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MANIFESTATIONS OF DIVERSITY: AN ECOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS

Lindsey M. Hopewell, Ph.D.
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Dissertation Director: Dr. Connie L. McNeely

Ethnic studies programs in United States colleges and universities began in the late 1960s and early 1970s, largely as a result of political and social movements that reflected a growing awareness of marginalized groups within society and their place (or lack thereof) within academia and, more to the point, of their largely omitted or overlooked place within and contributions to various disciplinary fields across academia. Even today, ethnic studies programs as such are evidenced only in approximately a quarter of all four-year institutions, and many of those programs face regular challenges to their existence, giving rise to critical questions about their disciplinary institutionalization. This study provides an analysis based on an organizational ecology perspective to explore whether changes in certain factors, such as geographical locale, population density, ethnic distribution, school type, and various other external and internal features, play a role in the establishment and institutionalization of these programs. This research fits into
larger discussions of organizational behavior and contextual relations, while also addressing more specifically how changes in demographics might impact higher education and the growth of related academic fields in the United States.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

We do not live in a homogenous society. The fight for social equality continues to surround us. Who is included versus who is left out sounds like a playground game, but it pervades society. While there has been some forward progress, groups are still marginalized, and history is still biased. Yes, strides have been made, and yes, there are many more voices telling the story, but there is still so much that is left out, hidden, or whispered like a dirty secret because of fear, unacceptance, and/or politics. Is it simply human nature to marginalize certain ethnic groups? If so, has this changed over time? Are the same groups marginalized or have we moved on to new groups? Is the perception the reality? Are we really trying to address the problem or are we just changing the focal point, using a sleight of hand, to make people look away or focus on something else? How do our colleges and universities, the training grounds for our future leaders, approach this issue? What we teach and how it is taught plays an important role in how society is shaped and how groups perceive their place within it and relative to other groups.

When it comes to ethnic studies, questions abound. Who decides what gets taught? More importantly, who decides how it is taught? There are good guys and bad guys in every story and most are ripe for manipulation. History can be taught through an inclusive lens, or an exclusive one and it is subjective. Take for example that “the Black
Student Union (BSU) at Washington State University (WSU) chose not to take the Black-centered approach, largely because the geography of WSU did not include a sizable Black community that could support such a program” (Robins 2012, p. 137). If it did include such a population, would they have gone a different way? When it comes to ethnic studies and its four most common subfields -- African American studies, Latino/a studies, Asian American studies, and Native American/Indigenous studies -- the location and breadth of programs, as well as their embeddedness varies greatly. Why is there such variation and does it follow any logical pattern? Despite interest and even protest, schools often fail to provide ethnic studies programs, sometimes claiming that they have a “divisive nature”, as well as citing budget constraints and other political issues. Harvard University is a great example in regards to its refusal to establish an Asian American studies.¹ Despite lengthy petitions, interest, and advocates, the school was unrelenting. N. Kathy Lin (2008), of the Harvard Crimson, indicated that...

...the valiant efforts of Asian American Studies to provide a counter-discourse against dominant Eurocentric interpretations of American history are ultimately inconsistent with its intentions — by prioritizing a particular group’s preservation and ethnic identity via primarily nationalistic justifications, Asian America risks becoming a centralized, hegemonic voice itself. She goes on further to discuss how the East Asian studies program demonstrates the way political power becomes an issue causing certain groups to be recognized and others to be forgotten or left out. Does Harvard have it correct? Or is this an easy excuse, especially given that it made a similar argument in regards to the creation of a Latino Studies Center (Trejo 2012). Are these programs really divisive? Several studies have shown that

¹ Note that Harvard does have a Department of African and African American Studies.
introducing students to this type of subject matter is critical for perspective. “Rather than
being divisive, ethnic studies helps students to bridge differences that already exist in
experiences and perspectives” (Sleeter 2011, p. 20). The results do vary. As Bowman
(2010, pp. 559-60) showed, the impact of taking more than one diversity course was
greatest for wealthy white males, and the overall benefit of diversity coursework was
greater for white students than for students of color.

WSU raises the interesting question of population and how it has the potential to
impact ethnic studies programs. United States (U.S.) colleges and universities have
changed as the nation changed. Societal shifts find their way to a college campus just as
they do with other facets of society. It is projected that by 2060, the Hispanic population
will comprise nearly 33% of the population while the non-Hispanic white population will
no longer be a majority at around 43%. The Asian population is projected to more than
double in size and constitute 8.2% of the population. The growth of these two groups,
Hispanics and Asians, will largely be the result of births. By 2060, the under 18, non-
Hispanic white population is projected to make up 32.9% of the population (down from
52.7% in 2012) and the Hispanic population is projected to comprise 38% of this age
group (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). Will these population changes alter academic
program offerings at U.S. colleges and universities? Given that student population does
not always reflectively mirror society, will programmatic change still occur given that it
is useful for students to understand the interaction between different groups and
themselves within society? How will this shift in population alter the make-up of the
student body? “The faces of the American college population will continue to change. In
an increasingly diverse United States, demographers anticipate that by 2020, students of color will comprise 46 percent of the nation's total student population” (Seurkamp 2007). Thus, will ethnic studies program offerings increase to reflect population changes and shifting interests in society as a whole, or even within specific university communities? Or will these interests be overshadowed by budget issues and societal concerns?

Ethnic studies as defined by the University of California, Berkeley (2009), the first school to create an ethnic studies department in the country, is an interdisciplinary enterprise that...focus[es] both on the specific experiences of African Americans, Asian Americans, Chicanas/os and Latinas/os, Native Americans, and other racialized peoples in the US, and on the lessons of comparative ethno-racial studies for generalizing about American society and history and about the contemporary global order (since race and racism are neither uniquely American nor ever merely a “domestic matter” in any modern nation-state).

Ethnic Studies departments were largely the result of the civil rights movement, which encouraged underrepresented or oppressed groups to fight for recognition and status within society (Hu-DeHart 1993, p. 53). As early as 1968, students on California campuses began to demand changes and reforms to what they considered a racist, sexist, and elitist system (Hu-DeHart 1993, p. 50; Yang 2000). Since inception, ethnic studies programs were developed to address social injustice, fight against the demoralization and social control of the masses, and recognize omissions in scholarship. Not only was the history and experiences of whole segments of the population being ignored and left out of history books and lessons, but scholars and their contributions were also being ignored and suppressed. In order to have a voice, groups such as the Black Student Union, Asian
American Political Alliance, and Latin American Students Organization, amongst others, fought against the majority, demanding to be heard and recognized.

Today, ethnic studies includes a myriad of sub-fields including, but not limited to, African American Studies, Asian American studies, Native American studies, and Latino/a studies. Programs are often combined as they are interdisciplinary and can be found in a number of different combinations. Some schools may only have a general ethnic studies program or department while others include specific sub-field programs or departments. It is important to note that not all schools offer all subfields, and the range of combinations is as diverse as the disciplines, primarily incorporating humanities and social sciences, from which courses are drawn. Ethnic studies is continuing to evolve and adapt to societal changes. The University of Michigan, for example, has recently adopted an Arab and Muslim American studies initiative which will become a minor in the winter of 2015 (University of Michigan 2014). This is important as it distinctly focuses on the Muslim American experience in contrast to traditional Islamic studies programs that have been in existence for decades.

**Research Questions**

The question remains, however: are programmatic and curricular changes correlated with societal changes? Do demographic changes correlate with the appearance of ethnic studies programs? This is an important question given that the rate at which students enter college and universities varies greatly. In 2001 for instance, according to data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the Department of Education, while 37 percent of the eligible white population attended a four-year institution, only 26 percent of the black
population, and 15 percent of the Hispanic population did so (Forster 2006, p. 50). Thus, in trying to determine whether demographics plays a role in the creation of ethnic studies programs, simply looking at population figures will only tell part of the story. On the other hand, it also is possible that ethnic studies programs have become institutionalized in and of themselves regardless of population and rather, are seen as legitimate curricular innovations in light of their disciplinary basis and knowledge construction.

In looking to determine whether there is a relationship between population changes and the institutionalization of ethnic studies programs or curricular innovation, it is important also to take into account the organizational culture of the colleges and universities themselves, as well as the populations within and surrounding them. Thus, it is necessary to engage in an investigation of the factors characterizing the institutions and their surrounding areas, in addition to examining their changing demographic profiles. Such an investigation will constitute an ecological analysis of ethnic studies programs within the context of changing societal dynamics. In this case, the term ecological is used as referenced in organizational ecology to examine the characteristics and problems that exist in the social, spatial, and institutional environment of the university and its surrounding area (Hannan and Freeman 1989; Hannan et al. 2007). The point of this kind of ecological analysis is to consider whether demographic and spatial community issues are a factor in the recognition, legitimization, and incorporation of certain groups and/or areas of study.

Previous studies investigating the creation of programs related to diversity or specific ethnic groups have centered around an internal impetus, whether it be a specific
faculty member or a student group (Yamane 2001, pp. 45-46). There are also a number of inquiries into what constitutes ethnic studies, the history of the discipline, the type and nature of particular programs, the approaches employed, and the degree of institutionalization (Yang 2000; Bataille et al. 1996; Guiterrez 1994; Hu-DeHart 1993).

In recent years, there has also been a rise in literature relating to women’s studies programs (Boxer 1998; Wotipka and Ramirez 2007; Olzak and Kangas 2006, 2008), which is important because women’s studies is often interrelated with ethnic studies. Moreover, women’s studies and ethnic studies share many similar challenges in regards to curricular transformation and institutionalization. Scholars have generated and tested theories on why Ethnic, Women’s and African American studies majors were offered in U.S. Institutions and found that the size of student and faculty demographic profiles played a role (Olzak and Kangas 2008). Others looked at Women’s studies as a form innovation, finding that global dynamics such as conferences and activities combined with national factors such as economic development led to program adoption (Wotipka and Ramirez 2007). The development of women’s and ethnic studies programs also have been examined as a result of curricular change looking at institutional shifts, economic forces, institutional embeddedness in society, and drive for legitimacy as guiding factors (Turk-Bicaki 2007).
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The term ethnic studies, when used in the context of the American educational system, does not have any single accepted definition. Rather, it generally refers to academic programs dedicated to the study of social, political, cultural and historical issues that impact the existence and development of ethnic minority groups in the U.S. Scholars often refer to it as an interdisciplinary, comparative study of underrepresented ethnic groups interacting in the larger scheme of American culture (Butler 1991, p. 26; Yang 2000, p. 8). Since the content and methodology for these academic departments and degree programs, which henceforth will be referred to simply as programs, are typically derived from humanities and social sciences, they can include a variety of courses situated in both areas of study. U.S. universities differ in terms of what they include under ethnic studies. For some universities, this includes any group that has at some time been denied full and equal citizenship in American Society (in de jour and/or de facto terms), while for other universities, it focuses on the study of specific ethnic groups.

How ethnic studies programs develop and change pertains to the social construction and conceptualization of ethnic studies, namely which groups are included, why, and how. Race itself is a social construct (Delgado 2001, pp. 7-8). It exists for political, social and organizational dynamics. It recognizes that racism is institutionalized in society. These constructs play an important role in social inclusion
and how that pertains to society. Program presence does not negate issues of racism nor does it necessarily equate to inclusion.

When it comes to the teaching of ethnic studies, how the material is presented and treated can influence the way a group is viewed within society. Not only that, but “it is to question what cultural representations will ‘shape the ideals and values as well as the categories of analysis and understanding that will guide the next generation of American leaders’” (Hunter, in Yamane 2001, p. 6). Cultural representation is important in regards to university support. This includes issues of faculty diversity, funding, support, sensitivity, and recognition. Not only is it important to address who is addressing the issues and how they are doing so, but also whether or not the university evinces any relevant recognition and commitment, which sends its own message.

In this study, the term ethnic studies will be used as an inclusionary disciplinary reference. It will refer to a program or department that addresses the existence and study of a subgroup of the population that has specific cultural traditions and/or long standing historical under representation within U.S society. Emphasis will be placed on programs and departments that relate to specific ethnic studies subfields rather than the overarching field of ethnic studies. This is because specific ethnic studies programs can be directly related to segments of the general population to see if changes in the demographics of a group are associated with programmatic changes. Overarching ethnic studies programs are also included in this study because they represent a recognition on the part of the university to address issues related to ethnic studies. Programs included may be independent or cross-listed under another department. Again, this research will
specifically focus on the following four subfields of study: African American studies; Indian/Native American studies; Latino/a Studies (which typically includes Hispanic American, Puerto Rican, and/or Mexican-American/Chicano studies); and Asian-American studies (which can include Chinese American studies, Japanese American studies, Filipino American studies, Korean American studies, etc.). These are the major subfields of ethnic studies in the U.S. Each is relatively autonomous and represented by at least one professional organization, yet they often have similar concerns and assumptions (Yang 2000, p. 12).

It is important to note that while ethnic studies programs examine the history and experiences of particular ethnic groups, they are not offered exclusively (or even primarily, depending on the situation) for these groups. Any student may take part in these courses or programs and are often encouraged to do so. In some cases, students are even required to participate in them. Bowling Green State University (BGSU), for example, has a “cultural diversity” requirement that all students must fulfill by taking a class in “multiculturalism.” This requirement was instituted in response to issues of diversity and keep with the university’s focus on multiculturalism (Bowling Green State University 2014).

Social Significance

This proposed study goes further in exploring the role of demographics by addressing both internal and external populations in relation to ecological changes in order to understand whether or not the interplay between these changes in society and the academic community aid in programmatic diffusion. To do so, it will focus on the four
main subfields of ethnic studies -- African American studies, Latino/a studies, Asian American studies, and Native American/Indigenous studies. Further, it will take into consideration the growth and existence of these programs. In addition to examining programmatic growth, population density will be investigated along with ecological changes to determine if certain factors, such as geographical locale, changes in population distribution, changes in social status, or type of school, play a role in the institutionalization of a program. In addition, critical underlying questions for this research reflect positions on these groups as either subjects or objects within their respective communities and society at large. However, for purposes of this study, these programs are considered within the dominant paradigm of higher education and curricular legitimation as a first step for later critical assessments of relevant societal effects.

One cannot examine the evolution of a program without looking at discipline institutionalization. Although ethnic studies appeared around the same time as women’s studies, women’s studies has made greater strides in becoming institutionalized (Yang 2000, p. 274). It is important to examine those schools with departments and/or other significant signs of institutionalization versus those without to determine whether barriers exist and why. “Institutionalization involves the processes by which social processes, obligations, or actualities come to take on a rule-like status in social thought and action” (Meyer and Rowan 1977, p. 341). Do demographic changes influence the institutionalization process? If not, what other criteria might be necessary for programs to successfully gain leverage?
In order to address these questions, the following study explores demographic and ecological factors related to the university and its surrounding demographic and spatial communities as possible factors helping to explain why specific subfields of ethnic studies have developed and taken root in certain locations and not in others, and why this might be so. Based on information derived from this, one might gain insight into how programs may develop, expand, or disappear in the future. This fits into a larger discussion of organizational behavior and institutionalization in higher education. It specifically addresses whether demographic and ecological factors are associated with curricular offerings by encouraging the recognition, legitimation, and incorporation of certain ethnicity based programs, while dealing with the broader question of whether or the extent to which tertiary educational institutions are influenced by societal changes.

The creation and institutionalization of ethnic studies programs will be examined in regards to ecological characteristics using various methods of analysis and taking into account prior studies. Chapter 2 will define necessary terms and undertake a theoretical analysis that will underline the construction of the arguments. It will look at the history of ethnic studies programs, the foundations of curricular institutionalization, and current issues facing academia that specifically impact ethnic studies. Chapter 3 lays out the hypotheses and identifies the logic behind them. Chapter 4 outlines the methods employed for this study. Chapter 5 describes the findings in regards to the specific questions raised and discusses the implications of those findings. Chapter 6 considers the findings to draw overall conclusions and indicate pathways for future research.
Origins of Ethnic Studies

The origins of ethnic studies programs on U.S. college and university campuses can be traced back to the 1960s and 1970s. Studies often link the rise in ethnic studies programs to student protest, but some also look at how the protests are part of a larger social movement occurring at that time (Gomez-Quinones 1978; Hu-DeHart 2000; Rhoads 1998; Yamane 2001; Soule 1997). Protest and change stem primarily from a growing awareness, but also an increase in the population base that helps create that awareness. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, an essential change took place, which helped create and shape ethnic studies programs in the U.S. and “set in motion a profound rethinking and rewriting of ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality and other modalities of ‘difference’ that further challenged monolithic conceptions of Americanness” (Reed 2014). This shift or rethinking emphasized individuality over assimilation and encouraged displays of ethnic identity (Yang 2000). Additionally, although many parts of the country were already marked by the settlement of majority non-European descent groups, increases in immigration due to the elimination of national origin quotas, which favored Europeans, continued to alter the population (Hu-DeHart 1993, p. 51). A number of other factors have also influenced program creation such as shifting demographic population, growing level of scholarship and expertise in the field, increase in available literature, and changing interests/level of value placed on cultural diversity.

While formal ethnic studies subfield programs, such as African American Studies, have histories that date back to the 1960s or earlier, others, such as Asian American or
Chicano studies came later to U.S. institutions. Stanford University, for example, did not approve its Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CSRE) program that included Chicano, Asian American, and Native American studies until 1996, despite interest as early as the 1970s (1996).

U.S. demographics are changing, “As a nation, we’re becoming much more radically diverse--but not everywhere and not in the same ways. Although the numbers of black and Hispanics have equalized at about 37 million each, it is Hispanics and Asians who are expected to account for 61 percent of the U.S. population growth from 1995 to 2025” (Hodgkinson 2002, p. 14). Based strictly on population then, would ethnic studies programs related to these two groups be expected to grow or expand to accommodate the changing population or do they not alter offerings? It has been posited that “there are more ethnic studies programs in the West because of that region’s fast-growing and ethnically diverse population” (Hu-DeHart 1993, p. 50). Is this true? How does it relate to other areas? In general, urban areas tend to be more diverse, and diversity helps cities thrive and is essential to the transfer and diffusion of ideas (Glaser 1996, pp. 70-77). If there is a relationship between urban areas, population profiles, and programs, would institutions in states experiencing the majority of this growth such as California, Texas and Florida be the first to adopt new programs or expand existing ones (Hodgkinson 2002, p. 14; Boulard 2006, pp. 30-32)? In contrast, would predominantly white institutions (PWIs) or universities in areas with a single dominant population be late adopters?
As previously mentioned, student activism in the form of protest is often linked to campus change and the development of programs related to the study of minority groups (Gomez-Quinones 1978; Astin 1982; Hu-DeHart 1993, 2000; Yang 2000). Community grassroots movements encouraged student activism and action on campus. Black students’ demands for ethnic studies related curriculum was highly correlated with curricular change (Astin 1982). Student activism has been present in each decade making contributions to curriculum change as students challenge the traditional power structure of institutions (Yamane 2001; Levine and Cureton 1998; Yip 1996). Is there a greater likeliness for ethnic studies programs at universities that have experienced ethnic studies related activism or does it only matter during the specific period in which the activism occurs? Instances of activism, although influential in program development have not been included in this study based on the fact that they have failed to show association with the presence of African American studies or ethnic studies (Turk-Bicakci 2007, pp. 185-187).

**Institutionalization**

Over time, ethnic studies programs have become more prevalent at colleges and universities. In the late 1960s, only a handful of programs existed; by the late 1970s, 526 programs existed (Washburn 1979), and by 1996, there were almost 700 programs or departments emphasizing minority groups (Bataille, Carranza, and Lisa 1996; Yang 2000, p. 273). Bataille, Carranza, and Lisa’s 1996 study found that only 112 ethnic studies departments existed. Based on these numbers, less than 16% of all ethnic studies programs, were departments. Department creation is essential to the continued existence
of this discipline because achieving department status puts it on a par with traditional disciplines and ensures that it has a place in the structure and organization that is academia as departments receive resources, hire faculty, determine curriculum, and grant degrees (Yang 2000, p. 274). Ethnic studies programs, especially ones that do not have full-time faculty, often rely on the use of faculty members who split their time between several departments or disciplines and encourage disciplinary fragmentation. Department creation does not necessarily eliminate this and in some cases, may further encourage the sharing of faculty by creating shared Full Time Equivalents (FTEs), which specifically require the hired faculty members to teach a set number of courses in each of the several programs they have been hired to aid. The sharing of faculty also occurs because ethnic studies programs are by their very nature interdisciplinary, relying on numerous departments from English to art, sociology to music; thus strengthening the knowledge base of the student. It is expected that Institutions with established ethnic studies departments would be more likely to expand their ethnic studies offerings through the creation of additional subfield departments and/or programs than their counterparts without departments because the university has a vested interest in their well-being, there is precedent, and the department leadership should have a certain degree of leverage to aid in fulfilling their needs.

Universal presence is another aspect of institutionalization pertinent to ethnic studies. Although a large number of institutions have initiated some form of ethnic studies program, more than three-quarters of the 3,688 U.S. colleges and universities have not created such a program (Yang 2000, p. 274). The continuing diversification of
the student body may aid in changing this, but certain geographic areas may experience change more quickly than others based on their population base, their level of commitment to diversity, and their ability to implement change (based on factors such as size, funding, administration). Those colleges and universities that have created a department or program are often likely to create or increase the number of subfield programs or departments due to the interdisciplinary nature of the subject matter. Take African American studies, often considered the pioneering field of ethnic studies, which frequently combines an emphasis on Africa, the Caribbean, Latin America, and the United States to create a matrix for looking at the connections among groups and experiences based on race, class, ethnicity, and gender (Butler and Walter 1991). Most other subfields are modelled similarly to African American studies or take an approach that has similar structural qualities. (Butler and Walter 1991). Thus, once a program or department is created and has established itself at a given university, it should be easier to replicate and expand because interdisciplinary faculty already exist, and the structure has been created.

Creating a program relies on leadership and administrative decision-making, and it is important to remember “higher education strategic management decisions span multiple policy areas. For college administrators, variability in internal and external domains, such as funding, source, student body, faculty characteristics, and facilities, can all be factors that drive organizational policy, individually or collectively” (Kushner 1999, p. 413). College administrators and leadership not only play a role in the distribution of resources and the hiring of new faculty, but they are also subject to some
extent to public demands, especially as universities become ever more complex. The development of ethnic studies programs and departments can be considered a form of curricular innovation (University of California, Los Angeles 2014). Institutions often strive to be at the cusp of innovation; public institutions are often pressured by the public (Hu-DeHart 1993), while elite institutions are pressured by their need to maintain their reputation. Institutions of higher learning compete for students, professors, and sources of funding. Not only does the institution’s reputation attract the students, but so do innovative and interesting programs. Schools located within a shared locality are likely to offer programs similar to those of their counterparts in order to compete, provided that they are of similar prestige levels. This is because colleges and universities that are in direct competition with one another are more likely to imitate one another in respect to teaching and research than they are to diversify in order to capture a portion of the market (Meek 2000, p. 3).

While ethnic studies programs face challenges to institutionalization at traditional colleges and universities, do they encounter similar or different ones when it comes to schools designated as minority serving institution (MSI) by the U.S. Department of Education? A college or university is considered an MSI if enrollment of a single minority or a combination of minorities exceeds 50 percent of the total enrollment. These institutions receive special grants and have a vested interest in maintaining their status as minority serving institutions. These institutions specifically target disadvantaged and disenfranchised students and often need to provide additional services to help these students succeed. This raises the question of whether this increased minority population
plays any role in the existence of ethnic studies related programs. Because these schools have a vested interest in their ethnic populations, do the organizational and social constructs of these universities differ significantly from that of traditional universities in a way that would alter the existence of ethnic studies programs? While little research ties together MSIs and the institutionalization of ethnic studies it does seem worth addressing especially in light of a recent discussion paper by Lee, Jr, and Keys, that raised the issue of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and their response to changing demographics and increased diversity. It brought up an interesting question in regards to how these schools can compete to attract a sufficient number of African American students and in the absence of that, students from other growing demographic groups. (2013, p. 30) Are ethnic studies programs already in place and, if so, are they specific to the type of MSI? How will changing demographics potentially alter MSIs?

National level versus campus level demographic considerations

There are differences among the various ethnic groups in terms of the proportion of college age population they represent over time, which partially accounts for differences in the college population. Another consideration to address is college acceptance and attendance. Although the pool of students applying to a given college or university may be ethnically diverse, acceptance and attendance rates may greatly affect student diversity.

What role, if any, does the surrounding community play in the university population? The specific cultural makeup of the surrounding population may aid in determining whether it affects the nature of offerings. Moreover, depending on the
nature of the school, it may act as an academic funnel for the local student body, thereby passing some of the influence and cultural characteristics of the local body onto the school. Although this is strongest in community colleges, it does occur at other types of institutions as well, especially those that are public in nature. By examining demographic changes at the national, local, and university level, it may be possible to capture whether there is a relationship in regards to diffusion and if so, what degree of time lag, if any, it takes to occur. Over time, one might expect to find that certain subfields have gained a certain degree of curricular legitimacy and institutionalization irrespective of location.

**Current State of Ethnic Studies**

While Ethnic studies programs have certainly achieved a certain degree of institutionalization, as evidenced by the fact that programs are available throughout the country at all academic levels, in all types of schools, and have received a general level of acceptance, they still face many challenges. It is important to look at some of these in order to understand where current and future impediments to growth may lie and also to understand why programs may or may not take root in certain locales. It is also important to note that while there are many facets of ethnic studies, they have not all achieved a uniform level of institutionalization.

**Issues facing Ethnic Studies Programs**

While it may appear that ethnic studies programs are alive and well, especially in the case of African American Studies, in light of current economic cutbacks, politics, and changing viewpoints, ethnic studies programs in many instances, are once again finding
themselves fighting to defend their place in academia. This section will take a brief look at some of the biggest challenges ethnic studies programs are facing including the potential impacts of disappearing funding, changing attitudes towards liberal arts, and legal/political challenges.

**Budget cuts -- surviving as funding disappears**

“Some estimates place the number of African-American studies programs reaching its peak at 800 in the early 1970s and declining to about 375, due to the lack of resources and support, by the mid-1990s” (Land and Brown 2003, p. 68). There has been some resurgence and growth since then, but budget issues are far from over and are arguably only getting worse. In addition, universities are facing competition from online and for-profit programs and are forced to compete for students in an unprecedented way. “Educators and others say that as campuses look to trim costs, ethnic studies programs are bearing the brunt and could be seen as irrelevant” (Rivera 2013). Moreover, others claim that budget cuts could be used as an excuse to cut programs that they do not approve of (Brown 2013). Regardless of the reason, some professors are finding it difficult to survive in a climate where their future feels uncertain and administrators are doing little to quell such fears. For example,

At the Stanislaus campus in Turlock, professors Lilia DeKatzew and Kou Yang said they fear their program will eventually be eliminated after administrators failed to replace two colleagues and have moved to reduce courses and restructure the curriculum. Dissatisfied with the changes, the two announced in May that they would resign at the end of the year. They were told that a temporary, part-time instructor would replace all four positions, DeKatzew said (Rivera 2013).
Other examples of this exist as well. Even while legislatures are working to protect programs, university heads at some schools are finding ways around this by employing part-time instructors, placing hiring holds on positions, and/or restructuring departments, while others are fighting to keep their programs afloat.

However, it is important also to remember that not all programs are struggling. In fact, some programs are taking it in stride and using the cuts to restructure and evolve, thus securing their place within the university structure. California State University, Fullerton, for example, is planning to establish the nation's first bachelor's program in Vietnamese studies in Fall 2015. As Mildred Garcia notes, "what wasn't available in the '60s, but is now, is a knowledge base and academic discipline that has tenure-track faculty engaged in research." (Rivera 2013) Other schools, like Dartmouth College, also are thinking outside the box. Their Department of Native American Studies will offer an off-campus program for the first time starting in 2015. “The program’s primary goal will be for students to engage native communities in ways that aren’t possible in a Hanover classroom, ‘so that native people aren’t just appearing in textbooks or films’” (Duthu, in Wolfe 2014).

**Challenges for the Liberal Arts and Ethnic Studies**

In recent years, economic problems have brought budget cuts for universities, as well as job concerns for their students. Budget issues and general concerns about the economy influence how students’ look at the future and decide on what to major in and what classes to take. Blumenstyk (2010) noted “enrollment statistics show that more than half of all undergraduates now choose majors in business, engineering, or nursing.” The
bigger issue is not the increased focus on job-related majors, but rather a decline in liberal arts. “College is increasingly being defined narrowly as job preparation, not as something designed to educate the whole person,” said Pauline Yu, president of the American Council of Learned Societies (Lewin 2013). Another aspect of institutionalization deals with the imitation of local life in practice. Does the interdisciplinary nature of ethnic studies allow it to combine aspects of vocational skill-focused disciplines with the analytical thinking critical to liberal arts in order to create a desirable option for current and future students facing an increasingly diverse world that they need to be able to navigate?

This combined with budgetary issues means that existing programs are competing for students while also trying to stay afloat. Lewin spoke to this when talking about Stanford. She said, “They have generous compensation, stunning surroundings and access to the latest technology and techniques of scholarship. The only thing they lack is students: Some 45 percent of the faculty members in Stanford’s main undergraduate division are clustered in the humanities — but only 15 percent of the students.” (Lewin 2013) As class enrollment declines, issues of need and relevancy begin surface, forgetting that these programs offer students a forum to discuss important issues related to race and cultural diversity.

**Changing views: Identity shifts and Government Intervention - failed by the legal system**

If economic challenges seem daunting for ethnic studies programs to overcome, what happens when political issues are added to the mix? In Arizona, beginning in 2010,
the Governor signed a law banning ethnic studies courses. The reason for the ban is “they say that ethnic studies has been created only by and for particular racial groups, and that it promotes hatred of whites and minority-group solidarity. Thus, the "harmful" and "dysfunctional" nature of ethnic studies is allegedly that it creates social cleavages where, presumably, none existed before” (Okihiro 2010). This is problematic for many reasons, but most importantly because it gives credence to critics that claim that ethnic studies is divisive. It plays into fears and control. “Arizona's anxieties over border controls, both within the state and along its fences with Mexico, reflect a national concern over solidifying consensus at home while imposing imperial order abroad” (Okihiro 2010). In addition to being divisive, it is also just untrue. There is evidence that ethnic studies courses, especially when combined with interracial interaction, have a positive impact on students. “Both students of color and White students have been found to benefit academically as well as socially from ethnic studies” (Sleeter 2011, p. 20). While initially the aim of the law banning ethnic studies was not universities, it does have its impact in stirring up political and social biases. It makes people think that ethnic studies are only by and for particular groups. It purposely fails to note that these studies were created to rescue knowledge and share it with all segments of the population. Ethnic studies are meant to be inclusionary, typically have diverse faculties, and always are open to all students regardless of race or ethnic background.

In addition to political issues, social changes appear to be taking place that alter the way new generations of Chicano and other Latino students view themselves.

“Students in many cases don’t identify as Chicanos, as did the generation that created
this department,’ Ortiz said. Many more identify as Mexican, Mexican-American, or simply American” (Florido 2013).2 The change in how students saw themselves has also changed what, to some degree, they are interested in studying. So while these students flocked to California campuses in record numbers, chicano studies programs failed to meet their target quotas. Is there a way to win students back? Will restructuring help or will it cause further marginalization?

If these issues are not enough, add in questions of legitimacy in the face of scandals such as that of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and African and Afro-studies. The former department chair of the African and Afro-American studies was recently indicted on fraud charges. “Since the mid-1990s, the African studies department held at least 200 lecture-style courses that investigators said likely met rarely, if at all. More than 50 percent of the classes enrollees were student-athletes, who received a collective total of more than 500 grade changes over that time period” (Westerholm 2014). The fact that this received widespread publicity itself reflects a broader racism and discrimination and a political and cultural bias against ethnic studies programs. Yes, what the chair did is scandalous, but he is not alone in this regard. This type of fraud has occurred across academic disciplines, but emphasizing this particular example in this way is used to call into question the legitimacy and integrity of ethnic studies programs everywhere.

What now?

2 More individuals choose to identify as Mexican, Mexican American, and American than as Chicano due to the political connotations associated with the term Chicano.
While ethnic studies programs are facing economic, political, and social challenges, this is not something new. Since their inception, they have been fighting to be recognized, and institutionalized and though this fight is far from over, good headway has been made which should help them hold their ground into the future. Arguments have been made that not only are certain programs alive and well, but they are thriving. While some programs are well-established, others have professors and students willing to continue the fight despite the difficult social, political, and economic climate. The real question might just be, will they remain as traditionally represented or will they pop up in new places or with new names?
CHAPTER THREE: HYPOTHESES

The preceding discussion provides the basis for the following nine hypotheses, which examine system dynamics and how the diverse interrelated and mediating factors that link demographics and program development play out (Figure 3a).

![Figure 3a -- Ecological model](image)

**Hypothesis I: Schools located within a shared locality will develop similar ethnic studies programs**

Do colleges and universities in a shared locale develop similar programs? If they do, why does it occur? Possible reasoning could include competition to attract a particular student base away from a neighboring school; clustering and sharing resources in order to increase competitive advantage; market demand; and/or population profile.
As previously mentioned, especially in relation to the breadth in curricular offerings, schools of similar stature are expected to develop similar programs. In some cases, such as that of the Claremont Consortium Group (Pomona College, Claremont Graduate University, Scripps College, Claremont McKenna College, Harvey Mudd College, Pitzer College, and Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences) and the Five Colleges Consortium (Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst), schools band together to offer additional programs that they may not be able to include on their own.

Ethnic studies can be viewed as a form of innovation. While certain schools may like to be at forefront in terms of creation, others hang back until there is sufficient demand for the “new” product or until they fear being left behind and framed as inadequate in their programmatic breadth. For example, take the case of Cornell, students and professors lobbied for a Puerto Rican studies program in the 1970s, with little success. However, in the 1980s they tried again with a stronger campaign and succeeded, in part due to visible Puerto Rican studies programs at other leading universities (e.g. University of Illinois, Chicago, Rutgers University, City University of New York.) (Cornell University 2014).

**Hypothesis II: The likelihood of a university having an ethnic studies program will increase with proximity to a major metropolitan area.**

Metropolitan areas often have a diverse population base, but is this enough to translate into programs? Metropolitan areas also offer resources such as museums, businesses, organizations, and people that suburban areas might lack. Are population
base and resources correlated with the presence of ethnic studies programs? If so, why? Students in urban areas, especially non-traditional students that may be part-time, have dependents, or delayed enrollment, may have or form strong ties to their communities and bring those values, interests, and questions to the school. Moreover, in trying to engage students and compete with job focused majors, some schools are stressing the engagement between universities and the communities that surround them through externships, community service, and cooperative educational opportunities. Does this engagement have any relationship with program presence? If so, is it exclusive to metropolitan areas or is it visible in suburban and rural areas as well?

Schools have also begun taking an active interest in the communities that surround them. Universities have begun to realize that, "'What happens in our city, especially in our neighborhoods, is crucial to our ability to attract and retain students,’ said MICA President Fred Lazarus IV. ‘If we don't step forward and things really deteriorate, it's going to be a problem. We can't be passive observers’" (Scharper 2013). As schools become “anchor institutions” for cities, will this impact their focus, offerings, and opportunities? It is likely too soon to tell, but worth considering.

**Hypothesis III: Public universities will be more likely to have ethnic studies programs than their private counterparts**

Public universities are more subject to the whims of the population surrounding them than their private counterparts. This is due in part to the fact they are largely state funded and have state provided oversight, often through a board of trustees. Public universities are also more likely to have a greater percentage of in-state students and with
that comes the possibility of a more engaged student body because they already have ties to or commitments within the local community. Public universities also often have larger student body populations and greater offerings, thus increasing the possibility for ethnic studies programs.

That being said; private schools may have more programs in certain areas given that they do not have the same budgetary and political constraints. For example, the University of Pennsylvania’s Latin America and Latino studies program offers a major, minor, and graduate certificate and, although the program is small, with “typically four undergraduate majors and six minors every year,... focus [is] more on the content of the program rather than on granting degrees” (Anthony 2014). This is something that is often not the case in public universities, take for example North Carolina State University. They had only two faculty members teaching in the Native American studies program and when the “target of hire” came into question at an American Indian Advisory Council Meeting, emphasis was placed on the importance of collecting data “to determine how many students have actually completed the Native American Studies minor and what sort of demand there is for the minor because it is market driven” (North Carolina State University 2013, p. 2).

If programs do follow demographics, then public universities would be more likely to have ethnic studies programs given that as noted in 2008,

… some 73 percent of the 18.4 million U.S. college students attended public institutions, 19 percent attended private not-for-profit institutions, and 8 percent attended private for-profit institutions. There were variations by race/ethnicity, however. About 81 percent of Hispanics and 79 percent of American Indians/Alaska Natives attended public institutions, higher than the percentages
for Whites (73 percent), Blacks (68 percent), and Asians/Pacific Islanders (75 percent) (National Center for Educational Statistics 2010).

Whether or not these programs are population specific or simply translate into general ethnic studies is also an interesting question.

**Hypothesis IV: Minority serving institutions will be more likely to have ethnic studies programs than their counterparts, but they may take longer to establish them.**

Minority serving institutions (MSIs), by their nature, emphasize particular ethnic populations. Does this translate into a need or desire to provide programs? It is important to remember that “MSIs have different histories, characteristics, and missions, all under the broad umbrella of educating students of color” (Cunningham et al. 2014, p. 5). Despite differences, almost all MSIs target low-income students and in doing so, try to keep tuition down. For many schools this, along with dependence on federal and state funding, create fiscal issues. While they support services geared towards enhancing the experience of their minority students, ethnic studies programs might naturally stem from this. Will ethnic studies programs be more likely to be offered?

**Hypothesis V: Institutions with any ethnic studies department are more likely to have a greater number of ethnic studies programs than those institutions without a department.**

The creation of a department shows a commitment on the part of the university to support ethnic studies. A department often includes professors, staff, courses, a degree program, scholarship, and other resources. Once a university has established these, they can be utilized to expand into other programs. Ethnic studies programs are often interdisciplinary sharing professors and other resources amongst themselves and with
other programs within the university. Thus, if a school has some form of ethnic studies department, it seems only natural to use those resources to expand offerings. The department can also be seen as an example of innovation as it creates a model that can then be followed. This also makes it easier to create similar programs.

**Hypothesis VI: The longer an ethnic studies program has been in existence; the greater the number of related programs offered.**

While a long history does not necessarily suggest complete institutionalization, it does imply a level of institutional commitment. The university has made a rational decision to continue funding and supporting the given program over time. At what point is an institution considered committed and when do other programs begin to form? As with institutionalization, schools that a long history of ethnic studies would potentially be expected to have additional programs given that they have a model to follow and certain resources available. The potential question is whether there are sufficient funding and interest.

Why and how programs sometimes begin differs from why they continue. Take Brigham Young University (BYU) for example, “during the 1960s, BYU formed the Institute of American Indian Studies, an unprecedented Indian Studies minor, and an Indian Education Department serving hundreds of students. By the mid-1970s, the popularity of the program among American Indians was reflected in enrollment numbers that exceeded 600 students from 77 different tribes representing 38 states” (Touchin-Roblin et al. 2014). The Native American studies program was created in 1973 and continues to this day despite the fact that due to competitive enrollment, the number of
Native American students today are about a third of what they were in the 1970s (Touchin-Roblin et al. 2014). The program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) also had an interesting start. The Chancellor received a five year Ford Foundation grant to create four ethnic studies Centers and engage in related research, resources, publications, and curriculum development. When the grant was up, the university agreed to assume and continue funding, indicating institutional commitment. (Feuer and Gable 2010) Over time, UCLA’s centers have grown and become important to the ethnic communities they support and represent.

**Hypothesis VII: Schools offering graduate programs will be more likely to have ethnic studies than those that are mainly undergraduate institutions.**

Does graduate coexistence have any relationship to program offerings? Given that graduate coexistence implies that there is a significant body of graduate students present on campus, there is the potential for a change in offerings because these students desire curricular innovation, scholarship, and academic resources. Furthermore, they have the potential to encourage program diffusion and the expansion of offerings due to their ability to aid in the teaching of classes, thus expanding programs and resources at a reduced cost. Taking it a step further, does the level of graduate coexistence matter in regards to the presence of ethnic studies programs?

**Hypothesis VIII: Universities with a significant portion of their student body identifying with one of the aforementioned ethnic groups, will be more likely to have some form of ethnic studies program.**
In order to have an ethnic studies program, is it necessary to have a diverse student body? Given that in many cases, groups such as the Black Student Union (BSU) and the Hispanic Student Alliance (HSA) were the impetus for program creation, one would expect to find that schools with a diverse student body are more likely to offer some form of ethnic studies. Looking toward enrollment statistics, is there a threshold for inclusion. Is the presence of any one particular group more influential or important than the presence of another?

**Hypothesis IX: Universities located within or surrounded by a specific ethnic community will likely have subfield programs to match that population.**

Since schools draw from their surrounding population and also engage with them in some way, it seems only natural that universities surrounded by a specific ethnic population would have a subfield to match.

According to UM-Dearborn’s newly appointed Dean Martin Hershock, ‘about 25 percent of UM-Dearborn’s enrollment is comprised of students of color. Combine that with the region’s diverse makeup, it is vitally important that programs like this exist,’ he says. ‘Teaching American History without incorporating African history components is like teaching Arithmetic without incorporating multiplication modules’ (Porter, in Alame 2013).

This is just one of the many examples of enrollment and community makeup combining to encourage program creation. The aforementioned case of BYU was similar in relation to Native American studies.

Together, these nine hypotheses might offer an understanding of the social and demographic issues related to the institutionalization, legitimation, and social embeddedness of ethnic studies programs. The hypotheses specifically target
characteristics of the social and physical environment within and surrounding the colleges and universities being examined. The aim is to engage the hypotheses in order to capture the interplay of social dynamics and the university environment.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA AND METHODS

In the previous chapter, nine hypotheses that address the creation and development of ethnic studies programs were put forth to be tested. These hypotheses center around three major aspects of growth and development. The first of these is location and how outside influences impact program growth and development. The next area of focus is the university, and it addresses internal pressures as well as the significance of early adoption. Finally, the last group of hypotheses centers around demographics and their potential significance.

Data Set

In order to identify ethnic studies programs and examine relative demographic changes, a representative sample of 251 universities was used. It consisted of a cross-sectional sample of four-year post-secondary Title IV eligible institutions. This included four-year institutions from across all 50 states and captured a range of university sizes and types. Title IV universities were used because their eligibility for federal financial aid gave the best indication of equal opportunity. This sample size provided statistically significant results based on the current number of predictors, the desired probability rate, and the preferred statistical power level. This sample included both institutions that have ethnic studies programs and ones that did not, and allowed for the exploration of relationships between program development/expansion and demographics to be tested.
against a control group to determine validity in the findings. Program presence was based upon the existence of a program according to the university website, catalog, or other relevant sources. The distribution by state was determined by mimicking the legislative model such that each state automatically received 2 slots (one for a public school and one for a private), accounting for 100 of the 225; and then, based on population size, the remaining were allocated across the states. In addition, 26 supplemental universities were added to the list due to their top ranking ethnic studies programs, based on *U.S. News and World Reports* (2010), in order to ensure that program presence was properly accounted for within the sample. School data were collected from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the Common Data Set, and sources directly related to the individual universities such as websites and catalogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># of schools in sample</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of schools in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variables within the data set are based on the existence of any one or combination of the following at a given time period for each school: a program/department in African American studies, a program/department in Asian American studies, a program/department in Latino studies, a program/department in Native American studies, and/or a program/department in ethnic studies. Information on the presence of such programs is taken directly from program/department pages on
individual university webpages. Changes to the program/department status, for example, becoming a department, adding a degree, etc., have been noted and coded accordingly. Dummy variables were used note whether a school had a program/department: those without were given a “0” and schools with a program or department were given a “1.”

Other components have been incorporated as independent variables within the regression analysis in order to aid in understanding and controlling for differences amongst the institutions and their settings. The independent variables can be broken down into three general categories: location, university characteristics, and population. There may be some overlap within the categories in order to fully explain the situation.

Locational measures were chosen in order to understand the interplay that exists between geography and demographics. University location was taken from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Distance to metropolitan area was taken from the U.S. Census Bureau. Proximity to other schools and university location was taken from NCES.

The distance to the nearest metropolitan area was measured in terms of the number of miles a school is from the metropolitan area. The Census Bureau’s list of metropolitan areas was used to determine the distance for those schools not located within a metropolitan area. This variable is included in an attempt to capture whether there are any similarities between schools in metropolitan areas and, if there is, the distance at which this effect is potentially nullified. For schools located in areas without a major metropolitan area, micropolitan statistical areas, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), were used as they may have an effect on a rural area.
similar to that of the metropolitan area on an urban area. According to OMB, micropolitan statistical areas are “a Core Based Statistical Area associated with at least one urban cluster that has a population of at least 10,000, but less than 50,000. The Micropolitan Statistical Area comprises the central county or counties containing the core, plus adjacent outlying counties having a high degree of social and economic integration with the central county or counties as measured through commuting” (U.S. Office of Management and Budget 2010). Geographic proximity to other institutions attempts to capture whether schools are influenced by neighboring schools. The number of schools within 5 miles, 20 miles, and 50 miles were taken from NCES. This included all types of higher education, four-year public universities, private not-for-profit universities, private for-profit universities, as well as 2-year institutions.

The population measures were chosen to paint a picture of the changing demographic complexity of the nation and its universities. These measures are based on four distinct populations: University student body population and distribution; local population and distribution; state population and distribution; and national population and distribution. The local, state, and national data came directly from the U.S. Census Bureau data, while the institutional data came from NCES and the colleges and universities. In addition to direct counts, ethnic populations are examined in terms of the percentage of the total population they represent in order to ascertain the strength of their presence. State populations are included in order to investigate effects outside of the immediate local community that may impact the university. Changes in the overall state
population may not be reflected in individual communities, yet may still impact the university population.

A number of institutional measures were gathered in order to examine the institutions themselves, as well as identify underlying issues related to institutional constraints. These measures aim to examine and control for institutional differences and ascertain their relationship to demography. The first four variables: Institution Type (public or private); Institutional Focus (liberal arts, research, technical); Institution Size; and Graduate Coexistence were taken from the Carnegie Classifications. Minority Serving Institution Status (as classified by the Department of Education) was taken from the U.S. Department of Education. These were gathered in order to understand the institution and control for basic differences between them. The middle four variables--presence of an ethnic studies program, number of programs, year of the start, and the number of degrees offered--are taken directly from information from the colleges and universities. This included, but was not limited to: university webpages and documents; related articles; professor curriculum vitaes, and other relevant documents. They are included to examine aspects to identify them and whether or not they are present. The year of introduction is included for two reasons: 1) to determine how long the program has been in existence; and 2) to look at program development and how time may or may not alter offerings. The number of ethnic studies related degrees offered refers to actual programs. Data were recorded according to date of inclusion or initial evidence within a course catalog or on a program document and are included in order to examine changes.
Data Limitations

As with any data set, there are some limitations. Not all data points were able to be accounted for in relation to all schools. Thus, missing data points are noted. In addition, although every effort was put forth to ensure the reliability of the data, it is only as accurate as what has been put forth by the school itself. Should there be an error in that reporting, it will invariably show up within the data set as well. Census data were not available for a few select cities/towns due to size. When this occurred, the county population data were used to represent the area.

In addition to standard data limitations, in the case of data for ethnic studies programs, it is important to remember that each school has its own history and story. How that story has been recorded and presented becomes an artifact of the data. Social and political contexts may be included or erased depending on the data collection and source. The data utilized for this study is therefore subject to these limitations.

Statistical Methods

Given that the response variable is binary, multiple logistic regressions will be used for analysis. Based on the size of the data set, the maximum number of predictor variables recommended in any given model is 8-9. Most will employ less and focus on specific mediating factors. The three categories of data feeding into the regressions analysis are spatial, institutional, and demographic. These factors are the fundamentals of the university. By controlling for these factors, less straightforward factors can be reviewed with a greater degree of accuracy and understanding. The spatial, institutional and demographic components provide independent variables to be tested, and the
demographic data will also be viewed graphically. Most of the variables are scaled. Goodness of fit was determined to assess the statistical significance of the selected variables.

Demographics will be examined by looking at where programs for specific types of ethnic studies, namely African American studies, Latino/a studies, American Indian studies, and Asian American studies, are located across the country (not just within the sample size), and how this compares with population density for each respective group across the country. The data on where programs are located has been taken from several sources such as eblackstudies.org’s "Mapping Black Studies”, the National Indian Education Association, the Guide to Native American Studies in the United States and Canada, and the Association for Asian American Studies. They have all been modified in order to meet the specific criteria being explored here—four-year institutions that include at least a minor in the specified area of study. These lists were then mapped to look at distribution across the country. The density maps are based on census data, though taken from different sources in an attempt to capture the best representation for each group. They are provided in order to give a population comparison.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings will be discussed as they pertain to the various hypotheses put forth in Chapter 3. The findings are presented relative to the hypotheses and models, and they test the various ways that location, university characteristics, and demographics might or might not influence the creation and expansion of ethnic studies programs.

The first two hypotheses deal with location, while the second two address type of university (public or private), and minority serving designation. The middle hypotheses deal with departmental status, program length, and graduate student presence, while the latter address demographics. All of the hypotheses are examined using logistic regression models, and the last hypothesis also includes a comparative analysis, as previously discussed.

Hypothesis I: Schools located within a shared locality will develop similar ethnic studies programs

Since the data set uses a binary response variable, a logistic regression model was used to test the data. Three predictor variables were used: Number of schools within 5 miles, number of schools within 20 miles, number of schools within 50 miles. There were 251 observations in the sample; 126 schools did not have ethnic studies programs while 125 schools did. The number of schools within 5 miles of any given college or university within the sample ranged from 0 to 115, (see Figure 5a). Fifty-eight schools
did not have another school located within 5 miles while 63% or 158 of the 251 schools in the sample size had between 1 and 15 schools within 5 miles. Of the 58 that did not have another school within 5 miles, 33% had some form of ethnic studies program, and of the 158, 53% had some form of ethnic studies program. The average number of schools was 8, within a 5 miles radius. The number of schools within 20 miles of any given college or university within the sample ranged from 0 to 292, (see Figure 5b). At the low end, 18 schools did not have another school within 20 miles, of those, 6 or 33%, had some form of ethnic studies program. Ninety-nine schools, or 39% had between 1 and 15 schools within 20 miles, and of those 39% had some form of ethnic studies program. The number of schools within 50 miles of any given college or university within the sample ranged from 0 to 443, see Figure 5c. Only 5 out of the 251 schools or roughly 2%, did not have a neighboring school with a 50 mile radius, and 40% of those had an ethnic studies program. In the case of schools within a 50 mile radius, 17% had between 1 and 15 schools within 50 miles, of those, 14 or 33%, had some form of ethnic studies program. The average was 99 schools within a 50 mile radius. Interestingly, 59% of the schools with 100-149 schools within a 50 mile radius had an ethnic studies program and 92% of the schools with 150-199 schools nearby had one.
Figure 5a -- Number of schools within a 5 mile radius

Figure 5b -- Number of schools within a 20 mile radius
In looking at the overall fit of the model, the p-value was 0.017. This means that there was strong statistical evidence that a school is more likely to have an ethnic studies program if there are other colleges and universities in the general area. However, when the p-values for the number of universities within 5, 20, and 50 miles, were examined individually, none were significant at the 0.05 level. The number of universities within 50 miles was the closest at 0.0856. The p-value was significant at the 10% level of significance showing some evidence that the greater the number of schools within a 50 miles radius of the school in question, the more likely it is to have an ethnic studies program.

Figure 5c -- Number of schools within a 50 mile radius
This raises the question of what type of relationship exists between shared locality and program existence. Could correlation merely be due to population density? A dummy variable was created to reduce the potential density issue and address the idea of proximity when further testing the initial hypothesis. Thus, the presence of a school within a 5 mile radius was coded with a one while the absence of a school within a 5 mile radius was coded with a zero.

In the given sample of 251 schools, 132 or 53%, were located within 5 miles of another school. Of the 132 schools sharing their locality with at least one additional school, 78, or roughly 59% had some form of ethnic studies program. The overall p-value of 0.0019 shows strong statistical evidence that the presence of a school within a 5 mile radius of the school in question increases the likelihood that it will have an ethnic studies program. The odds ratio value for the presence of a school within 5 miles is 2.2128. This means that a school within 5 miles of at least one other school is 2.2 times more likely to have an ethnic studies program.

The data supports the first hypothesis, as schools within the proximity of other schools were more likely to have ethnic studies programs. This relationship between the presence of ethnic studies programs and shared locality is an interesting one. The initial findings suggested a relationship between the number of schools in a given area and the presence of ethnic studies. However, when comparing the number of local schools, it raised the question of whether the data were being skewed by population density and the metropolitan areas. However, even after accounting for population density, sharing a local with another school increased the likelihood of program presence. This finding
suggests support for the previously mentioned idea that universities in a shared locale will develop similar programs in order to keep up with their neighbors or compete with them. In looking at specific examples from the data set, it is interesting to note that in New Hampshire and Wisconsin, both schools within the sample offering ethnic studies programs had a Native American studies program. Similarly, all institutions with an ethnic program in the sample for the states of Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Tennessee, had some form of program in African American studies. The data set suggests that schools in a shared location are more likely to develop similar programs rather than different ones to compete. Those schools within the sample that were in similar areas usually had either programs focusing on the same form of ethnic studies or a more general program (race and ethnicity, American studies, ethnic studies, etc.). Of those that did offer more, it might be the product of a more developed department that included the academic disciplines offered by their neighbors as well. This would be an interesting area for future research and would require looking at all of the schools in given shared areas.

**Hypothesis II: The likelihood of a university having an ethnic studies program will increase with proximity to a major metropolitan area.**

In order to examine the relationship between proximity to a major metropolitan area and the likelihood of a university having an ethnic studies program, three separate logistic regressions were run. The first looked at the relationship between program presence and distance to a metropolitan area. The second examined the relationship between program presence and a more generalized idea of the location. The third looks
specifically at being within a metropolitan area. Of the 251 schools sampled, 202 were located within or near a metropolitan area, 35 were located within or near a micropolitan area, and 14 were located outside of both a metropolitan and micropolitan area. Of the 202 located in or near a metropolitan area, 55% had some form of ethnic studies program, while only 31% of those in or near micropolitan areas did, and only 14% of those located outside of both a metropolitan and micropolitan area, (see Figure 5d).
In examining the relationship between program presence and distance to a metropolitan area, the overall model has a Chi-Square value of 9.5507, and a significance of 0.002, less than 0.05, showing a strong relationship between distance to a metropolitan area and ethnic studies programs. The odds ratio value for the distance of the school is 0.9920. Does distance itself matter? Or, is the general location more important: being located in or near a metropolitan area, in or near a micropolitan area, or being outside of an urban area. In order to examine this, a dummy variable was inserted to attempt to gain a better of understanding as to whether the bigger issue is distance itself or if the type of area (metropolitan, micropolitan, rural) matters more. The significance of the overall model was 0.0002, showing an extremely strong relationship between being located in or around the metropolitan area and having some form of ethnic studies program. The odds ratio value for the distance to a metropolitan area is 3.4462. This means that a school with an ethnic studies program is 3.4 times more likely to be located within or near a metropolitan area.

---

3 Schools located in metropolitan areas were coded with a one, while those located in a micropolitan or rural area were coded with a zero.
Of the 202 schools located within or near a metropolitan area, 112 were located within the metro area, 77 or 69%, had some form of ethnic studies program. Only 31% of the schools located near a metro area had an ethnic studies program, (see Figure 5e). In looking at the relationship between ethnic studies programs and schools within metropolitan areas, the numbers decrease. The model is still very significant with an overall p-value of 0.0012, and the odds ratio value is 2.3. Thus, a school does not have to be located within the metropolitan area itself; rather being in the proximity can have a positive effect. The findings support the hypothesis but suggest that the relative distance does not matter as much as simply being in the vicinity of the metropolitan area.
Thus, it might be that location in or near a metropolitan area increases the chance that the school will have an ethnic studies program. While being within the metropolitan area shows a slightly higher likelihood, being adjacent was also significant. This suggests that there are elements of urban and suburban areas that might facilitate the growth of these programs, with particular attention to factors such as a diverse population base, a wide array of amenities, community connections, cultural awareness and sensitivity, and a diverse student body, which may or may not be present in other locations. While metropolitan areas often have a more diverse population base with a wide variety of students, suburban schools might be more focused without the same level of diversity. Moreover, metropolitan areas tend to offer students a wide array of amenities within opportunities, whereas suburban schools might need to provide those amenities themselves or team up with a neighboring school or organization to do so. Thus, the increase in programs in suburban areas might be because the university has emphasized community connections, diversification of students, cultural awareness, and/or specific curricular offerings.

**Hypothesis III: Public universities will be more likely to have ethnic studies programs than their private counterparts**

The sample consists of 104 public universities and 147 private universities. Of the 104 public universities, 67 or 64% have some form of ethnic studies program, while 58 or 39% of the 147 private universities have some form of ethnic studies program, (see Figure 5f).
A logistic regression was run using public versus private as the predictor variable and presence of an ethnic studies program as the dependent variable in order to test the hypothesis. There were 251 observations in the sample. The p-value of the model was 0.0001 suggesting strong statistical evidence that public universities are more likely to have ethnic studies programs. The odds ratio value for a university being public is 2.7787. This means that a public university is 2.8 times more likely than its private counterpart to have an ethnic studies program.

Public universities were more likely to have programs than their private counterparts, with 64% of public universities sampled having a program versus only 39%
of private ones. Of the 36%, or 37 public schools that did not have a program, 8% were agricultural or technical colleges, and 14% were minority serving institutions. Moreover, 24% were Associates Dominant four-year institutions, which included several of the technical colleges and minority serving institutions. This is very interesting, with the possible implication that, in four-year public institutions, ethnic studies may be embedded to a greater degree. Looking specifically at public institutions, all 3 Maryland public institutions in the sample had relevant programs, as did both public schools in Wyoming. Only 1 public school in Florida in the sample had an ethnic studies program, while 7 did not. Kentucky, Hawaii, and Minnesota public schools within the sample did not have any programs, while public schools in states such as New Jersey, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania were evenly split between schools that did and did not have programs. While it was not surprising to find that Minnesota and Kentucky did not have programs based on the overall diversity of their population, the lack in Florida was somewhat unexpected, as was their presence in Wyoming.

**Hypothesis IV: Minority serving institutions will be more likely to have ethnic studies programs than their counterparts, but they may take longer to establish them.**

In looking at the role of demographics in regards to the establishment of ethnic studies programs, what happens in the case of institutions specifically designated as minority serving institutions? Given their student body, would the needs or desires be different than that of a traditional university when it comes to programs specifically focused on ethnic studies? In the given sample, there were 19 schools designated as minority serving institutions. Of those 19, 42% or 8 schools had some form of ethnic
studies. The programs were spread fairly equally over the various types of minority serving institutions (see Figure 5g). Of the 8, 6 had programs directly related to the minority group they are designated to serve, while 2 focused on an alternate group. One school had more than one type of ethnic studies program.
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**Figure 5g -- Minority Serving Institutions**

In running a logistic regression using the full sample with 251 data points and 5 predictor variables (see Figure 5g for groups), the p-value for the overall model, 0.119, was not significant, thus suggesting that there is not a significant relationship between minority serving institutions and the presence of ethnic studies programs. Holding all else
constant, neither minority serving institutions themselves or the individual programs, showed signs of a significant relationship. The data does not support the hypothesis. Given the fact that so few schools carry the minority serving institution designation, a qualitative study may provide further insight.

This hypothesis was not supported by the findings, suggesting that minority serving institutions are no more likely than any other school to have an ethnic studies program. Additional research is needed and, while there are many possible explanations, funding issues may be at the forefront. Minority serving institutions depend on federal and state funding, traditionally target low income students, and have additional factors drawing on their limited institutional resources. Thus, “non-traditional” programs may be viewed as less essential relative to dominant curricular definitions and accreditation schemes, unless there is a significant push for them or a benefactor supporting them. In recent years, as most schools face fiscal challenges and budget cuts, it may become even less likely.

**Hypothesis V: Institutions with any type of ethnic studies department are more likely to have a greater number of ethnic studies programs than those institutions without a department.**

Examining the sample, there were 125 schools with some form of ethnic studies program. Of those 125, 59 had a department dedicated to either ethnic studies or a specific category of ethnic studies with African American studies being the most common. The significance of the overall model was 0.000, suggesting a strong relationship between the existence of a department and the number of ethnic studies programs. The odds ratio for a university with a department is 4.268, which means that a
university with a department is 4.3 times more likely to have other ethnic studies programs. Of the 17 schools that had 4 or more ethnic studies programs, 14 of them or 82% had at least one ethnic studies department. Similarly, of the 21 schools with 3 or more ethnic studies programs, 17 or 82% had at least one department. However, of the 66 schools that had only a single type of ethnic studies program, only 19 or 29% of them were a department (see Figure 5h).

The data supports this hypothesis, suggesting that institutions with a department are more likely to have additional ethnic studies related offerings. Of the 17 schools that
had 4 or more ethnic studies programs, 10 were located in California; 9 of the 10 had at least one department; 6 were public and 2 were private. Of the remaining 7, 2 were in New Jersey, and both were public schools with at least one department; the other 5 were all public schools with 3 having at least one department. This suggests that institutionalization does play a role, as 83% of the schools with 4 or more programs did include at least one department.

In a changing world, are departments the best measure of university commitment? Princeton University, for example, chose to grow its African American studies program, nearly doubling the size of its faculty and establishing it as a potential leader in the field through the creation of a center rather than a department. The reason, “this center will give African American studies at Princeton a greater ability to reach students and faculty in numerous disciplines” (Cliatt 2006). Other schools are also trying different approaches. Tufts has recently created a Consortium of Studies in Race, Colonialism, and Diaspora (RCD), an interdisciplinary program linking Africana Studies, American Studies, Asian American Studies, Colonialism Studies and Latino Studies, They are looking at the intersection of the programs in an innovative way, as Adriana Zavala comments, “We really can jump in at the forefront of the ways in which these fields are not just ethnically bound, but there is a trend toward comparative, intersectional, transnational and global analysis” (Zavala, in Bottino 2014). Tufts has not ruled out eventually creating a department but for now, it is not their main concern. So, while looking at departments will give us an idea of the level of institutionalization, there are other potential options for schools that may not be captured in the study.
Hypothesis VI: The longer an ethnic studies program has been in existence; the greater the number of related programs offered.

In examining the relationship between how long an ethnic studies program has been in existence and the number of subsequent programs that have been formed, we see that there is a direct relationship between the average age of oldest program and number of programs a school offers. While there is a significant growth between the average age of the oldest ethnic studies program at schools with a single program and those with two programs, we see an almost plateau between those with three versus four programs (see figure 5i).
In looking at the year each program started, we again see a direct relationship. Interestingly, only a single school whose oldest program started after 2000, has more than two ethnic studies programs. The majority of schools with three or four types of ethnic studies offerings began their first program in the late 1960s or early 1970s (see figure 5j).
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**Figure 5j — Year started**

So, what does this mean? Since 2000, most schools have adopted at most only a single program, but the reason why is not clear. Questions arise regarding time lags between program creation and diffusion, or whether there has been some fundamental change in regards to views on ethnic studies at colleges and universities. This is a crucial area for future research.
Hypothesis VII: Schools offering graduate programs will be more likely to have ethnic studies than those that are mainly undergraduate institutions.

Using the Carnegie Classification in regards to undergraduate instructional program, those with some and high graduate coexistence were coded a one, and those with none a zero. There were 63 schools with no graduate coexistence within the sample, and 188 with either some or high. Of those with no graduate coexistence, 16 or 24% had some form of ethnic studies program, while 108 or 58% of those with some or high graduate coexistence had some form of ethnic studies. The p-value for the model was 0.0000 suggesting a strong relationship between graduate program coexistence and ethnic studies programs. The odds ratio was 4.053, meaning that a school with at least some graduate coexistence is four times more likely to have some form of ethnic studies program than a school with no graduate coexistence.

This raises the question of whether high graduate coexistence has an even greater impact. In looking solely at the number schools classified with high graduate coexistence in the sample, there are 70 schools, 60 or 86% of which have some form of ethnic studies program (see Figure 5k). In running the logistic regression, once again the p-value is 0.0000, suggesting a strong relationship between high graduate coexistence and ethnic studies programs. The odds ratio is 10.707, meaning that a school with high graduate coexistence is 10.71 times more likely to have an ethnic studies program than schools with some or no graduate coexistence.
High graduate coexistence points to a possible focus on scholarship as well as a willing pool of graduate students that could aid in teaching and research.

**Hypothesis VIII: Universities with a significant portion of their student body identifying with one of the aforementioned ethnic groups, will be more likely to have some form of ethnic studies program.**

Looking at the composition of the student body based on enrollment statistics gives an idea of the overall diversity of the university. The percentage of undergraduate enrollment by race/ethnicity for 2013 was used. The results of the logistic regression model with 251 data points and 7 predictor variables (Enrolled percentage of White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaskan Native,
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and Unknown) was significant with an overall p-value of 0.000. Holding all else constant, only the percentage of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students enrolled was highly significant at the 0.05 level with a p-value of 0.0009. The percentage of Asian students enrolled had a p-value of 0.0605 and was significant at the 0.10 level, holding all else constant. When the percentage of Hispanic or Latino students was removed from the model (p-value of 0.775), holding all else constant, all of the remaining variables except the percentage of Native American or Alaskan Native students are significant, the percentage of white students at the 0.10 level with a p-value of 0.058, and the rest at the 0.05 level.

Looking at this further and breaking it down by percent, 82%, or 42 out of the 51 schools where Asian students comprised at least 10% of enrollment had some form of ethnic studies. In examining the relationship between ethnic studies and enrollment for other races, the following is of note: 59%, or 50 of 85 schools where Hispanic or Latino students comprised 10% or more of the enrollment, had some form of ethnic studies. One hundred percent of schools with Hispanic or Latino enrollment of 50% or more of the student population had some form of ethnic studies. Black or African American enrollment did not have the same type of impact. Only 23% of schools with Black or African American students comprising 50% or more of the population had ethnic studies. The number increases as enrollment percentage decreases for Black enrollment. In this case, 29% percent of schools with Black enrollment of 25% or more had some form of ethnic studies and 37% of schools where Black enrollment was at 10% or greater had ethnic studies. Inversely, only 14% of schools with 90% white enrollment had some
form of ethnic studies (see figure 5). Although Black student enrollment evince a
different pattern, this general finding suggests a potential correlation between ethnic
studies and the percentage of students enrolled from a particular ethnic group. Until an
ethnic studies program is established and “legitimized” as a course of study, advocates
and individuals with a vested interest are often necessary to push the agenda and draw
focus to related areas of knowledge and scholarly contributions. Student groups, such as
the Black Student Union (BSU) and the Hispanic Student Alliance (HSA), often have
been instrumental in program establishment in a number of instances.
Hypothesis IX: Universities that are located within or surrounded by a specific ethnic community will likely have subfield programs to match that population.

To address this hypothesis, first the sample data were explored using a logistic regression. Then, a comparative analysis was undertaken looking at all current programs in each of the four major subfields at four-year institutions across the country, compared to recent population density maps for the given subgroups.

In examining the sample data, the overall model fit had a p-value of 0.0086 and was significant at the 0.05 level. In looking at the individual subfields however, only the percentage of Asian population for 2010, was significant with a p-value of 0.08. Thus, it is significant at the 0.10 level holding all else constant. Of the schools in the sample located within an area with 20% or more of the population reporting their race solely as Asian, 78% or 7 of 9, had an ethnic studies program. In areas with 10% or more of the population reporting their race solely as Asian, 71% or 29 of 41, had some form of ethnic studies program. The numbers were less interesting for other groups. For example, of the schools in areas where 50% or more of the population classified themselves as Hispanic or Latino, 67% or 6 of 9, had some form of ethnic studies program. When that percentage was dropped to 25% or more, 56%, or 34 of 61, of the schools had programs. Of the schools in areas where 50% or more of the population classified themselves as

---

4 The native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander category was excluded given that too many of the data points had been recorded as Z by the Census Bureau meaning their value was greater than zero but less than half of a unit of measure.
Black, only 47% or 8 of 17, had some form of ethnic studies program. Of the schools in areas with any percentage of the population classifying themselves as Native American, 52% or 66 of 126, had some form of ethnic studies program. Interestingly, of the schools in areas where 90% or more of the population reported their race as solely white, only 24% or 9 of 37, had some form of ethnic studies program. This indicates a correlation between the composition of the population surrounding a given college or university and whether or not it offers some form of ethnic studies program. While the presence of an Asian population was the strongest, that of a surrounding Black population was weakest just as it was in regards to student enrollment. This is interesting and, in the case of local populations, one might speculate level of curricular institutionalization in keeping with a number of factors such as, among others, program age, the percentage of the population from each group attending the school, the group’s overall presence within the community or within the section of the city in which the school is located, and the age of the population represented by the specific group in the community.

**Comparative Analysis**

The subsequent analysis examines hypothesis IX in relation to programs across the country, broken out by the four major subfields.

*African American Studies*

African American Studies, which for the purposes here, encompasses programs labeled as African American Studies, Africana Studies, Black Studies, Afro-Ethnic Studies, Pan African Studies, and African and African Diaspora Studies. Those labeled
simply as ethnic studies, American studies, etc. have not been included unless they have a
specific program or concentration in African American studies, similarly African studies
has not been included because of its regional focus rather than ethnic based one. This list
of schools comes from a modified version of eblackstudies.org’s "Mapping Black
Studies", but it was modified to remove programs at 2 year universities, as well as ones
that only have an ethnic studies or American studies program. In addition, schools that
were listed that only had a single professor interested in/or a single course in African
American studies were removed, thus leaving 429 schools around the country which have
been mapped below in two part (see Figure 5m and 5n).
“Mainstream university support for African-American studies emerged in the late 1960s. This was done in conjunction with the protests of the civil rights movement, the Black Power movement, and the admission of a massive influx of black students into predominantly white institutions. The preconditions for the growth of African-American studies were demographic, social, and political” (Land and Brown 2003, p. 66). As Figure 5m notes, by 2013, African American studies is pretty well distributed up and down the East Coast. This is notably the case between Boston, MA and Washington, DC where there is a heavy corridor of programs. African American studies programs are well established in this area and having been impacting their university communities in positive ways ever since. For example, “Africana Studies is Vassar’s longest-running multidisciplinary program. It has been at the heart of transforming the curriculum and broadening the intellectual and social experience of students, faculty, and administrators for four decades” (Vassar College 2014). Emory University in Georgia similarly noted “African American Studies at Emory has had an important impact on the intellectual life of the university community. The commitment of the College to the study of African Americans has resulted in the hiring of top core and associated faculty in the departments of History, Music, English, Religion, Sociology, Art History, Anthropology, ILA, Political Science, and Women Gender and Sexuality Studies” (Emory University 2014).
As Figure 5n shows, not only are African American Studies programs established on the East Coast, but they are prevalent across the country, especially in and around Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). It is interesting to note that “in 1950 approximately 75,000 blacks were enrolled in colleges and universities. In the 1960s, three-quarters of all black students attended HBCUs. By 1970, approximately 700,000 blacks were enrolled in college, three-quarters of whom were in predominantly white institutions” (Land and Brown 2003, p. 68). This change in enrollment played a role in altering the landscape of the university and it influenced the growth and establishment of programs across the country. Today, the number of departments and programs available across the country shows that “African American studies has matured and established itself to a point where there is no longer a question of it being a legitimate discipline” (Boynton 2002).
Now, if you take into consideration African American population density, one can note that programs seem to spring up in places where there is a concentrated population. While this is not always the case, it does appear to potentially play a role. A study by Alkalimat (2013, p. 6) looking at African American studies programs across the country found that institutions in the South were the most likely to have black studies in some form, while institutions in the West were the least likely to have some form of black studies. When looking directly at Figure 5o on density, this is what one would expect to find. However, when looking at the program distribution maps, the story becomes more

Figure 5o -- Black or African American Population Density
interesting because programs not only seem to follow major density patterns, but there appears to be some correlation with lesser ones as well.

*Latino/a Studies*

Latino/a Studies, as discussed here, includes programs labeled as Latino/a studies, Chicana/o Studies, Mexican American Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and Hispanic Studies. Those labeled simply as ethnic studies, American studies; etc. have not been included unless they have a specific program or concentration or minor in one of the aforementioned areas of study. Similarly, Latin American studies programs are not included because of their regional focus. However, an exception to this comes when there is an emphasis on Latino/a presence/experiences in the United States thus making the focus a more ethnic based one. It is worth noting that several programs labeled Hispanic studies were not included because their focus was solely linguistic. The list of schools includes only four-year colleges and universities that had at least a certificate in the program of study. Schools that contained a center or institute based around the area study, but did not offer complementary coursework were not included. The final list included 142 schools.
While some schools like New Mexico State University, established their Chicano Studies program simultaneously with other “ethnic” studies program during the tumultuous 1970s, other schools like the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, have instituted Latino Studies programs as recently as 2004 in response to growth of the Hispanic population. Like UNC Chapel Hill, the 2003 creation of “The Office of Latino/Latin American Studies of the Great Plains (OLLAS) has helped fill a void in the Nebraska and Great Plains region's infrastructure dedicated to the productive incorporation of the new and growing Latino population into the political, economic, and social life of the region” (University of Nebraska, Omaha 2012). As Figure 5p shows, while program distribution at colleges and universities is fairly spread out across the country, there are significant areas of concentration, namely the east coast, Texas and California.
Figure 5q below, taken from Lincoln Park Strategies political case study, shows the projected US population by race/ethnicity for 2010-2030. The Hispanic population in particular is projected to experience significant growth in the next 20 years and, to some extent, alter the population balance. This places related groups in an interesting and potentially influential position in regards not only to the universities but, also, the country as a whole.

Figure 5q — Projected Population by Race
When you compare the program distribution map (figure 5p) to this one (figure 5r, taken from Roderick 2010) based on demographic trends within population from 2010-2013, you can see that there are similarities in regards to high concentration in California and along the border between the U.S. and Mexico. There is also a pocket in the Northeast that corresponds; however, the lack of programs in Florida is surprising given the significant Hispanic population.
According to the Pew Research Hispanic Trends Projects, “Among all 3,143 counties in the U.S., 87 are majority Hispanic. Of those, 56 are in Texas” (Brown 2013). This is interesting given that when only the Mexican American studies programs were mapped, (see Figure 5s), the distribution was heavily concentrated in Texas with nearly 75% of the programs being located somewhere in the state.

Figure 5s -- Mexican-American Studies Programs

Asian American Studies

Asian American studies, like African American Studies, Latino/a Studies, and American Indian Studies, emerged in the 1960s. It, however, has not experienced the same type of growth, acceptance or social embeddedness as some of the other programs in part due to population and in part due to perception. As the University of Pennsylvania noted, “Often seen as the “model minority,” Asian Americans are viewed
as not having problems or special needs. In addition, Asian Americans are also seen as a homogeneous group, which hides the diversity of Asian Americans in terms of socioeconomic status, ethnic background, and nativity. These national issues have created an image of invisibility for many Asian Americans” (Hwang et al. 2014). The list of Asian American Studies programs was derived through the use of the Association for Asian American Studies’ "Directory of Asian American Studies Programs" and again was adjusted for school type, program type, and excluded any programs no longer in existence. The final list included 60 schools with some form of Asian American Studies.

As Figure 5t shows, programs have developed in specific areas, usually major cities, with the largest concentration being on the west coast. It is interesting to note that
in the case of Asian American Studies, program growth appears to be impacted by existing populations. This is further supported through statements made by universities in relation to program creation and existence. For example

The immediate Boston neighborhood next to UMass Boston -- known as Fields Corner, Dorchester -- is home to the largest concentration of Vietnamese residents, organizations, and businesses in the Northeast and the fifth largest in the U.S. The second and fifth largest Cambodian communities in the U.S. are nearby in Lowell and Lynn, as are new Chinese residential and commercial areas in Quincy and Malden and the 130-year old Boston Chinatown. Asian American students, many of whom live and work in these concentrated communities, represent 15-20% of UMass Boston's entering undergraduate class each year. By grounding its curriculum, teaching, and applied research in the realities of these dynamic local communities and by respecting the knowledge and bilingual/bicultural skills that many UMASS Boston students bring to the classroom, the program creates powerful learning environments for all students to gain critical awareness and understanding about the historical experiences, voices, contemporary issues, and contributions of diverse Asian populations in the U.S. (University of Massachusetts, Boston 2008).

This has been the case on both the East and West coasts, as California State University, Sacramento notes “we are an academic program that is meeting the needs of a dynamic and growing community. According to the 2000 Census, Sacramento is now the city with the 10th largest Asian American and Pacific Islander population in the United States” (California State University, Sacramento 2014). As both Figure 5t and Figure 5u show, population density and programs are concentrated on the coasts and around major cities.
Also of note, certain schools, despite interest and advocacy, continue to reject Asian American studies as a discipline. Harvard University is the perfect example of this, citing problems in the program’s creation that lead to “prioritizing a particular group’s preservation and ethnic identity via primarily nationalistic justifications” (Lin 2008). It further goes on to discuss the unequal representation of certain Asian ethnicities and the impact of this on the East Asian Studies program.

Native American Studies
The Native American Studies list was derived from a combination of the National Indian Education Association’s list of Native American Studies Programs and Robert Nelson’s "A Guide to Native American Studies Programs in the United States and Canada" with alterations made to remove any non-four-year institutions, for-profit schools, ethnic studies programs lacking a Native American Studies emphasis, etc. The final list included 118 schools across the United States. Native American studies programs grew out of the same social movements as the other ethnic studies programs but differed in that it was reliant on indigenous knowledge and oral history with its knowledge base coming largely from the indigenous communities themselves.

Figure 5v - Native American Studies Programs
“According to the United States Census, the Native population of the United States more than doubled between 1970 and 2000, from one million to almost two and half million. Half of this population lives in urban areas and less than a third on Reservations” (Reyhner 2006). Figures 5v and 5w here are probably the most interesting because of their distribution. It makes one wonder if there is any direct correlation between density and programs. It is important to note that density in the case of Native American population is on a much smaller scale than either of the previous two. That
being said, there are a surprisingly large number of programs, most of which offer no more than a minor, but they are well distributed throughout the country. They are also present in Alaska and Hawaii even though that is missing from Figure 5v. It is worth noting that there are a number of Tribal Colleges across the country, but most are community colleges, so they do not factor into the list used above.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Ethnic studies programs have existed in U.S. institutions of higher learning since the 1960s. Yet, their institutionalization and curricular legitimacy are still sometimes questioned and impeded by issues of racism, inequality, and marginalization. Through a broad ecological analysis, it has been made obvious that many ethnic studies programs still face significant challenges, despite having reached certain levels of institutionalization. Moreover, with only about a quarter of the country’s colleges and universities having ethnic studies programs or departments, it begs the question of institutional commitment and recognition. This situation suggests that, while their continuation and even expansion to additional schools may take place, it will not likely occur across the board. The hypotheses tested here offer preliminary insights in regards to gaining an understanding of where these programs exist.

To begin, the role of location was examined. Sharing a locale with at least one other school significantly increased the odds of a school having some form of ethnic studies. The findings were significant when population density was controlled for. Future inquiries might explore whether the strength of the relationship between the presence of ethnic studies programs and shared locality changes depending on the presence of specific types of schools within the locality (ex. four-year public institutions, four-year private institutions and/or arts and science focus institutions versus professions focused
Another avenue of exploration could be the distance between schools with specific kinds programs to see if any given subfield of ethnic studies is more likely to appear alone or in conjunction with others.

Another aspect of location dealt with distance to/from a metro or micropolitan area. A school with an ethnic studies program is 3.4 times more likely to be located within or near a metropolitan area. Exact distance did not seem to be as great a factor as general proximity. To explore this further, one could look to see if the size of the metropolitan area had any correlation with program existence.

From there, the focus turned towards the schools themselves. As expected, public universities were more likely than private universities to offer some form of ethnic studies. Public universities are more dependent on the public for funding, and draw more of their population from the surrounding community. As the country’s demographic profile changes, it will be interesting to see if program demand changes as well, and results in significantly different levels of institutionalization at public schools in contrast to private ones. Interestingly, Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs), did not prove to have a statistically significant relationship with the presence of ethnic studies programs. In order to better understand how MSIs that have adopted or implemented ethnic studies programs differ from non-adopters, a qualitative study might be undertaken.

There was a strong correlation between the existence of an ethnic studies department and the existence of additional ethnic studies programs. This is not surprising given that department creation signifies a certain level of (at least initial) commitment. Moreover, diffusion is much easier than creation as once a program exists, the costs of
expansion are much lower, resources are already present, and opposition is reduced (because a working model exists). Future research might examine factors such as prestige rankings, political limitations, and the role of institutional governance structures to gain a deeper understanding of department creation and institutionalization.

There is a direct relationship between the length of time the program has been in existence and the number of additional related ethnic studies programs. Most schools with at least three types of ethnic studies offerings began their first program in the late 1960s or early 1970s, and there was little difference for schools with three program offerings versus four. There was only one school in the sample, located in Illinois, whose oldest program started after 2000; it had four ethnic studies offerings. This is notable since, while the 1960s and 1970s experienced a period of intense adoption of multiple programs, and the 1980s and 1990s continued adoption at a steadily increasing rate, the post-2000, period appears less likely to add multiple programs. Why? Future research may address this issue in several ways. First, the average time lag for the early adopters might be considered. Second, early adaptors versus more recent adopters of ethnic studies should be examined. Third, investigation is needed on whether late adopters will increase the number of programs offered (since most seem to have only a single program) and, if so, what the average time lag for adoption or diffusion will be.

Having a significant graduate population also correlates with the presence of ethnic studies programs. A school with high graduate coexistence is 10.71 times more likely to have an ethnic studies program than schools with some or no graduate coexistence. The focus of future research in this area could take a closer look at the
differences between schools with some graduate coexistence and those with high graduate coexistence to determine the factors that influence program existence and institutionalization.

In regards to diversity in student enrollment and the presence of ethnic studies programs, a corollary relationship exists. While the logistic regression offered some insight into the interplay, looking towards the percent of the student body identifying with specific ethnic groups was more telling. This is an area where future inquiry could be fruitful in answering questions such as why did the percentage of Black students not have the same type of correlation with ethnic studies that Asian or Latino students did. It would also be useful to look at how diversity in enrollment has changed over time in order to be able to project how future population changes affect enrollment rates and institutionalization.

Finally, in looking at the influence of the diversity of the population of the city/area immediately surrounding the university it is again apparent that the story is complicated. While the overall model was significant, the individual ethnic groups were not. However, the percentages do suggest some correlation between diversity within the community and the presence of ethnic studies programs. In expanding past the sample and looking at all programs nationwide for each ethnic studies subfield in comparison to population density for that subgroup, the similarities were notable. In the case of Native American studies, Latino studies, and Asian studies, densely concentrated areas correlate with ethnic studies programs on the map. Black studies did not have the same type of correlation, though there was some.
From a policy standpoint, as the nation’s demographic profile changes, diversity will increase and with it, the potential demand for a greater presence within academia. Colleges and universities will need to decide where to focus resources in light of expected demographic shifts and an increasingly diverse student body. Asian American, Native American, and Latino programs are correlated with the presence of a respective population, even though they are open to all students. African Americans are the exception to this as African American studies programs do not have the same levels of correlation. This might be due to black/white relations in society and how this has been treated as indicative of US race relations in general, ignoring differences and similarities in experiences and contributions of racialized minorities. Colleges and universities that are committed to developing and growing ethnic studies programs must allocate resources to develop the knowledge base necessary to establish a level of institutionalization. In turn, this could encourage-programmatic diffusion.

Future research could examine the institutionalization of these programs in light of dominant white paradigms within society and academia. This speaks to ideas of power and control in regards to not only program creation and institutionalization, but also factors such as acceptance rates, faculty hiring, and student support. Although the research here touches upon ideas of marginalization, it does not directly engage institutionalized racism as such and its role in the development, legitimation, or oppression of these groups and programs. This is interesting from a cultural perspective and could play a crucial role in gaining a better understanding of social embeddedness and dynamics.
The institutionalization of ethnic studies programs is a complex issue. While this exploratory study touched upon a number of social, spatial, and institutional factors, it is important to note that there are political, historical, and social dynamics at play which may also influence the creation and institutionalization of ethnic studies. For example, the governance structures of public educational systems in some states have the power to covertly and overtly exert limitations on what is or is not offered at given colleges and universities. This may play a role not only in where ethnic studies programs are found, but also in why diffusion may or may not have taken place in given locations.

In regards to historical issues, it is important to note that prior to the 1978 ruling in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, many public colleges and universities had racial quotas for admission. Public schools replaced the quotas with less direct diversity goals that in many cases still exist, and some schools still use race as a factor in college admissions. Further research is needed to determine if quotas played a role in the creation or diffusion of ethnic studies programs, especially in regards to early adopters. Moreover, examining diversity goals and admissions practices could provide insights regarding how changing demographics might not only influence curricular decisions, but also enrollment.

Overall, this study found that social, institutional, and demographic factors all play a role in regards to ethnic studies programs. While some factors hint at a relationship, others are clearly correlated. This study points to a variety of important factors and raises a number of important questions to be explored more fully in future research.
APPENDIX

Logistic Regression Results

Hypothesis I, Regression 1a – Number of Schools within 5, 20, and 50 miles

Descriptives...
126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.2988</td>
<td>14.8534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.5697</td>
<td>57.1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99.2072</td>
<td>111.8510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.8085
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.7651
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.7651
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.7651 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 10.1908; df=3; p= 0.0170

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>StdErr</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.8752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.9100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.3765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>O.R.</th>
<th>Low -- High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0024</td>
<td>0.9733 1.0323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0006</td>
<td>0.9906 1.0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0034</td>
<td>0.9995 1.0073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis I, Regression 1b – Presence within a 5 mile radius

Descriptives...

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5259</td>
<td>0.4993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 338.2821
-2 Log Likelihood = 338.2804
-2 Log Likelihood = 338.2804 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 9.6755; df=1; p= 0.0019

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>StdErr</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7942</td>
<td>0.2579</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.4265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>O.R.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2128</td>
<td>1.3348</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis II, Regression 2a – Program Presence and distance to a metropolitan area

Descriptives...

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8048</td>
<td>0.3964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 334.3886
-2 Log Likelihood = 334.3270
-2 Log Likelihood = 334.3270
-2 Log Likelihood = 334.3270 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 13.6289; df=1; p= 0.0002

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable  Coeff. StdErr  p
1 1.2373 0.3532 0.0005
Intercept -1.0186

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable  O.R.  Low -- High
1 3.4462 1.7246 6.8861

**Hypothesis II, Regression 2b – Being located within a metropolitan area**

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

Variable  Avg  SD
1 0.5060 0.5000

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.5161
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.5141
-2 Log Likelihood = 337.5141 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 10.4418; df=1; p= 0.0012

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable  Coeff. StdErr  p
1 0.8246 0.2579 0.0014
Intercept -0.4257

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable  O.R.  Low -- High
1 2.2809 1.3759 3.7812

**Hypothesis III, Regression 3a – Public versus private**

Descriptives...
126 cases have \( Y=0 \); 125 cases have \( Y=1 \).

Variable \( \quad \) Avg \( \quad \) SD
\[ 
1 \quad 0.4143 \quad 0.4926 
\]

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 332.6033
-2 Log Likelihood = 332.5951
-2 Log Likelihood = 332.5951 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 15.3608; df=1; \( p = 0.0001 \)

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable \( \quad \) Coeff. \( \quad \) StdErr \( \quad \) p
\[ 
1 \quad 1.0220 \quad 0.2654 \quad 0.0001 
\]
Intercept \( -0.4282 \)

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable \( \quad \) O.R. \( \quad \) Low -- High
\[ 
1 \quad 2.7787 \quad 1.6517 \quad 4.6745 
\]

**Hypothesis IV, Regression 4a – Minority Serving Institutions and ethnic studies**

Descriptives...

126 cases have \( Y=0 \); 125 cases have \( Y=1 \).

Variable \( \quad \) Avg \( \quad \) SD
\[ 
1 \quad 0.0478 \quad 0.2134 \\
2 \quad 0.0319 \quad 0.1757 \\
3 \quad 0.0120 \quad 0.1087 \\
4 \quad 0.0398 \quad 0.1956 \\
5 \quad 0.0757 \quad 0.2645 
\]

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 339.4611
-2 Log Likelihood = 339.2068
-2 Log Likelihood = 339.2016 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square = 8.7543; df=5; p = 0.1193

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable | Coeff. | StdErr | p
---|---|---|---
1 | -1.6049 | 1.4554 | 0.2702
2 | 1.9612 | 1.3472 | 0.1454
3 | -1.2389 | 1.8438 | 0.5016
4 | -0.3396 | 1.0005 | 0.7343
5 | 0.5422 | 1.3725 | 0.6928
Intercept | 0.0035

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable | O.R. | Low | -- | High
---|---|---|---|---
1 | 0.2009 | 0.0116 | 3.4827
2 | 7.1077 | 0.5070 | 99.6436
3 | 0.2897 | 0.0078 | 10.7506
4 | 0.7121 | 0.1002 | 5.0605
5 | 1.7197 | 0.1167 | 25.3368

**Hypothesis V, Regression 5a – Ethnic Studies department presence and related programs**

Descriptives...

192 cases have Y=0; 59 cases have Y=1.

Variable | Avg | SD
---|---|---
1 | 0.9522 | 1.2360

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 273.7497 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 170.4354
-2 Log Likelihood = 164.8132
-2 Log Likelihood = 164.6451
-2 Log Likelihood = 164.6448
-2 Log Likelihood = 164.6448 (Converged)
Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 109.1050; df=1; p= 0.0000

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable    Coeff.    StdErr       p
1        1.4512    0.1841    0.0000
Intercept -3.0508

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable      O.R.      Low -- High
1        4.2681    2.9754    6.1224

Hypothesis VII, Regression 7a – Schools with at least some graduate coexistence

Descriptives...

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

Variable     Avg       SD
1        0.7490    0.4336

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 327.3199
-2 Log Likelihood = 327.2139
-2 Log Likelihood = 327.2138
-2 Log Likelihood = 327.2138 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 20.7421; df=1; p= 0.0000

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable    Coeff.    StdErr       p
1        1.3995    0.3250    0.0000
Intercept -1.0776

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable      O.R.      Low -- High
1        4.0530    2.1436    7.6631
Hypothesis VII, Regression 7b – Schools with high graduate coexistence

Descriptives...

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

Variable   Avg    SD
1         0.2789  0.4485

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 295.0103
-2 Log Likelihood = 293.7825
-2 Log Likelihood = 293.7689
-2 Log Likelihood = 293.7689
-2 Log Likelihood = 293.7689 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 54.1870; df=1; p= 0.0000

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable   Coeff.    StdErr     p
1         2.3710    0.3751    0.0000
Intercept -0.5792

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable    O.R.    Low -- High
1         10.7077    5.1338   22.3334

Hypothesis VIII, Regression 8a – Student body enrollment and ethnic studies

Descriptives...

126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

Variable   Avg    SD
1         0.0974  0.1025
2         0.0164  0.0991
3         0.0624  0.0875
4         0.1219  0.1844
5         0.0017  0.0052
6         0.5743  0.2297
7         0.0602  0.0731
Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 295.6878
-2 Log Likelihood = 291.2726
-2 Log Likelihood = 290.9914
-2 Log Likelihood = 290.9897
-2 Log Likelihood = 290.9897 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 56.9662; df=7; p= 0.0000

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>StdErr</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9263</td>
<td>3.2330</td>
<td>0.7745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.8975</td>
<td>3.0818</td>
<td>0.5381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8577</td>
<td>5.2519</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3.1864</td>
<td>2.8989</td>
<td>0.2717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-100.3251</td>
<td>30.1626</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.9023</td>
<td>2.9078</td>
<td>0.5130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5.7052</td>
<td>3.5820</td>
<td>0.1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.4197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>O.R.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5253</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>1426.5269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1499</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>62.9774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19105.8282</td>
<td>0.646785584.1506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0413</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>12.1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1492</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>44.5613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>3.7266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis VIII, Regression 8b – Student body enrollment (minus Latino students) and ethnic studies

Descriptives...
126 cases have Y=0; 125 cases have Y=1.

Variable Avg     SD
1    0.0164  0.0991
2    0.0624  0.0875
3    0.1219  0.1844
4    0.0017  0.0052
5    0.5743  0.2297
6    0.0602  0.0731

Iteration History...
-2 Log Likelihood = 347.9559 (Null Model)
-2 Log Likelihood = 295.6961
-2 Log Likelihood = 291.3359
-2 Log Likelihood = 291.0724
-2 Log Likelihood = 291.0709
-2 Log Likelihood = 291.0709 (Converged)

Overall Model Fit...
Chi Square= 56.8850; df=6; p= 0.0000

Coefficients and Standard Errors...
Variable Coeff.    StdErr       p
1   -2.6158    1.8148    0.1495
2    8.8210    3.8014    0.0203
3   -3.8972    1.5452    0.0117
4  -100.8423   30.1146    0.0008
5   -2.6388    1.3928    0.0581
6   -6.3951    2.6769    0.0169
Intercept 2.1352

Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals...
Variable     O.R.      Low  --  High
1    0.0731  0.0021    2.5629
2  6775.1295  3.936560572.3873
3    0.0203  0.0010    0.4196
4    0.0000  0.0000    0.0000
5    0.0714  0.0047    1.0954
6    0.0017  0.0000    0.3171
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