who visit America. Americans often betray what sometimes must be an insulting level of ignorance or of indifference towards the national identity of Asians. It is perhaps important to note that while there seem to be quite a few Asians or Asian-Americans of Chinese and Korean background in political science departments, the proportion of Japanese seems relatively small, at least on the East coast. For political and economic reasons, Chinese and Koreans in America seem less eager than Japanese to return to their homelands, although this was not the case before the Communist takeover in 1949 as far as the Chinese from the mainland were concerned.

Comparatively speaking, the Korean who specializes in Korean studies is at a dual disadvantage: he must compete with many more of his co-ethnics, and Korean studies is an area for which there is almost no market in the American academic community, as compared to Chinese and Japanese studies. Chinese studies or Indian studies on many campuses seem to be regarded as the rough equivalent of Asian studies, but this is less often the case for Japanese studies, certainly not for Korean or Southeast Asian studies. The Japanologist and Koreanologist are usually required to acquire expertise on China or other subjects, but the reverse is normally not the case.

In the titles of undergraduate political science courses, the distinction among Chinese, Japanese and Indian studies is usually not made: we have courses on Asia, East Asia, or the Far East. Notwithstanding the American military involvements in Korea and Vietnam, undergraduate courses specializing on these two countries are for all practical purposes non-existent in any department on the campus. Asian studies, one of the up-and-coming specialties in the heyday of area studies in the early 1950s, have seriously suffered in the 1970s from neoisolationism and the rise of trendy courses on urban studies, the environment, computer programming, etc. The non-Asian as well as the Asian specialists on Asia have suffered from this, but the Asians might

find it harder to change fields or otherwise adjust to the new situation.

In spite of the ideals of assimilation and equality, Americans in general are still, with the best will in the world, apt to treat as Asian-American differently. As a graduate student at Columbia University's East Asian Institute, I had a number of Chinese friends with whom I often ate and discussed Asian topics. These people, like myself, were mostly specialists in Asian politics and history. I once, however, tried to become acquainted with a young "Chinese" (he looked Chinese), who had a Chinese name, but who seemed to resent my discussing Asia with him. He had been born in the United States and was studying to become a vocational advisor. He was not interested in China or Asia at all. He evidently wished to be regarded as 100% American, and resented that idea that just because of his racial background he had to be identified as someone with a special interest in China. I have the impression that many Asian-American political scientists may be teaching courses on Asia not so much out of choice as because of their ethnic background. The assumption always seems to be made that an Asian-American political scientist is an authority on Asia. This would seem to be no more logical than the assumption that all WASP political scientists are authorities on British government. The Asian or Asian-American political scientist is thus often assigned to an academic ghetto (Asian studies) not of his own free choice. This ghetto has recently taken on a new dimension. With the growth of Asian-American studies (the study of the life of Asian ethnics in America), the Asian-American political scientist may be called upon to organize and teach courses or engage in research related to what are essentially American social and cultural problems. One wonders then if it is not incumbent on American society to avoid imposing roles on Asians because of their race, just as we are today not supposed to impose roles on women because of their sex.

Specialists on Asia in American political science departments not on the west coast sometimes seem to be regarded as having an exotic specialty, not relevant to the real concerns of American society. These specialists are dealing with topics with which their fellow political scientists are usually unfamiliar, and their teaching and research are therefore more difficult to evaluate. Asian specialists are sometimes regarded as *sui generis*, not genuine political scientists, and therefore incapable of "making a contribution to the discipline." Although Americans make up only five percent of the world's population, specialists on American

politics often seem to be regarded as generalists in political science whereas specialists on Asia, where half of the world's population lives, are often regarded as having a narrow specialty. This is a problem that non-Asian experts on Asia have to face as well as Asian experts on Asia. However, the problem of disciplinary identity for the Asian political scientists sometimes seems more acute than for the non-Asians. This, I believe, is very often the result of a kind of racial prejudice, however unconscious. The Asian who writes with great expertise about the politics of the country of his origin is sometimes regarded as a mere "resource person" or journalist by his colleagues, while similar (sometimes inferior) writing about American politics is regarded as highly sophisticated and informed. The problem of the academic ghetto is often serious for the Asian political scientist when the non-Asian specialists on Asia may not suffer from ghettoization at all. It must, however, be said, that the non-Asian who gives priority to Asian studies sometimes feels more isolated from the rest of the discipline of political science than the Asian who is behaviorally oriented and assigns low priority to Asian studies.

I believe that we have had some very difficult problems in the matter of the graduate training of Asian political scientists in America. In addition to all of the other hurdles facing the graduate student, the Asian student often begins with an extremely formidable language handicap. Sometimes he manages to get his degree even though his English has failed to show substantial improvement. Although we put the Asian student through all the formal requirements for the Ph.D. we sometimes do not require him to master oral English that will facilitate his integration into political science departments in the United States. Several years ago there was a violent riot in a Southern, predominantly black, university. A principal complaint of the students was that some of the professors were Asians who could not speak English intelligibly. For better or for worse, nearly all the courses in American political science departments focus on life in the United States or America's relations with the rest of the world. It must be admitted that a foreign-born political scientist who has a poor understanding of American political institutions is not going to make a creditable impression on today's college students, let alone his colleagues, no matter how much he may know about the politics of areas that are regarded, often wrongly, as exotic. At small colleges, where the Asian political scientist must teach American politics and only rarely teaches courses on

Asia, he should of course know American politics better than his students do.

The Asian political scientist is often handicapped linguistically, more than his colleagues may be aware. It is difficult even for many native-born Americans to speak or write English with a minimum of grace, charm, and wit. Such a skill is essential to academic advancement, and sometimes it seems to serve as a substitute for solid disciplinary competence. But the foreign-born Asian political scientist, whose English may be very adequate for undergraduate lecturing and conveying his research findings in writing, is apt to be at a linguistic disadvantage in the banter and give-and-take of seminars, symposia, and faculty meetings. However, much more serious is the case of the foreign-born political scientist whose speech is almost incomprehensible to students in the lecture hall. The Asian political scientist who cannot speak intelligible, literate English is not able to make much of a contribution to the teaching program.

It may be also that our sympathies have led us to keep unqualified Asian students in our graduate programs longer than we should. Some are political refugees of upper-class origin who discern no respectable alternative to being a student. The Asian student is sometimes sent to the Asian specialist in the department, who is expected to watch after the young man (or woman) and act as a cushion between him and the rest of the faculty and students. Often the academic failures of the student are attributed (rightly or wrongly) to his linguistic limitations, which he is expected to overcome in the unspecified future. On one campus, the grades assigned to such students were referred to as "Vietnamese B's." By the time we discover that the student falls far short of what we require from native Americans, it is difficult — often very painful — to cut him out of the program. If the linguistically and academically handicapped student finally is awarded a doctorate he may end up at a college in a remote area teaching the very course in which he is least qualified: American government. He may then become a problem for his colleagues, his students, and himself.

An interesting dimension of the ethnic consciousness of some Asian-American political scientists (but by no means peculiar to them) is that although they are usually quite aware of their own immediate problems in inter-ethnic relations, they sometimes seem unconscious of the existence of the problems of other ethnic groups. Many Asians seem quite unaware of ethnic distinctions of which most Americans seem very conscious. This may be because

the Asian was not in the course of his education sensitized to the nationalities of proper names, and racial and dialectic variations among American whites. The American experts on Asia with whom the Asian is apt to come into contact do not represent a typical cross section of the ethnic composition of the United States. For example, although Asian-Americans, WASPs, and Jews are heavily represented among American Asian specialists, it is almost impossible to find any Blacks or Chicanos among them. In the age of women's lib, what percentage of Asian political scientists are women? In some twenty-five years of professional activity, I have known only one.

On Stereotype Image

YAWSOON SIM

Even before empirical data which are plentiful are amassed and systematically analyzed, it is not difficult to discern some stereotype images of Asian political scientists.

Almost as a routine, whenever Asian political scientists confront their American counterparts, the following questions will be asked and in fact, they are answered suggestively by the questioners themselves:

1. What part of Asia are you from? . . . Korea (China or Japan) I presume.
2. What is the topic of your dissertation? . . . On Asian affairs, I am sure.
3. What do you teach? Far Eastern Politics, I guess.
4. Do you go back to your country very often?
5. Are you doing any research now? On Asian politics, I bet.

No Asian political scientist can deny that they have never been confronted with some of the questions mentioned above.

There is nothing wrong with the questions, for they may be asked simply out of curiosity or courtesy. What these questions imply and reflect is a certain stereotype image, projected for Asian political scientists — Asian political scientists teach and research Asian government and politics only. As a result of these stereotype images, Asian political scientists will therefore usually be asked or assigned to teach courses about Asian politics. Asian

political scientists will also frequently be asked to speak on Asian affairs and issues. They will always be assigned to do research on Asian politics. These stereotype images of Asian political scientists probably could have forfeited their chances to teach and develop their potential talents in non-Asian subjects. Consequently, Asian political scientists will usually be confined to academic jobs, teaching or researching on Asian politics. Just recently, Asian-Americans, Chinese-Americans in particular, have been trying with some degree of success to shed off such old stereotype images about their occupations as coolie, restaurateur, laundry men and cooks. Asian political scientists in their profession seem to be cast nilly-willy into another kind of stereotype image.

The cause of these stereotype images for Asian political scientists should not solely be attributed to American counterparts. In fact, Asian political scientists themselves should share a greater blame for promoting, shaping and perpetuating these stereotype images. Many Asian political scientists, for the sake of convenience and opportunism, would tend to cash in on their background, and knowledge on teaching courses on Asian politics, studying Asian problems and publishing works on Asian affairs. Most Asian political scientists are well-trained in all areas of political science. Of course, they are capable of teaching courses other than those on Asian politics. On the other hand, there are many American political scientists specializing on Asian politics. How many Asian political scientists specialize in non-Asian politics and government, especially in American politics?

It is not wrong for Asian political scientists to specialize and concentrate on Asian politics. Nevertheless, they should not be confined and led by these stereotype images and mentality. There are boundless subjects and fields for Asian political scientists to explore. Is it not time for Asian political scientists to divert their interest and talents? Is it not time for Asian political scientists to de-stereotype their professional images?

Asians, Asian-Americans and Asianists

GEORGE O. TOTTEN

I believe there is a community of interests among three types of political scientists: (1) those who were born and at least partly raised in Asia; (2) those who were born in the United States of parents who had come from Asia or whose ancestors had immigrated from Asia to America; and (3) those who are not of Asian racial heritage but who have specialized in the politics of Asia or some region or country therein. These three categories could be further subdivided. But they all have in common a strong awareness of how little Asia has penetrated the consciousness of most of their colleagues in the academic world. They are aware that most academic and university administrations still think that the study of Asia is exotic, that it is an embellishment in learning but not basic. They are aware that Americans feel they have much to teach Asia and little to learn from Asia.

Within the academic world I consider that the natural scientists are most openminded and willing to learn a new scientific advance or technique. Next come the social scientists. While they are willing to incorporate information and data from Asian societies to test their hypotheses, they are less inclined to accept the idea that Asian societies, polities or economies are experimenting with ideas and systems that could have suggestive relevance to American thought or social experimentation. Finally, the humanities faculties, outside of the Asian specialists, are most hostile to the study of Asia except in the most peripheral way. By many it is felt that, since students have so little time in college, they should spend most of their humanities courses on studying the great Western tradition, with some enrichment from Asia as the West brought back a few ideas and artifacts after the onset of the Age of Discovery. Political scientists, then, are not as antagonistic to learning from Asia as the people in the humanities all the way from music to literature, but they are still much less so than the natural scientists from physicists to doctors of medicine.

Feeling this general rejection of the many types of cultural traditions outside of the Western tradition, a number of students of Asian background have shied away from intensive study of their own tradition. They have bought the American melting pot theory and attempt to conform by specializing in American government. That is well and good, if they are really most interested in that. But if they are, they find they often have to

contend with department heads or administrators who nudge them into teaching about Asia, more because they look Asian than because they have had special study of the area. This is one kind of discrimination Asian-American political scientists in the second category above encounter. Persons in the first category may encounter it even more. That is, people who were born and partly educated abroad, such as in China or India, find that, even if their main interest is in American politics, they are typed by their racial or cultural features, as persons who should teach about Asia, even if they do not especially want to do so.

Most of those in the first category, however, probably feel they are better able to teach comparative government, using as one of the areas the country they were born and raised in, than teaching about American government. Many of them have accents in English from their native Asian tongue, and administrators are afraid these Asians will not be understood by "average" American students. This can be used as a mark against them in the hiring process.

As a person who fits the third category above, namely, a Caucasian of non-Asian background, I feel that people in this category understand and sympathize with those in the first and second categories much more than the rest of the social scientists. I think this is so because they tend to become fascinated with the culture of the people they are studying. Or, they have been drawn to study Asia in the first place by a prior cultural attraction. Over and over again I find the political scientists specializing on Asia to be more interdisciplinary in their approach and more culturally rounded and sophisticated than the average political scientist. They become gourmets in the cooking of the country or region of Asia they study; many become music adepts, calligraphers, art connoisseurs, music lovers, and/or experts in the games of "their" culture. Often such people, myself included, feel more at home with other "area specialists" at the Association for Asian Studies (AAS) meetings than at meetings of the American Political Science Association (APSA). I find this also true of some of those among us who are most behaviorally inclined. Such people usually have lived abroad in the area of their specialization. All this disposes them to identify with the culture of their choice of study and as a result to identify with their colleagues of Asian background, whether immigrant or born as Asian-American. This commonality of understanding forms a bond among the three categories above. If this common ground were nurtured, and if

Science Association. Though this may start as tokenism, it can have a leavening effect. It is already going on all over — in other professions, especially the sciences, and now in the mass media. Why does it take so long with political science? I think that, especially as international relations people set up their own organizations and as area people seek contact with other specialists in their own groups, the APSA becomes parochial, largely American-government dominated. Nevertheless, as other minority groups get representation, as affirmative action is carried into effect in hiring procedures, and as comparative government aspects are sought in new fields such as urban studies and public policy, this parochialism is being broken. This shows the interrelated nature of these two goals. But in order to get Asians into leadership positions and in order to uncover cases of discrimination and raise consciousness on this issue, it is most helpful, if not imperative, that Asianists and Asian-Americans work together in the Association, either on a formal or informal basis.

As for reorienting the field of political science, I believe the greatest gains so far have been in the comparative field. All over the country, courses are now given in Asian government. One problem is that Asia as a term and concept is really too broad; it is almost meaningless in cultural terms. At least there should be a division between South Asia, on the one hand, and East Asia on the other.

Political scientists find, when they attempt to teach Asian comparative studies, that the students are usually ill prepared in terms of the history, geography and culture of the areas to be studied, compared to those students taking European comparative government. For this reason, Asianists should not be required to cover both East and South Asian, unless they are talking only about underdevelopment on a regional basis or something like that. In other words, one of the first jobs Asianists have to do is to educate the rest of the members of the political science department and of the profession about the fact that Asia is not one but many and that the term "Asia," much less the term "East" or even the "Far East," not to mention the "Orient," are misleading terms. They must be taught that *at least* there are *East Asia*, *Southeast Asia*, and *South Asia*, along with the Middle East and North Africa as separated from Black Africa or Africa South of the Sahara.

Next, I believe we should work for a comparative perspective in American government. Asianists, Africanists, Latin America-

nists, etc., can be brought in for separate lectures or discussions in courses on the American executive, pressure groups, public policy, or what have you. This can be done both in introductory courses and advanced seminars. Much can be done in this field rather easily. The same goes for public administration.

Finally we come to the subfield of political theory. When we get to normative theory, we are close to the humanities and history. The usual thing is that Western political philosophy is taught historically from Plato to Machiavelli and from Machiavelli to the present. A course on modern ideologies often gives some attention to "Maoism." But that is about it. There are still far too few Asian political thought courses. And here again Asia should be broken down into at least East and South Asia. At the larger institutions, there are courses on Chinese political philosophy, sometimes with some attention to Japan. Always neglecting Korea. There may be a course on Islam, but hardly ever on Buddhist thought and politics, though this is sometimes included in some of the few courses on religion and politics. In short, here is a vast territory to be invaded and conquered. All political scientists have read Plato's *Republic*, but how many have read the *Hsün Tzu*? How many have read an Indian classic? This poverty in the normative area in our discipline most clearly reveals the Western bias. This may be the heart of the matter. It may be that exposing students to Asian political thought may be the best way to develop their respect for the great traditions outside of the Western and that then this would spill over into the other fields or subfields and bring about a general reorientation of attitudes.

Since the Second World War no doubt great changes have taken place. The GI Bill of Rights gave a whole new generation, a whole set of new social classes and minority groups, the opportunity to get a college education. Having fought in Europe and Asia, they were thirsty to learn about the rest of the world, but the universities were then ill equipped to teach them, especially about Asia. Today we have a great quality of news, literature and texts available, however inadequate in many ways. Some of the studies and texts were done by members of this generation who had learned an Asian language during the war (including myself). But still we are faced by academic administrators who think there must first be a "student demand" for new courses before they are instituted or funded. We have much to fight for here.

We have more Asian-Americans than ever who have restudied their heritage and we also have Asians who had received their

doctoral training in America. When one adds to this the American Asianists, we are no longer suffering from a shortage of trained Asianists. Nor are we handicapped by problems we faced in the past, such as the great gap in the 1950s between traditional training and the behavioral approach, and between the content of political science training which Asian political scientists and Americans then received. As political scientists, we now talk the same languages. Americans and Japanese, for instance, both read Dahl and Deutsch. Some Americans read Maruyama. The gap is narrowing.

Still the chasm we have to cross is great, but with the greater assets we have today, in terms of talent, texts and general attitudinal change, I think with organization, awareness and political acumen, we — the three categories of Asians, Asian-Americans and Asianists — can move rapidly ahead in bringing greater balance and perspective to political science and greater justice to the profession.

A British View

DEREK J. WALLER

I'm not sure that my remarks are exactly appropriate to this particular gathering except in the sense that some of the problems which I am talking about, faced by the British minority political scientists in this country, might be also faced by those Asian political scientists who have had their training in Hong Kong and who will, of course, have been influenced by the British educational system, as well as in other ways. It struck me at first that there was no really British perspective on this problem, just a case of an infinite variety of views, reflecting individual perceptions, and that there was therefore no specifically British view. Again, when faced with the question, "Do British political scientists in this country face any particular problems or difficulties?", on first consideration I thought that the answer would be "no," because generally the British are conceived of as coming forward with advantages rather than disadvantages. However, on second thoughts, I think one should answer "yes,"

although I would not want to exaggerate the seriousness of the problem.

The British, like other foreigners, of course, suffer from visa difficulties, and the difficulties of a strange working environment, but these, as I say, are faced by everybody, and I think that the British probably have less trouble with them than anybody else except possibly the Canadians.

It was Oscar Wilde who said that the Americans have everything in common with the English except language. These remarks come from a short story called "The Canterville Ghost," a story which is interesting because it is the description of how a traditional English ghost who haunted the home of the Cantervilles for generations was virtually destroyed by an incoming American family with their brashness, their lack of fear of the unknown, and their technological innovation. In fact, very much the same kind of thing that happened to the British study of government when faced with the American science of politics. Nevertheless, even though now there are no major discontinuities between British and American training of political scientists such as there were a decade ago, it is still true to say that British political scientists are less familiar with the theoretical and mathematical terminology of the discipline than their transatlantic counterparts. *The American Political Science Review*, for example, has few subscribers in Great Britain, fewer readers, and it is only rarely fully understood.

Exactly how many British political scientists there are in this country is a figure which I don't think exists — at least I have not been able to discover it. Many will have taken out American citizenship as their ties to the home country attenuate, others will have retained their original status out of a mixture of loyalty, lethargy and expedience. There is no British minority organization in this country, which should not be at all surprising. Individuals, on the other hand, may feel a minority status because of their identity with the United Kingdom, possibly reinforced to a degree by the different training in the discipline which they received in Britain. However, as I have already mentioned, this gap in training has narrowed. In a similar vein, the British come to this country with their own preconceptions of democracy, which could result in some problems if they were asked to teach courses in American government. This does not usually present a major problem though, because they are asked to teach such courses infrequently. However, I would be interested to hear comments as to whether this creates difficulties for other people, Japanese and

Chinese, for example, who immigrate and are then asked to teach courses on the governments of their home countries or other Asian States.

A less obvious but very real factor and one again that is also applicable to Asian political scientists, is that the British are not familiar with the American teaching system. This was brought home to me dramatically the other day at Vanderbilt when I was acting as a freshman adviser. I am not exactly unfamiliar with the system, as I was a graduate student in this country and I have taught for some years at Vanderbilt, but when faced for the first time with the complexity of grade-point averages, credit hours, distribution requirements, the major, minor, double majors, "psych," "soc," "western civ," and "A-P'ing" out of French 100 to 101, my heart sank, and I am sure several students will have had their college careers irreparably ruined by my bad advice. It was not like that when I was an undergraduate at the London School of Economics. When one arrived, one was told to study six subjects: two in history, two in politics, and two in economics, plus two to be chosen at one's option. The word "elective" was not in our lexicon. If you wished to sit in on some lectures you could, but it was not mandatory. After two years (and not before) you were examined, and if you were successful, you went into the third and final year on very much the same basis. The normally highly structured environment of the American college system does come as something of a shock to the native born Englishman, and as a practical professional loss it may be that because of this the British, the Japanese or Chinese may well be passed over for the position of Chairman or Dean, though whether this is a loss or a virtue, I'm not sure. Unfamiliarity with the system also makes dealing with the Deans an interesting experience, for the British are more formal than the Americans, and the British university is more autocratically and hierarchially structured; the wheeling and dealing of money and power within an American institution is initially strange to the average Englishman. At least at first, one has to be equipped with a certain survival capacity.

Finally, and I give my apologies in advance for ending on a note of sheer frippery, the British are unused to the problems of affluence. They are by nature not convention-goers and in any case there is no money in Britain to go to conventions. The entire British political science establishment could be fitted into a room not much larger than the one we have here. So the British are therefore unfamiliar with the special problems surrounding the large American professional meeting. When in England, one is

always taught before one embarks for the U.S., that one talks to Americans eyeball to eyeball. One looks them in the eye because that is the way it is done. Now this is true, *except at conventions*. At conventions, particularly in the public spaces such as the bars or the lobby, one does *not* look one's companion in the eye. One looks over his shoulder and one uses one's eyes like radar to scan the horizon in search of someone more interesting. Consequently, the British rarely get to meet the people they want to meet.

The Economic Condition of some Asian-Americans or Does Education Pay?

YUAN-LI WU

Some interesting data concerning the economic condition of Asian-Americans are now available. They confirm what many have long suspected and raise some pointed questions about the distribution of opportunities among different ethnic groups in this country and the divergent responses of these groups to the similar circumstances they encounter.

A recent study by Sowell¹ based on survey data of the American Council on Education shows that Orientals are more often than not paid less than their white or black academic colleagues and that this is especially true for those who have made their mark in terms of publications. During 1972-73 full-time faculty members in all fields with Ph.D's from "distinguished" or "strong" institutions who had published five or more articles received on the average 14.8 percent higher pay than their Oriental colleagues if they were of the white race, or 21.3 percent more if they were black. Those who had lower degrees than the Ph.D but who had published five or more articles received on the average 54.6 percent more pay than Orientals if they were white or 50.2 percent more if they were black. Between white and Oriental academicians with equally strong Ph.D's and five or more published articles per person, the highest salary differential

1. Thomas Sowell, *Affirmative Action Reconsidered: Was It Necessary in Academia?*, Washington, D.C., American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Evaluative Studies 27, December 1975, Tables 1-5, pp. 16-22.

in favor of white academicians was 13.1 percent and in the natural sciences. The highest salary differential between black and Oriental academicians with the same strong Ph.D's and publications was 27.8 percent, and in the humanities. For those who had published but who had lower than Ph.D degrees, the highest white-oriental pay differential was in the social sciences, at 64.4 percent. Between blacks and Orientals in the same category the highest differential was 61.2 percent, also in the social sciences.

The same general situation prevails with respect to full-time faculty who had not published. Within this category, white academicians with strong Ph.D's received in 1972-73 7 percent more pay than Orientals, while black academicians averaged 25.5 percent more pay than Orientals. For those who had less than Ph.D degrees and who had not published, the pay differential was 18.1 percent for whites and 16.0 percent for blacks in excess of the Orientals' pay. The only exceptions in the case of those who had not published were in the natural sciences and humanities for those with strong Ph.D's. In these two cases white academicians averaged 4.9 percent less pay than Orientals in the natural sciences and 9.8 percent less in the humanities. One suspects that seniority and long years of remaining at the same jobs, perhaps because no other opportunities are available, may explain this phenomenon. More data are not now available; they are needed before we can be sure.

Similar data from the 1973 survey of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers of the National Academy of Sciences² show the same discrepancies against Orientals in terms of median annual salaries. Among those who received their Ph.D's from strong institutions, 63.1 percent of the Orientals had published five or more articles; the corresponding figures for whites and blacks were 57.4 percent and 51.4 percent respectively. One is tempted to conclude that academic achievement did not pay off for orientals as they were more likely to do for white or black academicians.

A recent study by Jiobu³ on earnings differentials between whites and other ethnic groups based on the 15 percent sample of the 1970 census for California raised equally pointed questions in this regard. According to Jiobu, while occupational status paid off

2. Thomas Sowell, *op. cit.*, Table 5, p. 22.

3. Robert M. Jiobu, *Earnings Differentiation Between Whites and Ethnic Minorities: An Empirical Assessment of Asian Americans, Blacks and Chicanos*. Department of Sociology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Paper prepared for the Asian-American Mental Health Research Center.

best for Chinese-Americans education as such brought relatively low returns. These findings are based on a multiple regression analysis of earnings, comparing whites, blacks and Chinese. Furthermore Jiobu suggests that one might ascribe to their minority status an earnings disadvantage in 1969 for Chinese amounting to \$1600 per year. The Jiobu study would seem to confirm our general conclusions. That is to say, while education may have enabled Chinese-Americans to enter certain better paying occupations, they tend to be paid less within these occupations. Still other statistics relating the ratio of college graduates to the number of persons earning \$10,000 or more a year, for example, would yield the same results.⁴

Have some Asian-Americans been barred from the better paying institutions? Have they been given less pay for equal work and in spite of at least equal qualifications? If so, has this been the result of outright discrimination, or has it been the outcome of neglect and indifference? Should the latter explanation be true, is it in part a result of the fact that Asian-Americans tend to be less demanding and assertive than members of other ethnic groups? If such non-assertiveness and passivity have been at the root of the situation, is this phenomenon a special trait of "the Oriental culture"? Might it also be the result of rational calculations on the part of those Orientals who are new immigrants? They may have decided that it is better to maximize earnings over a longer period than to fight for higher pay and jeopardize job security. However, such a behavioral pattern, if true, may itself be based on a perception on their part that the rest of the society, including their employers, actually practice discrimination against them. The young and the militant may well raise the question whether this behavioral pattern should not be modified because it pays off less well and less rapidly.

4. Urban Associates, Inc. (Arlington, Va.), *A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census, Vol. II: Asian-Americans*. HEW Publications No. (OS) 75-121, July 1974, Table E-8, p. 101.

INDEX

- Academic community, 4, 121
Academic discipline, 9
Academic ghetto, 125, 126
Academics, 34, 138, 139
Acculturation, 116
Administrative ladder, 47
Administrative position, 14, 24
Africa, 68, 72, 96, 104, 105, 133
African political scientists, 67
African origins, 23
African students, 104, 106
Afro-Americans, 51
Afro-Asian political scientists, 23
Alienation, 91
American Indians, 5, 18
American political science, 3, 10, 12, 15, 19, 38, 55, 73, 92, 125, 126, 127, 129
American Political Science Association (APSA), 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 16, 21, 40, 53, 67, 68, 80, 112, 113, 120, 131, 132–133; *Biographical Directory* (1968), 23–24
American Political Science Review (APSR), 136
American political scientists, behavior, 138; intellectual bias, 3; prejudice, 130
American Psychological Association, 121
American Public Health Association, 121
American Sociological Association, 121
American studies, 37, 38, 55
American teaching system, 137
Aptitude, 100, 110
Arab-Israeli conflict, 95, 102
Arab students, 102
Asian American community, 119, 120
Asian-American movement, 4
Asian committee, 4, 5
Asian communities, 119–120
Asian/Pacific American Federal Employee Council, 122
Asian political scientists, aspirations, 26–27, 30–31, 45–47, 79; attitude toward Caucus for a New Political Science, 82–83, 87, 89; bias against, 5–6, 60, 123, 130, 132; biographical profile, 53–56; department chairmen's views of, 56ff; discrimination against, 5–6, 13–15, 19; employment, 6, 14, 19, 27, 28, 42–44,

74, 78–81, 84–85, 89, 140; ethnic consciousness, 10, 11, 121, 127; ethnic problems, 1, 2–5, 16, 49, 117, 127, 132; identity, 5, 7, 116, 123; image of, 5, 120, 128–129; language problems of, 8–9, 15, 28–29, 31, 38–39, 56–57, 59–60, 74, 86, 96–98, 119, 126, 127ff; numbers of, 1, 12, 33; professional problems, 13, 17, 27, 28, 88; publications, 13, 40, 56, 77–78; recognition and representation, 2–5, 16, 45, 48, 88, 121, 132–133; salary, 6, 42, 87, 138, 140; social adaptation, 12, 62–63, 91; status, 12, 17, 21; struggle, 10; suggestions for, 18–21; surveys of, 24, 34–35, 53, 67–68

Asian Political Scientists Group in USA (APSG), 11, 20, 21

Asian politics, 2, 122, 125, 128, 129, 130

Asian specialists, 19, 54, 101, 124, 126, 127, 130

Asian studies, 37, 38, 41, 124, 125, 126

Asianists, 130, 132, 133

Assimilation, 7, 116, 123, 125

Association for Asian Studies (AAS), 1, 6, 41, 131, 132

Association of Korean Political Scientists in North America, 36, 48

Attitude, 4, 59, 60, 63, 82, 83, 84, 89, 101, 111, 121, 132, 134

Australia, 72

Baker, Earl, 69, 77

Beach, Walter E., 5

Behavior pattern, 62, 140

Behavioral jargon, 101

Blacks, 1, 4, 6, 16, 18, 20, 48, 59, 101, 107, 108, 115, 117, 126, 128, 138, 139, 140

Blumenthal, W. Michael, 2

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, 2, 115, 120

California State Board of Education, 117

Canada, 24, 25, 26, 68, 72, 92, 98, 113

Canadian citizens, 1, 96, 136

Canadian Political Science Associations, 112, 113

Canadian political science departments, 92

Caribbean report, 101

Carter Administration, 116

Caucasian, 131

Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS), 3, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90

Caucus of the Foreign Born Political Scientists, 11, 15, 68

Cheap labor, 6

Chicanos, 1, 4, 16, 20, 59, 115, 117, 128

China, 12, 57, 67, 72, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132

Chinese, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 25, 30, 124, 125, 134, 137, 140

- Chinese-Americans, 1, 2, 7, 129, 140
Chinese studies, 5, 124
Citizenship, 14, 17, 21, 26, 29, 30, 85, 136
Columbia University, East Asian Institute, 125
Community activities, 62
Comparative politics, 13, 19, 37, 38, 55
Constitutional Law, 73
Cultural affinity, 132
Cultural pluralism, 7, 8, 118
Cultural adjustment problems, 27, 28, 29, 31, 44, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 118
Cyprus crisis, 101
Department of Labor, 18
Deutsch, Karl W., 21, 23, 67, 115, 135
Developing countries, 33, 97
Discrimination, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 31, 45, 64, 80, 81, 84, 88, 101, 102, 122, 140
Doctoral Scientists and Engineers of the National Academy of Sciences, 1973 survey, 139
East Asia, 12, 13, 15, 30, 72, 82, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 124, 133
East Europeans, 15, 25, 70, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 95, 97
Eastern Russia, 24
Employment, 19, 20, 41, 43, 44, 78, 84, 85, 89, 90, 94, 117, 121
English, 8, 9, 15, 29, 60, 74, 81, 86, 92, 97, 98, 100, 106, 108, 110, 111, 119, 126, 131, 136
Equal opportunity, 5, 19, 20, 34, 59, 121, 122
Ethnic groups, 7, 10, 51, 62, 64, 65, 105, 123, 138, 140
Ethnic interests, 4, 10
Ethnic problems, 1, 127
Eulau, Heinz, 21, 23, 67, 115
Europe, 9, 15, 97, 108, 115, 134
European political scientists, 11, 15, 21, 23, 81, 85, 89, 90, 115, 124
Executive Order 11246, 18
Fairbank, John K., 3
Federal government, 17, 117, 121, 122
Financial aid, 83, 84, 94, 98, 99, 100, 106, 111, 112
Fong, Hiram L., 2
Foreign students, 17, 34, 49, 67, 91, 99, 101, 105, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113
Foreign-born political science graduate students, 91ff; grievances, 99-102; profile, 92-96; social relations, 103-105; suggestions for, 112-114

- Foreign-born political scientists, 8, 11, 15, 23, 26, 27, 29, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 88, 89, 102, 107, 111; attitudes toward CNPS, 83, 87, 89; biographical profile, 69ff; surveys of, 67-68
- Friedrich, Carl, 21
- Generalists, 126
- German students, 106
- Goel, Lal, 11, 13, 15
- Graduate students, 17, 24, 70, 74, 76, 77, 78, 83, 91, 92, 105
- Guam, 25
- Hall, Oswald, 51
- Harvard Law School, 95
- Harvard University, 3, 8
- Hawaii, 2, 3, 4
- Hayakawa, S. I., 2, 120
- Hebrew, 97
- Hong Kong, 72, 135
- Hsüeh, Chün-tu, 4
- Humanities, 6, 34, 120, 130, 134, 139
- Identity, 5, 6, 7, 11, 92, 94, 103, 123, 126, 131, 132, 136
- Immigration, 17, 41, 70
- Immigration and Naturalization Act (1965), 34, 51, 102
- Immigrants, 12, 15, 18, 49, 51, 113, 119, 120, 131, 140
- Income Differential, 41, 42
- India, 72, 96, 131, 132
- Indian studies, 124
- Indians, 25
- Inkeles, Alex, 5
- Inouye, Senator, 120
- Institutional racism, 115
- Integration, 116
- Intellectual bias, 5-6
- International relations, 13, 19, 37, 38, 55, 73, 133
- International set, 6
- Iran, 25
- Iraq, 25
- Islam, 134
- Israel, 25, 97
- Jacob, Herbert, 4
- Japan, 25, 67, 123, 128, 132, 134
- Japanese-Americans, 1, 2
- Japanese specialists, 101
- Japanese studies, 124

- Jews, 1, 51, 128
Johnson, Chalmers, 3
Jordan, 25
King, Martin Luther, 120
Kim, Se-Jin, 53, 116
Kirkpatrick, Evron M., 4
Kissinger, Henry, 2, 21, 23, 67, 75, 115
Knowles, Louis, 115
Korea, 12, 25, 33, 37, 43, 44, 46, 116, 124, 128, 134
Korean-American cultural group, 49
Korean Christian churches, 119
Korean political scientists, 29, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 48, 53, 95, 117; aspirations, 45–47; biographical profile, 35–38; number, 33; publications, 39–40
Korean studies, 124
Korean War, 33, 49
Koreanologist, 124
Koreans, 1, 25, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 72, 95, 119, 124
Kremlinologists, 132
Kuala, Lumpur, 8
Kuroda, Yasumasa, 11, 13, 15
Language of politics, 8
Language proficiency, 86, 96, 98
Lebanon, 25
Latin America, 72, 95, 97, 133
London School of Economics, 137
Los Angeles, 119, 123
Loyalty, 6, 7
Machiavelli, 134
Malaysia, 8, 25
Maoism, 134
Marx, Karl, 7
McCarthy “cold war” period, 132
Melting-pot theory, 116, 123
Methodology, 19, 38, 39, 48, 57, 73
Middle East, 72, 95, 133
Militant ethnic politics, 20, 116
Minority, 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 51, 59, 74, 79, 80, 81, 82, 105, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 134, 140
Morgenthau, Hans, 23, 67
Moslem students, 102
National origin, 12, 59, 70, 89, 97, 98

National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel, 70
Nationalities, 70, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 128
Native-born Americans, 8, 40, 127
Native-born American political scientists, 23
Native-born non-Asian Americans, 5, 101
Native-born North Americans, 74, 99, 104, 107, 108, 111, 112
Native-born students, 94, 96, 99, 103, 105, 106
Natural sciences, 6, 130, 139
Naturalization, 92, 94, 123
Neoisolationism, 124
New York State, 25
New Zealand, 72
Nixon, Richard, 9
Non-American studies, 37, 55
Non-Discrimination Under Federal Contracts, 18
Normative and empirical theory, 19, 55, 73, 134
North-America, 1, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 41, 46,
67, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108,
109, 111, 113
North American universities, 33, 113
North Korea, 57
Oriental, 1, 6, 14, 18, 133, 138, 139, 140
Oteiza, Enrique, 41, 42
Pacific/Asian-Americans, 2
Pakistan, 96
Pakistanis, 25
Palestine, 25
Patriotism, 7
Pax-Americana, 33
Pekinologists, 132
Pennsylvania, 25
Permanent residents, 1, 12, 14, 17, 21, 70, 96
Personalities, 37, 118
Ph.D. degree, 1, 14, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 41, 69, 73, 76, 79, 86,
88, 90, 92, 102, 109, 113, 126, 138, 139
Ph.D. dissertation, 26
Philippines, 25
Physical sciences, 120
Plato's *Republic*, 134
Political science terminology, 101
Political psychology, 19
Portuguese, 97
Pottinger, J. Stanley, 17

- Prejudice, 13, 64, 126
Productivity, 38, 46, 48, 56, 64, 65, 88
Professional activities, 21, 27, 52, 56, 61, 80, 118, 128
Promotion, 17, 27, 28, 41, 45, 60, 63, 64, 80, 81, 82, 118
Public administration, 19, 73, 134
Public law, 55
Publications, 4, 5, 6, 13, 26, 34, 37, 45, 46, 77, 78, 79, 82, 138
Quota system, 82
Racial problems, 2–6, 13–16, 15, 19, 69, 84, 88, 123
Record, William, 51
Refugees, 72
Reorientation, 119, 132, 133
Repatriation, 30, 41, 92, 94, 103
Research, 8, 11, 21, 23, 26, 27, 34, 36, 38, 40, 45, 52, 53, 56, 57, 69, 78, 79, 86, 94, 95, 102, 103, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 117, 121, 123, 125, 128, 129
Research activities, 27, 31, 38, 40, 53, 56
Research grants, 14, 17, 27, 28, 31, 39, 56, 63, 64, 80, 81, 89, 102, 106, 107, 111
Research methodology, 38, 57
Riggs, Fred, 24, 67
Rogers, Lindsay, 8
Salary, 17, 27, 28, 45, 52, 63, 64, 78, 80, 81, 82, 89, 138, 140
San Francisco, 7
Scholar-agents, 116
Self-criticism, 7, 10
Seniority, 6
Sex, 6, 12, 13, 94, 108
Shanghai, 2
Social distance, 15, 115
Socio-political differential, 41, 43, 44, 45
South Asia, 12, 30, 72, 82, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 133
South Korea, 25, 33, 34
Southeast Asia, 7, 72, 85, 132, 133
Southeast Asia studies, 124
Southern Europeans, 97
Soviet Union, 132
Status, 6
Students, 8, 14, 33, 49, 65, 69, 72, 87, 88, 91, 97, 100, 101, 102, 105, 107, 126, 127, 134, 137
Sui generis, 125
Survey research project, 110
Taiwan, 30, 72

- Taiwanese, 25
Teaching, 17, 26, 27, 35, 36, 40, 44, 45, 52, 54, 60, 69, 74, 78, 79, 81, 82, 86, 101, 102, 103, 113, 121, 125, 127, 129
Teaching assistants, 78, 92, 98, 106
Tenure, 17, 52, 63, 64, 74, 82, 85
Thesis supervision, 94, 101, 102
Underutilization, 18, 115, 119
United States, 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 29, 33, 34, 43, 44, 54, 64, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 80, 83, 89, 92, 97, 98, 113, 120, 123, 125, 128, 138
United States, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), 17, 18, 19, 117
University politics, 61
Urban politics, 19, 73, 133
Value, 37, 120
Vietnam, 25, 57, 124
Virginia, 25
Visa, 136
WASP, 125, 128
Washington, D.C., 10, 122
Washington, George, 9
Washington University, 8
Wei, Yung, 116
West Asia, 12, 13, 30, 72, 82, 85, 87, 88, 89
West Europeans, 15, 72, 85, 86, 87, 89
West Indies, 96
Whites, 6, 15, 29, 96, 108, 116, 139
Wilde, Oscar, 136
Women political scientists, 1, 3, 13, 16, 18, 20, 59, 128
World War II, 134
Yale Law School, 95
Yang, Sung Chul, 53, 116