
Student Work

12-1-1989

Black students in private white colleges: Changing coping strategies.

Anece Faison McCloud
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

McCloud, Anece Faison, "Black students in private white colleges: Changing coping strategies." (1989).
Student Work. 2713.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2713>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

© 1989

by Anece Faison McCloud

All Rights Reserved

Black Students
In Private White Colleges
Changing Coping Strategies

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Sociology

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Anece F. McCloud

December, 1989

UMI Number: EP74257

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74257

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

<u>Mark O. Roussow</u>	<u>Sociology</u>
Name	Department
<u>Robert T. Suzuki</u>	<u>Public Administration</u>

Wayne Pittell
Chairman

December 4, 1989
Date

ABSTRACT

Black Students In Private White Colleges, Changing Coping Strategies

The present study was undertaken to investigate changes in the coping strategies of black students at private, predominantly white colleges, and the implications of their behavior for the future of black Americans. This population of students was selected for the study because blacks in private, predominantly white colleges who assimilate successfully and graduate from these institutions are presumed to have an advantage over other college graduates. A prestigious network in place through fellow alumni, former professors and "friends" of the college help them to move into the American mainstream. Consequently, they become part of a sub-group of privileged black Americans who form a black elite.

The study revealed that assimilation, the coping strategy that enables these blacks to become elites, also causes them to avoid other black Americans and predominantly black activities and institutions.

Research for this project consisted of testing two questionnaires that were designed to assess behavior in a number of campus and community situations. One hundred and four (104) enrolled students and 47 alumni responded. The study revealed, 1) there is an association between the experience of integration students in the study have had and the degree to which they assimilate into white society while avoiding other black Americans; 2) the socioeconomic status of black elites is only slightly related to their assimilation/avoidance behavior; 3) the assimilation/avoidance behavior of the enrolled black students was not as great as the behavior of the elites had; 4) socioeconomic status and assimilation into white society are negatively associated with the career-aspirations of the enrolled black students in this study.

An exploratory project, this study had a secondary purpose of determining if black students who are currently enrolled in private white colleges and black graduates of the same

schools can be studied in a meaningful way for the purpose of explaining the changes perceived in black student behavior. Findings were that under certain conditions the process can be accomplished successfully.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the individuals who provided assistance and support in making this study a reality.

To Dr. Boyd Littrell, my advisor and Committee Chairman, I express my heartfelt thanks for his time, helpful guidance and constructive suggestions throughout the total process. To the other members of the committee, Dr. Mark Rousseau of the Sociology Department and Dr. Peter Suzuki, Professor of Public Administration at the University of Nebraska, special thanks for their interest, assistance and encouragement. To Dr. David Novak, Professor of Sociology at Washington and Lee University, my special appreciation for the many roles he assumed as my proctor and friend.

Without the cooperation of the administration, students and alumni at the five schools selected for the project, this study could not have been carried out. I express sincere thanks to each of them.

Finally, my deepest appreciation to my loving family: to my husband, Mac, who has always supported my efforts and to our daughters Aja and Carla, who quite often knew how to say just the right words of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii-iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
The Societal Problem	
The Sociological Problem	
Observations	
Major Concepts of the Study	
Chapter	
I. The Nature and Consequence of Coping	11
Theoretical Perspectives	
The Focus of This Exploratory Project	
II. Conducting the Study.....	23
The Sample	
Methodology	
Coding, Concepts and Variables	
Data Analysis	
Validity	
III. Results.....	38
General Background Information	
Assimilation/Avoidance Behavior	
Results of the Hypotheses	
IV. Changes in Student Behavior—Some Observations and Opinions.....	56
An Evaluation of the Study	
Appendix	
A. Student Questionnaire	63
B. Alumni Questionnaire	73
C. Questions Designed to Measure Variables for Each Hypothesis	86
D. Income Levels.....	88

E. Problems of Black Americans Identified as Being Basically Different from Those of White Americans.....	89
F. Reasons for Selecting the College	91
Selected Bibliography	93

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Assimilation of Black Elites Into Mainstream America	17
2. Crosstabulation of Black Students' Enrollment Period and Integration Scores by Assimilation Scores	35
3. Crosstabulation of Black Alumni's SES and ASSIM Scores When They Were Students and as Elites.....	36

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Adaptive Pattern and Economic Status Correlates	14
II. Information on Schools Selected.....	24
III. Questionnaire Distribution and Response Rate.....	26
IV. Time Periods of Data Sets	38
V. Where Enrolled Students and Alumni Grew Up	40
VI. Occupational Prestige Score Percentages	42
VII. Income Level Percentages	42
VIII. Comparison of Black/White Median Ratios in Neighborhoods and High Schools.....	43
IX. Types of High Schools Attended	44
X. Percentage Differences in Memberships and Awards	45
XI. Comparison of Interpersonal Relationships	47
XII. Comparison of the Three Sample Groups in Social Interactions.....	48
XIII. Black Students Integration Scores by Assimilation Scores	50
XIV. Assimilation Scores of Black Elites by SES.....	51
XV. Frequency Distribution of Assimilation Scores	52
XVI. Career Aspirations by Assimilation Scores for Currently Enrolled Students	53
XVII. Enrolled Students' Assimilation Behavior and Career Aspirations While Controlling for SES	54
XVIII. Crosstabulation of Assimilation Scores	59

INTRODUCTION

The Societal Problem

Various reports indicate more than one million black students enrolled in colleges during most of the years of the 1980's (Arbeiter, 1987:14; Smith, 1981: 299; and Thiers, 1987:1). Approximately 75% of all black students attending college during the mid-1980's were enrolled in predominantly white institutions of higher education (Black Issues in Higher Education, 1 Apr. 1986:2). There is also evidence that those black students at the predominantly white institutions had higher professional career aspirations than the students at predominantly black colleges (Black Issues In Higher Education), 1 June, 1986:1). Furthermore, some educators believe that the high percentage of blacks attending predominantly white colleges and their means of coping with their minority status by avoiding ties with the larger black population have implications for the future of black Americans in particular and for American society in general.

Social scientist William E. Sedlacek and various colleagues of his over the years (1976:97-134; 1987:484-495) have stressed the importance of white colleges making environmental changes to better accommodate black students on their campuses. This study addresses the issue of changes perceived in the black student population due partly to their experiences on white college campuses, and partly to changes in the life-styles of more privileged black Americans during the post-segregation years.

The Sociological Problem

One crucial problem the sociologist faces in determining the social significance of the change in black student behavior and the implications of this behavior for the future of blacks in America is the brief period of time over which the phenomenon has occurred. Kitano (1980:72) says "An analysis of intergroup relations can be misleading if the

research covers only a narrow period of time." Only since the 1960's have fairly sizeable numbers of blacks attended predominantly white colleges. This is just over a quarter of a century. These two and a half decades will allow the researcher to compare a small sample of black students and alumni from white colleges. There are reasons to believe that student behavior at white colleges, especially **private** white colleges, reflects the prevailing adaptive mode of the sub- population of privileged black Americans. It is possible that the the behavior pattern of privileged blacks follows assimilation models employed in studies of immigrants to America.

This exploratory project is designed to determine if black students who are currently enrolled in private predominantly white colleges and black graduates of the same schools (i.e. alumni) can be studied in a meaningful way for the purpose of explaining the changes perceived in black student behavior.

Observations

In 1986, the year this study was begun, at least two sources (Evans and Taylor) noted the changes various researchers and educators had begun to perceive in the behavior of black students in the 1980's, when that behavior is compared with the thinking and actions of the students of the 1960's. Manifestations of these changes include student apathy over issues involving blacks, rejection of the historical beliefs of black Americans, and attempts to emulate whites. These actions are especially apparent among black students on predominantly white campuses.¹

¹Cheatham (1986), a critic of the Taylor article cited in the paragraph, stresses the importance of noting distinctions between "Black students at white colleges and their counterparts at Black colleges" as well as of comparing the perceptions of black and white students on predominantly white college campuses. Since this study is primarily concerned with how changes in the behavior of black students on private predominantly white campuses will affect future leadership in the black population, such comparisons are not deemed necessary.

The observations concerning black student behavior in the mid- eighties differ from the findings of several researchers of the early 1970's; namely Willie and McCord (1972), Davis and Boders-Patterson (1973) and Gibbs (1974). They found black separatism to be the most prevalent coping behavior and belief in black unity to be the prevailing ideology² among black students on white campuses.

The earlier studies, conducted approximately a decade before the more recent ones, lead one to suspect that changes have occurred in the behavior of black students on white campuses. If this is true, understanding the factors that have contributed to the changes is important in understanding how this new behavior will affect black Americans and, more generally, U.S. society.

Parallels can be drawn between the experiences of black students on predominately white campuses and those of blacks in American society. Both are subordinate groups in their respective settings. Both, therefore, are subjected to some form of prejudice, discrimination and segregation. Neither blacks on predominately white campuses nor black citizens control positions of wealth, power and authority in their respective environments. As Alvin Poussaint (Conley, 1986:6) said in Black Issues In Higher Education

Few minority students get involved in student government, fraternities and sororities, or the school newspaper at [white] universities....There's resistance to their participation. It may not be expressed, but it is felt.

Finally, norms governing the behavior of group members in both situations are determined by the values of the majority culture. According to Kitano (1980:69-101), the characteristics described above indicate a position of domination.

²Black ideology, as used in this study, is defined on page 6.

Allen (Black Issues In Higher Education, 1 June 1986:1) and Fleming (1986) have linked academic performance, student satisfaction and emotional well being with the college environment of black students. In each instance these researchers have found the achievement of blacks to correlate positively with attendance at predominantly black colleges. Attendance at an historically black college is more likely also to encourage student involvement in the black community. One may deduce from these studies that the **lack** of interest in the black community which is shown by black students at predominantly **white** colleges is correlated with **their** environment; an environment where their physical appearance, if nothing else, causes them to be perceived by others as having subordinate status (Webster and Driskell, 1978) and to be treated accordingly.

Kitano (1980), citing Simpson and Yinger (1965) discusses three ways in which subordinate groups have adapted to their status of domination. These include "(1) acceptance of their... status; (2) aggression, fighting back, and attempts to change the system; and (3) avoidance" (p.73). The behavior of black students on predominantly white campuses in the mid-1980's suggests they coped with their status by "avoidance," denial of their black heritage and "assimilating" into the dominant culture (83). Students of the 1960's coped apparently by using aggression, trying to make changes in the environment. The same patterns of adaptive behavior have been exhibited generally by members of the black population during the same time periods. In fact the aggressive behavior of some black leaders in the 1950's preceded the actions of the students (Morris, 1984).

Major Concepts In The Study

Continuing this discussion about black students on private, predominantly white college campuses and their relationship to the larger black population requires an

understanding of how various concepts are being applied in this study. In some instances, the meaning of terms will differ slightly from their generally accepted definitions. This is necessary in trying to develop a language to which other social scientists can relate while using concepts based generally on norms that have excluded blacks in America. Milton M. Gordon (1978: 259) describes this problem as follows:

American society is criss-crossed by two sets of stratification structures, one based on social status, economic power, and political power differences, regardless of ethnic background, the other a set of status and power relationships based precisely on division of the population by race, nationality background, and religious categories....The two systems must be kept conceptually separate, for otherwise the nature of their interrelationships cannot be discovered. Operationally, the problem has been handled in class research, thus far, largely by analyzing the class system of the Negro group separately, and including members of other ethnic groups in the general American class system.

As black Americans seek assimilation into the class system of the mainstream America, the combined effects of race **and** social class as defined generally must be studied, and terms must be redefined and concepts relabeled.

Accordingly, the concept "black Americans" as used here includes all members of the ethnic group in the United States whose ancestors, either in reality or as perceived by others (van den Berghe 1981: 16), shared an African heritage and the experiences of being forcibly brought to America and sold as slaves. Because of these common historical experiences and the putative perception of inferiority, usually based on skin color and hair texture, members of this group were historically forced to live, work and socialize separated from members of the dominant society. A natural consequence was for blacks to have their own customs, values, and social norms. Their cultural traits were usually modified versions of those in the dominant culture.

The forced separatism blacks experienced did not preclude the existence of class distinctions **within** the black community. In the past, the class distinctions among black Americans were based more on the amount of education attained and the degree to which

blacks emulated the white culture (Frazier: 1966) than on major differences in the earning power and social integration of blacks.³

Although American blacks gained legal entry to mainstream institutions through affirmative action, the continuing perception of others that black people are in some ways different and inferior maintains the commonality of the black experience in America. However, some members of the black population who are making progress in mainstream America are becoming less willing to acknowledge linkage with the historical black experience. This brings us to the recognition of a black ideology.

In a general sense, ideology is an explanation by members of particular groups or social movements of relevant aspects of life or social arrangements. As used in this study, ideology refers to political and social explanations by black Americans that are an outgrowth of their common historical experiences. As alluded to earlier, from the time of slavery through the 1950's—with the exception of a brief period just after the Civil War—blacks in America were forced to use separate institutions (i.e. black churches, black schools, black social organizations, etc.) and were not welcomed in most institutions for whites (Lee, 1954:143). With few exceptions, blacks were excluded from holding political positions that carried influence in or upon the dominant white culture. While based on a caste system, the position of subordination held by blacks resulted in their occupying a lowly position in the socioeconomic structure of the United States. Segregation, including economic barriers, produced a type of "black consciousness" which at the very least served to critique the interests of the dominant white groups, especially as these interests have had

³In studying stratification arrangements of black Americans during the period of segregation, one must modify the concept of class to correlate with Weber's "status groupings", i.e. well educated persons. The educated blacks in the segregated communities served as leaders in shaping the black Americans' judgments about position.

an impact upon the interests of blacks (Bottomore, 1983: 219-223; Myrdal, 1944: 781-857; Hurst, 1972:659).

As a result of policy changes, especially those involving affirmative action, some blacks have been able to surmount the social and economic barriers that previously affected all blacks equally. As the unequal earning power among black Americans increases, differences in class are beginning to supersede racial identity in determining political and social interests (see Wilson, 1978 and Gershman and Clark, 1980).

In studying changes in the behavior of blacks in America, it is well to remember that up to the 1960's upper-class black Americans, like other blacks, were confined to segregated communities. In the 1980's, upper-class blacks differ from others in that their lifestyles include more interactions on more nearly equal footing with members of the white middle class. These blacks comprise an elite group within the population of blacks in America. In many instances, they are graduates of historically black colleges whose parents "came from all of the socioeconomic levels and social classes in the black community..." (Thompson 1986: 4; also see Freeman: 1976). In other instances, they are the more recent graduates of predominantly white colleges and universities. Many of these privileged black Americans tend to go along with the "assimilationist goals" (Gordon, 1978: 157) of the dominant society because assimilationist behavior provides a much faster route to economic success and social acceptance.

Privileged black Americans in this study are defined as black elites. They are members of the black race who have attained some formal education, by current standards at least a baccalaureate degree. In addition to formal education they have achieved economic, political or military success on a par with that of middle-class whites. [Class in this instance refers to the "aggregations of occupational categories", rather than the Marxist concept of class structures based on the social relationships of production" (Wright et al,

1982: 709-726).] In concluding the definition, the success of privileged blacks has been accompanied by interactions with and a degree of social acceptance in the dominant society.

Emphasis is placed on education in this definition because black Americans historically have put great faith in the ability of formal education to diminish racial inequality (Thompson, 1986: 1-6), although blacks have not always had the financial means or opportunity to attain **terminal or professional** degrees. Accordingly, in order for members of this group to be identified as privileged, they must first have the one advantage which causes other blacks to evaluate them as advantaged. While they may or may not characterize **themselves** as being elites, in having a formal education, the types of jobs and the social interactions they experience, these elite black Americans do realize that they have set themselves apart from the black masses.

The categories of middle class whites to which I am comparing members of the sub-population of privileged blacks is in line with Mills' (1956) description of three types of elites in American society: those who have achieved in the areas of business, industry and the government. There is some debate among social scientists as to whether Mills ever really showed how these groups form a power elite. Similarly the definition used here is not an attempt to classify blacks who are in these categories as a "**power elite**" in the usual meaning of the term. Rather it is recognition of the varied personal achievements of those black Americans who have become part of mainstream America and have, in some instances, used their persuasive power very effectively to benefit all black Americans. The late U.S. Air Force General, Daniel "Chappy" James Jr., is one example of this type of black American; Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall and the late Dr. Martin Luther King are other well known examples. There are other locally and nationally known black men and women throughout the United States whose lifestyles and civic contributions compare favorably with those of the three black men named here (Matney, 1988). For

many years, persuasive power was the only type of power blacks in America could employ. Finally, business, industry, and the government are the areas of achievement through which blacks will continue to have the **greatest** means for providing leadership to the total black population.

Increasing numbers of college-educated blacks will have attended predominantly white institutions in years to come. Consider for example that between 1976 and 1981, when there was a general increase in the number of degrees awarded to black students, in the 20 states where there are "total black institutions" (TBIs), the number of degrees awarded by TBIs **decreased** by 13 percent and the proportional representation of TBI awards fell by nine percent. The total number of bachelor degrees awarded to blacks in 1981 in those state was 38,154, with the number from TBIs being 19,414. These figures compare with 22,000 bachelors degrees from TBIs in 1976 out of a total 37,055 degrees awarded to blacks in the selected states. These data mean that the percentage of degrees awarded to blacks by **white** institutions in the 20 states with total black institutions increased from 40 to 49% over a five year period. (See Brown 1987:18.) It should be noted that after 1981 the college enrollment of black students began a downward trend (Arbeiter, 1987: 14-19; also see Pruitt, 1987: 25-31) but a larger percentage of black students in college during the latter 1980's are going to **white** schools.

Moreover, in the future, many black students who are from the higher socioeconomic backgrounds are likely to attend **private**, predominantly white colleges because of their career aspirations (infra. p. 13). The black students in the private, predominantly white colleges who assimilate successfully and graduate from these institutions will have a prestigious network in place through fellow alumni, former professors and "friends" of the college. Because black Americans who have graduated from private, predominantly white colleges are presumed to have advantages over other

college-educated blacks, the alumni in this study are called black elites.

CHAPTER I: THE NATURE AND CONSEQUENCES OF COPING

In his article "Black Students on Predominantly White Campuses in the 1980's," Charles A. Taylor (1986:196-201) gave several "Reasons for Concern" about the change in the behavior of black students on predominately white campuses. His observations emphasize the implications black student behavior today has for the future of blacks in America. Taylor's concerns include:

- The national decline in affirmative action policies and practices or in the enforcement of them and the black students' lack of "political awareness" to assess the possible results of this decline.

- The decreasing enrollment of blacks in institutions of higher education [at a time when the "number of high school graduates and the graduation rate for blacks is at an all time high" (Arbeiter, 1987: 14)] and Taylor's belief that "university administrators are not being challenged on [this and other] issues by black students as they once were."

- The continued "underrepresentation of a large segment of the black population in professional and technical fields."

- The refusal of many blacks to share their time and knowledge with other black people.

If these observations are applicable to a large percentage of the black students enrolled in predominantly white colleges, the implications are that, in future years, the "gap" between the upper-class blacks in America and the lower- or underclass blacks will continue to widen, leaving the underclass with fewer well-educated black leaders who are willing to recognize or assist other black Americans (Wilson, 1978).

This problem of decreasing leadership for the black lower-class was articulated from a different perspective in 1980 by the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. The following quotation from the Committee's report on "Admissions and Retention Problems of Black Students at Seven Predominately White Universities" (Smith, 1980:5), describes possible consequences of different **selection procedures** now being employed by predominately white schools.

This preference for students from private [high] schools over those with equal qualifications from public (mostly inner-city) schools portends a potentially elitist admissions policy, in which few students from all-Black inner-city schools will gain entree to the most prestigious universities. Taken to its logical conclusion, such highly selective admissions policies, which look not only for the highest achievers but also for those who have been socialized in white environments, could ultimately result in the development of an elite Black leadership that has little identification with its Black roots and, accordingly, feels little responsibility for the Black underclass. This crucial issue surfaces not only at the prestigious private universities but also emerges to a lesser extent at the public universities studied.

In conducting the research project to investigate changes in black students' coping skills, information was gathered on the types of high schools attended by respondents. But, whether the changes perceived in the behavior of the black students at white colleges today are due to highly selective admissions policies producing a more "elite" black student population, or to actual changes in the ideology of black students on these campuses irrespective of their backgrounds, the outcome is likely to be the same: increased polarization among blacks.

The concept of a growing gap between social classes is not limited to the population of blacks in America. Following Ronald Reagan's second election to the position of president, a post-election, special issue of Time Magazine (1984) reported the following observation:

The Reagan recovery has not been universal. According to several studies the gap between the rich and poor, black and white, is growing. This societal wound could create a dangerous polarization between classes and races.

It is too early to determine the extent to which the Bush administration might affect this situation. However, since the caste system of the past continues to have an impact upon the lives of the most black people in the United States, this system is not likely to change within the near future. Therefore, the gap will undoubtedly continue and may widen. Additional polarization between classes obviously would have a more devastating effect among blacks than among whites.

Theoretical Perspectives

Several researchers have studied the phenomenon of black students on predominantly white campuses. From these studies, two well-known facts about this particular student population have emerged. These students generally have come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds and have higher aptitude test scores than other black students (Fleming, 1984:33; also see various studies in Pruitt, 1987). There is also some evidence that as freshmen these students have higher career aspirations (Black Issues In Higher Education, 1 June, 1986:1).

Robert P. Ruffin summarized some of the research concerning blacks on predominantly white campuses. Most of the studies Ruffin discussed are from a microsociological perspective and emphasize "the mediating influence of social-psychological factors" (p. 8). These factors include "background" defined in terms of the presence of one or both parents and the economic status of the family; "school factors" (the degree of integration and quality of education found in the student's previous school environment), and personal "social-psychological factors" reflecting a student's "self-esteem" and interpersonal relationships.

Ruffin discussed four theorists (Pettigrew, Hammon, Kysor and Gibbs) who have studied black students' adaptive behavior on predominantly white campuses. The theorists

have described coping strategies of black students which are similar to those identified by Kitano as subordinate group adaptive patterns.⁴

Ruffin's report on the results of Gibbs' study (9) showed correlations between socioeconomic background, including exposure to integration, and the selection of a particular adaptive behaviors by black students at Stanford University. Table I summarizes Ruffin's interpretation of Gibbs' research. Socioeconomic status correlates positively with the assimilation/ avoidance mode of behavior of black students on at least one private predominantly white campus.

Table I: Adaptive Pattern and Economic Status Correlates

ADAPTIVE PATTERN OR MODE OF BEHAVIOR	DEGREE OF UTILIZATION	SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUP	EXPOSURE TO INTEGRATION PREVIOUSLY
withdrawal	most prevalent adaptive behavior	low	little
separation	second most prevalent adaptive behavior	low to slightly middle income families	not given
assimilation (avoidance of) black peers) families	least prevalent adaptive behavior	upper middle class, mostly professional and white collar families	not given (assumed to be high)

⁴"Withdrawal" is synonymous with Kitano's description of acceptance of one's subordinate status, "separation" connotes aggression and "assimilation" means avoiding one's black peers. According to Ruffin, Gibbs identified a small percentage of the "assimilation" group who "attempted to merge their heritage with that of the white culture . . ." (p. 10), but most in this group refrained from participation in the black subculture.

Because black students at white schools reportedly (supra. p. 13) have higher career aspirations, one may assume they have elected to go the private, predominantly white institutions because of their desire to achieve high socioeconomic status after graduation. Although this view is speculative, it would explain why some black students at white schools who **are not** from high socioeconomic backgrounds develop the assimilation/avoidance mode of behavior.

More than ten years ago researchers such as Kluegel (1978:285) began documenting improvements in the educational and occupational status of blacks. According to reports, the gap between black and white men in these two areas has decreased continuously. It is hypothesized here that changes in the socioeconomic status of blacks who have entered mainstream America have produced changes in their coping behavior. Similarly, the earning potential of black students in private, predominantly white institutions has caused changes in their coping behavior. Actually, the behavior of black students on white college campuses is believed to reflect the behavior of black alumni who are part of the sub-population of privileged black Americans. Socioeconomic status is obviously an important concept in this study and warrants defining.

Socioeconomic status as used here refers to the social characteristics of family background, education, and values, all of which are based on the goals of the more privileged blacks during the years of segregation (i.e. formal education and the emulation of whites), combined with prestigious occupations and economic status in the dominant culture today. Gordon (1978: 249) identifies five characteristics that constitute "the basic dimensions of economic power": economic status includes "income," "wealth," "credit access," "employment control" and/or "wage" and "price control."

Two perspectives on racial and ethnic relations help explain the hypothesized relationship between the increased socioeconomic status of privileged black Americans and

their assimilation/avoidance behavior. The first, offered by Michael Banton (1967:68-76) identifies six orders of race relations to which Harry H. L. Kitano (1980:16-26) has added the variable of power and "hypothesized sequences".⁵ The second, proposed by Milton M. Gordon (1978:169), identifies "assimilation variables". Taken together, the works of these three social scientists suggest a step-wise process by which immigrant groups are assimilated into the dominant culture.⁶ This process is summarized in Figure 1.

⁵Harry H.L. Kitano; Race Relations (New Jersey: Printice Hall Inc. 1980), 16-20 citing Michael Banton, "Banton's Six Orders of Race Relations," Race Relations (1967), 68-76.

⁶I have borrowed from two theories in race relations portions that I consider relevant to this study. Stefan Nowak (Bottomore, 1975: 123-167) advocates "cumulative growth" in social research when "the propositions established by one generation of researchers are modified or even rejected by others . . ." (126). The portions of the theories used in this study form an appropriate foundation upon which to build propositions concerning the assimilation of black elites into mainstream society.

**Figure 1: ASSIMILATION OF BLACK ELITES
INTO MAINSTREAM AMERICA**

**Based on Steps Selected from the Works of
Banton (1-5), Kitano (a) and Gordon (I-VII)**

Orders of Race Relations		Hypothesized Results
1. Peripheral Contact		Entrance to the U. S.
2. Institutionalized Contact (a) Paternalistic (unequal power model)		Interaction of a few from each group. Master/servant relationship
	Assimilation Variables	
3. Acculturation	I. Cultural or behavioral assimilation	Learn new ways of life, discard old.
4. Integration	II. Structural assimilation (Large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs and institutions of host country.)	Participation in institutional networks.
5. Assimilation	III. Marital assimilation	Sub-process or Condition Social relations between members of the two cultural groups.
	IV. Identification	Development of sense of assimilation peoplehood based on host society.
	V. Attitude receptional	Absence of prejudice.
	VI. Behavior receptional	Absence of discrimination.
	VII. Civic assimilation	Absence of value and power conflict.

In America, the dominant culture, of course, refers to the culture of "white, middle-class, protestants," whose "cultural pattern" is primarily Anglo-Saxon in nature (Gordon, 1978:171).

Robert Blauner has observed that colonialized groups, for example American blacks, differ from ethnic immigrants in their ability to "operate fairly competitively within the relatively open section of the social and economic order..." (Blauner, 1971: 396).⁷ Immigrants obviously are more advantaged than colonialized Americans. Various European groups and Asians came to America voluntarily in search of a better life. As a result of their motivation to immigrate here and the lack of barriers based on caste, immigrants (especially those of European ancestry) gained control of their own communities within one generation, and those group members who wished to do so proceeded to become integrated into the dominant culture. This was not the case with black Americans (supra. pp 5-6).

As the combined theories of Banton and Gordon are applied to the assimilation of blacks into the dominant culture of America, it is concluded that the ancestors of **all** black Americans as defined in this study (supra. p. 5) generally had socioeconomic status equal to each other during the orders of "peripheral" and "institutionalized contact." While some acculturation (Banton's term) and cultural or behavioral assimilation (Gordon's term) of all blacks have been inevitable, the degree to which blacks have been accepted and are accepting the ways of life of the dominant society today varies with their socioeconomic status.

Banton's "integration", and Gordon's second assimilation variable, "structural assimilation," imply similar results: respectively, participation in institutional networks

⁷Harry H.R. Kitano (New Jersey: Printice Hall Inc. 1980), p. 22 citing Robert Blauner "Colonized and Immigrant Minorities" (unpublished study; 1971), p. 396.

(Kitano 1980: 25) and "large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs and institutions of the host country" (Gordon, 1978:171).

Structural assimilation or integration became possible for blacks only with legislation and with the implementation of equal opportunity and affirmative action agencies. Most important among these were the 1954 Supreme Court decision ordering the desegregation of all public schools (Carter, 1979: 19); President Kennedy's 1963 Executive Order No. 11114, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which was updated in 1972, and Executive Order No. 11246 of late 1965. These four mandated equal employment opportunities. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance was created to monitor progress toward compliance (Rogers 1975: 77-81).

Those blacks who have gained most in the dominant culture as a result of these policies are the college-educated. They are now able to reach higher levels of socioeconomic status which lead to their being integrated into the mainstream. At the same time that these privileged black Americans are becoming increasingly integrated, the black masses are remaining economically trapped. Since the majority of blacks who have gained entry to the mainstream no longer reside in areas that are occupied predominantly by blacks, they (the privileged sub-population of blacks) do not have the motivation educated blacks once had to be actively involved in providing leadership for those areas or for the black masses.

At the risk of sounding overly optimistic or extremely naive about the situation of the majority of black Americans, I assume that this change in the behavior of the privileged blacks will affect the structure of society. One change in the structure will be the number of blacks experiencing upward mobility and increased exposure to integration. More important will be the social distance black upward mobility and integration create between the two sections of the black population.

Peter Blau (1977:5), in elaborating on Simmel's work on groups, describes social mobility as "...the transfer of persons from one group or stratum to another" and talks about possible structural changes as a result of it:

Processes of social mobility are an essential element in most forms of structural change, whatever the conditions that precipitate the change. Social mobility is defined broadly to encompass all movements of persons between social positions, including not only occupational mobility and migration but also religious conversion, marriage, rising income, unemployment, and changes in political affiliation. Excess mobility in one direction alters the population's distribution among social positions and thereby changes the social structure. Other forms of structural change are also furthered by high rates of social mobility, ...and extensive mobility in opposite directions that does not alter the population distribution nevertheless contributes to social change.

Blau explains that social mobility may result in "mutual exchanges in social associations [and can] cement intergroup relations...." However, as he later points out, the outcome is different when "ascribed status" such as race and gender are involved (39). Superordinate group members, in the present discussion white members of mainstream society, are not very receptive to upwardly mobile persons of subordinate ascribed status, in this case black Americans. Increased attempts by privileged black Americans to be accepted by mainstream society are causing upwardly mobile black Americans increasingly to avoid associations with other members of the black population. Consequently, and the point made earlier warrants repeating, the black under-class is becoming estranged from those leaders who have the social standing and financial means of assisting in the resolution of political and social problems which affect them.

The Focus Of This Exploratory Project

The total study envisioned at the beginning of this project was, as Blau (1977:2) described his study on Inequality and Heterogeneity, a "macrosociological analysis of the

relationships among parts of society," especially a study of "differentiation" in the black subculture and the implications of this phenomenon for the future of society as a whole. The exploratory project, presented here is the first stage of a larger possible study. In this stage in addition to testing the methodology for conducting a study of this type, I am concerned with answering the following questions:

1. Is the behavior of black students on private, predominantly white campuses today different from the behavior of black students on the same campuses in the 1960's and early 70's ?
2. Do black alumni from predominantly white colleges show through their behavior that they are less supportive of the black population as black elite adults than they were as students?
3. Is the behavior of black students at private predominantly white colleges in the mid-1980's similar to the behavior of black elites in the mid-1980's who had graduated from the same colleges ten to twenty years earlier?

The assumption that changes in the behavior of black students at private, predominantly white colleges reflects adaptive patterns of the sub-population of privileged black Americans, is based on five propositions. The first two were addressed in the Introduction and Chapter I. The last three serve as the bases for the hypotheses that are proposed for quantitative research.

1. There is a system of economic and social stratification in the United States, and blacks comprise one of the subordinate groups.
2. Stratification within the black population is beginning to be based on socioeconomic status comparable to the SES of the dominant culture.

3. With social integration, those blacks who are at the upper level of the socioeconomic strata have been increasingly assimilated into the structure of white society. This assimilation, in turn, has been accompanied by an increase in their avoidance of institutions, projects and activities in which a larger percentage of blacks participate. Black churches, predominantly black schools and involvement generally in the black community are among the institutions and activities privileged black Americans avoid.
4. The desire to succeed in careers that have the highest socioeconomic potential is what motivates black students to attend private predominantly white colleges.
5. Black students enrolled in private predominantly white colleges in the mid-1980's emulate or reflect the assimilation/ avoidance behavior of the black Americans in the mid-1980's who graduated from the same colleges ten to twenty years ago and have moved into mainstream America as black elites.

CHAPTER II: CONDUCTING THE STUDY

Research for this project consisted of testing two questionnaires: one for enrolled black students at selected private, predominantly white colleges and the other for black alumni of the same schools. Three sets of data were collected from the questionnaires. One concerning the alumni when they were students, will be referred to as "alumni when students". Another set, "enrolled students", describes the students who were attending the selected colleges at the time the questionnaires were distributed in the mid-eighties. Finally, questions were included on the alumni questionnaire to assess the alumni's status at the time the study was conducted. This set is labeled "elite" data. The three data sets and the time periods represented by them are identified in Table IV (*infra* p. 38).

The questionnaires were designed to determine if there is support for the three hypotheses that address directly the issue of change in the behavior of black students at predominately white colleges over the past 10 years. More specifically, the study examines the coping strategies of black students on predominately white campuses in the eighties to determine if coping behavior reflects the adaptive patterns of black elites, the black alumni from these colleges who are now in the American mainstream. The hypotheses will be stated and discussed later in this chapter.

The Sample

Purposive sampling was employed (Downie and Starry, 1977:62). In disseminating the questionnaires, four institutions were selected based on their similarities in size, mission, history and ratio of black to white students. For example, each of the schools was once all-male, and all of them have become co-ed within the past twenty years. All are private institutions and emphasize a liberal arts education. At least three of the four

schools embrace a student-run "honor system" that governs the entire campus. Each school was reported as having less than a four percent black student enrollment during 1984, the most current enrollment data at the time this study was begun.⁸

Individuals were identified on the selected campuses to secure their assistance in disseminating questionnaires to the subjects. The populations of black students and alumni were too small to produce samples of a size from which meaningful information could be drawn. Consequently, a fifth, larger institution was invited to participate. It too is private, but it has a slightly higher percentage of black students enrolled than the other four schools. The five schools selected for the study are identified by assigned codes. Information on each is included in Table II.

Table II: Information on Schools Selected

School ⁹	Geographical Location	Percent White/ Black	Total Enrol 1984
School A	South	86.2/ 5.3	8533
School B	East	93.7/ 2.1	2793
School C	South	94.2/ 3.9	1373
School D	South East	95.9/ 2.0	1705
School E	South	95.6 2.5	1158

⁸Based on information in the "Fact File: Racial and Ethnic Makeup of College and University Enrollments." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 23 July, 1986:25-34.

⁹Ibid 8.

Schools A, D and E are universities, therefore, the white/black percentages and total enrollment figures include graduate and/or professional school students. Since the focus of this study is on undergraduates, the only responses used in the analyses were from students enrolled in courses in the liberal arts college and business school of each institution and from alumni who had received bachelor's degrees in non-professional majors at the schools.

An attempt was made to control the distribution of questionnaires so that only liberal arts students and alumni would receive them. However, with the exception of one school where the student and alumni mailing lists were provided directly to me, questionnaires were distributed through third parties: i.e. minority student personnel administrators, equal opportunity officers, and/or alumni directors. Responses indicated that, in some instances, alumni questionnaires distributed by school personnel were sent to persons other than those for whom the study was intended. It also became apparent that not all student questionnaires were distributed to every student on each campus who had identified himself or herself as being black.¹⁰

Two sets of questionnaires with cover letters were sent to the contact person at each school, except the one for which I was given lists. One set was for distribution to all the black students who were enrolled during the spring of 1988. The second set, enclosed in stamped envelopes to which address labels were to be affixed for mailing, were sent for the black alumni who graduated from each school between 1965 and 1975. I sent

¹⁰I asked the contact person on each campus to put a questionnaire in the campus mailbox of every student who was self-identified as a black American. In one instance the contact person reported there were 50 black undergraduates on the campus. I, therefore, sent 50 student questionnaires to that school. Some weeks after the response deadline, the contact person returned 38 questionnaires that had not been distributed. The individual had elected to hand out the questionnaires during a minority student meeting instead of using the mailbox method of distribution that was suggested. Some of the enrolled black students did not attend the meeting and never received a questionnaire.

questionnaires directly to the subjects from the one school that had provided lists, at approximately the same time the contacts at the other four schools were sending out their copies. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire for its return directly to me. The questionnaires were designed to be self-administered. Each questionnaire was numbered, and the series of numbers sent to each school were kept for the purpose of monitoring returns. (The distribution and response rates are summarized in Table III.)

Table III: Questionnaire Distribution and Response Rates

Method of Distribution:	by School Contacts		by Researcher		Totals	
Population (Column #)	Alum (1)	Stud (2)	Alum (3)	Stud (4)	Alum (5)	Stud (6)
# Distributed	(271)	(374)*	(15)	(33)	(286)	(407)
Responses After 1st Mailing	(30) 11%**	(88) 23%	(3) 20%	(16) 48%	(33) 11.5%	(104) 25%
Additional Responses aft 2ond Mailing	(11) 4%	—	(3) 20%	—	(14) 5%	—
Total Responses	(41) 15%	(88) 23%	(6) 40%	(16) 48%	(47) 16%	(104) 25%

*Four hundred and twelve student questionnaires were mailed to the contacts at the schools, but 38 were returned unused by one institution.

**The percentages in columns 1 through 4 represent the percentage returned from the total mailed by the method of distribution, i.e. school contacts or the researcher. Columns 5 and 6 show the percentages of questionnaires returned from the total samples of alumni and students.

Based on numbers, in some instances estimates, supplied by college personnel, 412 questionnaires were sent to four of the five schools for black students who were enrolled in liberal arts and business, and 271 questionnaires were sent to the four schools to be forwarded to black graduates of the colleges during the designated years. Thirty-eight (38) of 50 student questionnaires sent to one school were returned unused. Therefore, the distribution of student questionnaires to the schools was actually 374. An additional 33 students and 15 alumni questionnaires were sent directly to persons from the one school for which I had lists. The total numbers of students and alumni questionnaires actually distributed were 407 and 286 respectively.

Babbie (1973: 163) emphasizes the importance of at least two follow-up mailings, two to three weeks apart. Because of the cost involved in this personally funded project, and also because the first mailings went out late in the spring term, only one follow-up mailing was made to the alumni and none to the students.

From the 407 student questionnaires actually distributed, 104 responses were received, producing a 25% student response rate with no follow-up mailing. Three of the 104 responses were not used in the analyses because two were from students who were enrolled in Bachelor's Degree Nursing Programs and the racial background of the third was not clearly defined.

Responses were received from 47 of the 286 alumni questionnaires distributed, yielding a response rate of 16%. Six of the 47 responses were not usable because the respondents had received professional rather than undergraduate degrees from the selected schools. Worthy of note are the response rates for the one school for which I was provided lists. In this instance, in which I had corresponded directly with the subjects, 16 of the 33 students responded—a rate of 48%, and six of the 15 alumni responded—a 40% response rate.

While the response rates for the students and alumni were low, they could serve the exploratory purpose of this study. **It is emphasized at this point that the data and analyses presented in this study are concerned only with the 101 black students and 41 black alumni whose responses are being used.** No attempt is made to generalize findings to all black students and alumni of the schools that participated in the study nor to other black students and alumni of private, predominantly white institutions.

Methodology

Copies of the two questionnaires described above appear in Appendices A and B. The Alumni Questionnaire contained questions to assess the behavior of respondents when they were enrolled in college. Other questions assess their behavior during the years since they have graduated from the selected schools. Questions on the alumni questionnaire and on the student questionnaire were designed to measure the concepts of this study by using identical operational methods. These methods are discussed in conjunction with the hypotheses that are being studied.

H₀₁: The integration scores (INTEG) of black students on the selected private, predominantly white college campuses are not related to their self-reported assimilation/avoidance behavior scores (ASSIM).

H₀₂: The socioeconomic status of black elites (EliSES) is not related to their assimilation avoidance behavior scores (EliASSIM).

H₀₃: The assimilation/ avoidance behavior of black students (Assim) at predominantly white colleges in the mid 1980's is not related to the assimilation/ avoidance behavior of black elites (EliAssim).

H₀4: The career aspirations scores (CarAspir) and assimilation/ avoidance behavioral scores (ASSIM) of black students at private predominantly white colleges are not related to their socioeconomic status (SES).

In testing hypothesis 1, black alumni who graduated from the selected private, predominantly white colleges between 1965 and 1975 comprise the "before" integration group, and black students enrolled on these campuses during the spring of 1988 comprise the "after" group.

Hypothesis 2 is concerned with the black alumni population only. The socioeconomic status and assimilation/avoidance scores of the black alumni as students are compared with these variables for the alumni at the time of the study, when they are considered to be "elites". The purpose of this assessment is to determine if the assimilation behavior of the alumni has remained constant as they have completed college and have developed their own socioeconomic status, rather than sharing the SES of their parents.

Hypothesis 3 assesses how the current black students and black elites compare in their assimilation/avoidance behavior.

Hypothesis 4 assesses only the black students. Their assimilation/avoidance and career aspiration scores are compared with their socioeconomic status.

Coding, Concepts and Variables

In coding the answers for this study, numerical values were assigned to each possible answer for each question. The values per question ranged from 0-4, 0-5, 0-6, or higher, depending upon the number of answers available for any particular question. The higher numbers in each answer sequence were assigned to responses that indicate behavior more typical of the mainstream society. The lower numbers were assigned answers that were indicative of separatism or a deviation from mainstream behavior. For example, in

response to the question, "What was the black/white ratio in the neighborhood where you grew up?", the weighted, coded responses were: no response or other = 0, 100% black = 1, 95% black / 5% white = 2, 70% black / 30% white = 3, 50% black / 50% white = 4, 30% black / 70% white = 5, and 5% black / 95% white = 6. Ordinal coding was used for all of the "group" variables: integration, assimilation / avoidance, socioeconomic status, and career aspirations. It will be noted later (*infra*. p. 33) that nominal coding was assigned answers to all of the general questions used in the analysis.

Three questions concerning the racial composition of the respondent's high school, the respondents' college, and the community in which he/she grew up were used to determine the degree to which one had been exposed to integration. (See appendix C for numbers of the questions designed to measure the variables for each hypothesis.) Weighted codes for responses to the questions for this variable produced integration scores ranging from a possible 4 to 16, with the higher numbers indicating greater exposure to integration.

Nine questions on each questionnaire were used as assimilation /avoidance indices. Twelve different indices were produced by the nine questions. The questions indicated personal choice on the part of the respondents and required reciprocal actions from whites to a greater extent than the questions for measuring integration. Questions for determining an assimilation/avoidance score inquired about choices concerning campus organizations, roommates, companions, dates, Greek affiliations and the adult counselor from whom the student would seek advice; awards received and community participation while in college; and finally, the respondent's opinion about minority problems. For the purpose of analysis, responses in the assimilation/avoidance category were dichotomized by black/white orientation of the activity or resource. The degree of participation in black oriented activities, i.e. the number of memberships and leadership roles held in such

organizations, were coded separately. The assessment of the respondent's opinion about minority problems included whether or not the person felt that the problems of black Americans today are basically different from those of white Americans and, if the answer was "yes", to whom the respondent attributed the difference: (1) to the majority society in America, (2) to blacks themselves and the majority society, or (3) to blacks alone.

Based on the method of weighted scoring described above, a respondent's assimilation/avoidance score ranged between 13 and 54, with high scores being toward assimilation into the white culture and avoidance of black oriented activities.

Socioeconomic status of respondents was operationalized by using five questions for enrolled students and for the alumni when they were students. The questions provide information on the student's environment while growing up, i.e. if mother only, father only, or both parents were present; the formal education of parents; occupational prestige scores of parents; estimated income level¹¹ while growing up; and the type of high school attended: public or private. Possible scores for socioeconomic status ranged from 4 to 36. Three additional questions on the alumni questionnaire were used to determine the SES of elites (EliSES). The questions included the respondent's own occupational prestige score, income level and advanced degrees earned. The possible range of scores was 4 to 16.

Of all the concepts included in determining SES and EliSES, establishing a coding scheme for occupational prestige is the one that requires further explaining. Open-ended questions were used to identify the occupations of four very different sample groups: (1) parents of the alumni when they were students some twenty years ago, (2) parents of the enrolled students, (3) the elites, and (4) the career aspirations of enrolled students. The

¹¹While the questions concerning income required a response based on continuous scales, responses were converted to discrete, ordinal scales for ease in making comparisons during the analysis.

scoring method had to be reliable over time and needed to include a wide range of jobs and occupations. For these reasons, the prestige score distributions developed by Hodge, Siegel and Rossi for use with the 1960 U.S. Census Occupational Codes seemed to be the logical choice. These distributions were updated for the 1970 listing (General Social Surveys 1972-1985: Cumulative Codebook, July 1986: 433-445. See Davis, Allen and Smith in the bibliography.) Twelve broad occupational categories are listed in the "Occupational Classification Distributions". The classifications include approximately 442 different occupations with prestige scores ranging from 9 to 82.

In conducting the analysis for this study, the responses to all open-ended questions concerning occupations were listed, then categorized according to the "Occupational Classification Distributions" and assigned corresponding prestige scores. Prestige scores were then collapsed into intervals of 10: with scores of 1-10 =1, 11-20 =2, 21-30 =3 ...71-80 =8, and 81 and above =9.

Career aspirations of enrolled students was operationalized through the use of three open-ended questions: the reason for selection of the college, actual career goal, and reason for selecting the career goal. The career goals were converted to occupational prestige scores as described above. Responses to the question concerning reasons for selection of the college were grouped under four different headings and assigned ordinal codes. (See Appendix E.) Likewise, responses to the question concerning reasons for selection of the career goal were grouped under five different headings and assigned ordinal codes. (See Appendix E.) In both instances greater weight was given to the responses that indicated an interest in prestige, money, power, and personal rewards. The score range of this variable was 3 to 23.

General information was requested through the use of additional questions on the Student and Alumni Questionnaires (note Appendix C). Responses to such questions made

it possible to compare students and alumni on data other than those specifically related to the hypotheses. The question concerning race was asked to ensure that only the responses of those who identified themselves as Black-Americans were used in the analyses. However, after reviewing the responses concerning race, they were dichotomized to differentiate between those who identified themselves as being black and those who responded "black" mixed with some other racial background.

In addition to the usual variables of gender, age, race, etc, several other questions were asked. For example, one was concerned with the presence of minority affairs personnel on campus. It was hoped that responses to this question would be useful in determining if changes have occurred in the area of support services for blacks and other minority students on the private, predominantly white campuses. A question concerning whether or not the respondent was successful in attaining the career goal decided upon while in college was included on the alumni questionnaire. Responses to most of the questions in this general category were coded by using a nominal scale.

Data Analysis

This study involves the comparison of cross-sectional sample groups: black alumni when they were students in private, predominantly white institutions, students enrolled at the same institutions when the study was conducted, and the black alumni as members of the sub-population of privileged blacks in the United States during the 1980's, i.e. black elites. (Table IV *infra*. p. 38.) Based on available literature, this is a relatively new approach to studying black student populations (see Sedlacek, 1987: 484-491).

Data analysis consisted first of developing median scores for the alumni when they were students, for the enrolled students, and for the alumni, as elites, on each of the

"group" variables. The group variables are integration (INTEG), assimilation/avoidance (ASSIM), socioeconomic status (SES), career aspirations (CarAspir) and elites' socioeconomic status (EliSES) and assimilation/avoidance (EliAssim).

The group variables are composed of "elementary" variables generated by responses to categories of questions listed in Appendix C. Since the responses were assigned discrete ordinal coding, a mean score was determined for each of the respondents on each of the group variables; the median scores were then calculated for the alumni (as students) and the enrolled students together, for testing hypothesis 1, and for the individual peer groups for all other data analysis. The responses were then dichotomized by high (Hi), when individual scores were above the median and low (Lo), when individual scores were at the mean or below.

For **Hypothesis I**, crosstabulations, with cell percentages based on responses, were run on alumni when students (representing the time period 1965 to 1975—before major advances in integration in the United States) and on the enrolled students (representing the time period 1987-1988—after the integration of major institutions in the U.S.) by their scores on integration and assimilation. (Infra. Figure 2.) Alpha was set at .1 because this is an exploratory study with a small sample size.

**Figure 2: Crosstabulation of Black Students'
Enrollment Period
And Integration Scores by Assimilation Scores**

		Time Period					
		<u>1965-1975</u>			<u>1987-1988</u>		
		Integration Scores			Integration Scores		
		Lo	Hi		Lo	Hi	
Assim. Scores	Hi	%	%		Hi	%	%
	Lo	%	%		Lo	%	%

Similarly, crosstabs were run for hypothesis 2 to measure the joint outcomes of socioeconomic status on the assimilation/ avoidance behavior of alumni when they were students with outcomes of the two variables for elites.

Figure 3: Crosstabulation of Black Alumni's SES and ASSIM Scores When They Were Students and as Elites

		Black Alumni					
		<u>As Students</u>			<u>As Elites</u>		
		SES			EliSES		
		Lo	Hi		Lo	Hi	
Assim. Scores	Hi	%	%	Hi	%	%	
	Lo	%	%	Lo	%	%	

Gamma was used to measure the ordered crosstabular association of the two sub-groups of black alumni.

Crosstabulation was used also for testing hypothesis 3. The career aspirations and assimilation scores of enrolled students were measured in a first-order table and then while controlling for socioeconomic status. Recall that in Chapter I, I state that some black students who are not from high socioeconomic backgrounds but attend private, predominantly white institutions may develop the assimilation/avoidance mode of behavior because of their high career aspirations. In testing this hypothesis, alpha was set at .1.

For the purpose of describing the two samples, frequency distributions were run on the following variables: race, gender, athletic status, Greek membership, evaluation of minority problems as being basically different, source to whom minority problems are attributed, and the listing of identity as a problem for blacks. Frequency distributions were also run on alumni success in attaining career goals and finally, on the presence of minority affairs personnel on campus.

Validity

Three factors promote confidence in the validity of the test instruments:

1. Question design.

Banton and Gordon's definitions of integration and assimilation (*supra.* p. 17) were used as a guide in formulating questions to measure these two concepts. SES was operationalized by asking questions that identified indicators described by other social scientists (*supra.* p. 15). The "career aspirations" questions rely on face validity.

2. The selection of behavioral concepts that were used in a previous study.

Lee (1954: 139) identified the "common denominator[s] of behavior and attitudes". These include housing, jobs, education, social and religious life, politics and use of public facilities. Asking subjects in the current study to describe their participation in various activities made it possible to assess behavior in the first six of the seven areas identified by Lee.

3. The "behavioristic" rather than the "mentalistic" perception of behavior was used as the basis for questions to measure this concept.

According to B. F. Skinner (1974), the behaviorist views behavior as a relationship among the organism, his anatomical and physiological characteristics and "contingencies of survival..." (228) through the evolutionary and lifetime environment. Skinner also implies that public behavior, as opposed to private, is more easily recalled because it is visible to others, can be described in terms (vocabulary) that are understood by others and, therefore, elicits reactions or stimuli from others. For these reasons, Skinner describes the reporting of current and past behavior (29) as being broadly accurate.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Before discussing results related to the four hypotheses, we will compare the general background factors concerning the samples of enrolled students and alumni. The two samples produced **three** data sets for use in studying the hypotheses. These data sets represent the time periods identified in the table below.

TABLE IV : Time Periods of Data Sets

LABEL OF DATA-SET	TIME PERIOD
Alumni when Students	Between 1961 and 1975
Currently Enrolled Students	1984 to 1988
Elites*	Approx. 1980 to 1988

*Elites are the black alumni in the study who are now considered to be part of mainstream society.

In review of information about the backgrounds of the enrolled students and alumni, important data emerged concerning the parents of the two sample groups. Since this is an exploratory study, data about the parents are presented in this chapter, and discussions are included in Chapter IV to explain how these phenomena have influenced the behavior of black students at private, predominantly white colleges.

General Background Information

Some differences and similarities are immediately apparent when background data on black students enrolled in the selected colleges in the mid-1980's is compared with the

information about black alumni when they were students in the same colleges between 1961 and 1975. Of the 101 **enrolled students** from the five schools whose responses are being used in the study, 64% are female and 36% are male. Twenty-four percent (24%) of the 42 **alumni** whose responses are used are female and 76% are male. The male/female response ratio of the alumni reflects the previously all male enrollment of four of the five institutions selected.

Ninety-six percent (96%) of the currently **enrolled students** are black Americans and 4% stated they are of black ancestry mixed with one or more other racial backgrounds. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the **alumni** identified themselves as black Americans and two percent mentioned racially mixed ancestry which includes black heritage.¹²

All four undergraduate levels are represented in the **enrolled student** sample: 37% are freshmen, 20% are sophomores, 25% are juniors and 19% are seniors. (The percentages total slightly more than 100 due to rounding.) Fifty-six percent (56%) of the currently enrolled students reported their cumulative grade point average (CGPA) to be in the "C" range, with 39% reporting theirs to be closer to a "B" or "B+". At the opposite ends of the scale, only 2% said they have attained a CGPA of "A", and 3% reported an average that is closer to being a "D" or "D+".

The **alumni**, in a manner similar to the enrolled students, reported their CGPAs in college as being closer to the ranges of "C", and "B", than at the extreme ends of the scale. No alumni gave their undergraduate CGPAs as being "A" or "D". The difference in the reporting of D averages by the enrolled students and alumni may be due to the fact that the

¹²During segregation, any persons who had black ancestry mixed with other backgrounds referred to themselves only as Negro or black. In some instances, those who were light of complexion and had straight or "silky" hair moved to another location when they became adults and passed for white. Today an increased number of black Americans of mixed heritage will mention all related ancestry when giving their race. This phenomenon could be interpreted as more evidence of assimilation.

alumni have **graduated** from the selected colleges and a "D" average does not normally qualify one for graduation.

In response to the question concerning where they lived while growing up, the enrolled students' and alumni's answers differed as follows:

Table V: Where Enrolled Students and Alumni Grew Up

Location Type	% Alumni	% Enrol. Stud.
Rural area	14.3	4.0
Small Town (up to 100,000)	28.6	26.0
Mod. Size Town (to 1,000,000)	21.4	22.0
Large City (over 1,000,000)	33.3	25.0
Suburbs	2.4	20.8%

The alumni and currently enrolled students show similar locales while growing up, with the exception of a decrease in the percentage who lived in rural areas and an increase in the percentage residing in suburbia.

Seventy percent (70%) of the **enrolled students** lived with both of their parents while growing up, 29% with the mother only and 1% with the father only. More of the **alumni**, 81%, lived with both parents while growing up. Fourteen percent (14%) lived with the mother only and 2% with the father only. The remaining 3% of alumni gave other answers or no response to this question.

With regards to education and employment, the majority of the **enrolled students** reported their mothers and fathers have completed at least some college. However, 47% of the mothers have attained the educational level of college graduate or above, while fewer

fathers, 44%, have reached the college graduate level or higher. Only 2% more fathers than mothers of enrolled students work. Although an equal percentage of the working fathers and mothers (49% each) have occupational prestige scores of 51 and above, the mothers' scores cluster in the 51 to 60 score range while the fathers' scores in the upper categories cluster in the 61 to 70 score range. Both of these score ranges include mostly white collar jobs; the latter, 61 to 70, includes higher positions in administration, education, health care and the like. The prestige of the jobs the parents hold undoubtedly accounts for 18% of the enrolled students reporting their parents income to be in the high range. See Appendix C for the estimated income amounts.

As one might expect, the educational levels, and occupational prestige scores of the **alumni's** fathers and mothers tend to be lower than those of the enrolled students' parents: 67% of the fathers and mothers of alumni attained the educational level of high school graduate or less. The median range of the occupational prestige scores for the alumni's fathers and mothers is 31 to 40 with 58% of the working men and women being at the median or below. Blue collar workers—such as truck drivers, hairdressers, and restaurant and cafeteria workers—are included in this prestige score range. The white collar jobs at this lower end of the occupational prestige score scale include cashiers, ticket agents and the like, teacher aids, therapy assistants and telephone operators. Twelve percent (12%) of the alumni, 6% less than the enrolled students, reported their parents income to be high when they were in college.

When data from the **elites** who are close in age to the parents of enrolled students are introduced, and the percentages of their occupational prestige scores and income are compared with these variables for the parents of the alumni and the parents of the enrolled students, it is obvious there has been increased participation at the upper end of both scales by the subjects in this study. Note Table VI and VII (*infra*. p. 42). This idea suggests that

the alumni when students and the enrolled students assumed the status of their parents during the time the respective student groups were growing up.

Table VI: Occupational Prestige Score Percentages

Score Range	Alumni's Parents Father/Mother	Enrol Studs' Parents Father/Mother	Elites Males & Females Combined
11-20	24% / 19%	6% / 3%	—
21-30	13% / 26%	5% / 9%	—
31-40	21% / 13%	11% / 15%	2%
41-50	26% / 16%	30% / 24%	31%
51-60	— / 23%	13% / 30%	19%
61-70	13% / 3%	21% / 14%	12%
71-80	3% / —	10% / 4%	33%
81+	— / —	6% / 1%	2%

Table VII: Income Level Percentages

Income Levels	Alumni's Parents	Enrol Studs' Parents	Elites
Low	32%	39%	10%
Medium	56%	43%	56%
High	12%	18%	34%

(Percentages in both tables are rounded.)

Tables VI and VII give evidence of the black Americans in this study moving closer to the mainstream in terms of occupational prestige and income. However, the **enrolled students'** responses showed some disparity in the black/white ratios of the neighborhoods where they grew up and the racial composition of the high schools attended. The high schools were more integrated than their communities.

**Table VIII: Comparison of Black / White Median Ratios
in Neighborhoods and High Schools**

Enrolled Students	Alumni
Neighborhood: 70% blk / 30% wht.	Neighborhood: 95% blk / 5% white
High School: 50% blk / 50 white	High School: 30% blk / 70% white

Forty-nine percent (49%) of the enrolled student respondents reported attending high schools in which white students comprised 70% or more of the total student population.

Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the **alumni** reported growing up in neighborhoods with a white population of 5% or less. Yet, 57% of the alumni reported attending high schools in which white students comprised 70% or more of the total student population. The results cited here indicate that, although they were from more segregated neighborhoods, a larger percentage of the blacks attending the five private, predominantly white colleges in the 1960's to mid-1970's were from high schools which had a higher percentage of whites, while the black students enrolled at the same colleges in the mid-

1980's are from high schools with a more equal distribution of blacks and whites.

Moreover, a larger percentage of the alumni attended public high schools. Note Table IX.

Table IX: Types of High Schools Attended

Type of High School	Percent Attended	
	Alumni	Enrol. Studs.
Public	85%	67%
Private	10%	29%
Parochial	5%	4%

Elites live in neighborhoods which have a higher percentage of whites than either of the student groups, although the time period they represent more nearly corresponds with that of the enrolled students. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the elites reported living in neighborhoods that are 70% or more white; only 29% of the enrolled students reported living in neighborhoods that are 70% or more white. Data was not collected on the racial composition or types of schools the children of the elites attend.

Assimilation/Avoidance Behavior

As stated in Chapter II, nine questions on each questionnaire were used as assimilation/avoidance behavior indices. At this point the **alumni when they were students** with **currently enrolled students** are compared on the results of their responses to some of these questions. The comparisons are begun with a review of memberships in college organizations.

Two points in Table VIII (infra. p. 45) which follows deserve special note. First, while it is obvious that the enrolled students held memberships in fewer organizations than

the alumni had when they were students, when results from the two groups were compared, 9% more of the enrolled students were members of **black-oriented** organizations. Second, and in a different category of the respondents who attended the five schools during 1961-1975, 12% more were athletes compared with students of the 1980's.

Table X: Percentage Differences in Memberships & Awards

Type Studs.	Alumni When Students	Enrol.
Member Non-Greek Campus Organizations	93%	91%
Member Non-Greek Campus Organizations Black Oriented	63%	72%
Different=Percent Members of Non-Black Oriented Organizations	30%	19%
Held Office in Non-Greek, Black Campus Organizations	36%	35%
Received Awards	36%	41%
Received Black Oriented Awards	17%	10%
Difference=Percent Receiving Non-Black Orient. Awds.	19%	31%
College Athlete	31%	19%

Sixteen percent (16%) of the **enrolled students** are members of Greek organizations and 10% of those who reported holding Greek memberships are members of traditionally white Greek organizations. It was not possible from the data collected to compare the enrolled students and alumni in terms of their Greek memberships because the data solicited do not show how many of the alumni were Greek members when they were enrolled in college or

who among them have joined graduate chapters. However, 21% of the **elites** reported that they were members of Greek organizations at the time of the study and of that number, 11% are members of traditionally white Greek organizations.

Some questions in the assimilation/avoidance category that were designed to solicit information concerning enrolled students' and alumni's personal relationships were accompanied by others which revealed some possible changes in the policies and administration of the five schools. These changes determine to some degree the opportunities or choices black students may have had to assimilate with whites. For example, 61% of the alumni when students, between 1961 and 1975, who had roommates selected their own, while only 51% of the enrolled students, 1984-1988, with roommates reported selecting their own. The 10% difference could be due to students generally not having the same privilege of roommate selection in the 80's as the students in earlier years; or the difference could be due to the inclusion of freshmen in the enrolled student sample. It is possible that first year students may not know as many of their classmates and, therefore, do not use the roommate selection privilege as frequently as sophomores, juniors and seniors.

In another example, 42% of the alumni stated there were minority affairs personnel on campus when they were in college, compared with 92% of the enrolled students who reported minority affairs personnel on the same campuses during the mid-1980's. It should be noted that "minority affairs personnel" is a position title and does not in and of itself mean that the persons assigned the title are minority group members. However, usually black students who exhibit assimilationist behavior will avoid contact with the minority affairs office because of its title and various perceptions they may have of the services of the office.

With the aforementioned changes in mind, consider the following responses which indicate the interpersonal behavior of the alumni and the enrolled students.

Table XI: Comparison of Interpersonal Relationships

Type Relationship	Alumni When Students Black/Whites	Enrolled Students Blacks/Whites
Roomed with	59% (31% possibly white, 10% both)*	35% (62% possibly white, 3% both)
Dated	97% / —**	74% / 17%
Friends ate with	65% / 15%	53% / 31%
Friends studied with	68% / 14%	56% / 30%
Adults consulted for advice	78% / 22%	81% / 19%

*The roommate question was answered with "yes" roommates were of the same racial background as the respondent or "no" they were not. "Both" and other racial backgrounds were sometimes written in; therefore, the remaining percentages are believed to be of white roommates.

**Where there are differences in the percentages recorded for each sample group and 100%, the missing percentages are for responses other than blacks and whites.

In several types of social situations, it is possible to compare the percentage responses of alumni, enrolled students and elites because identical questions were asked the members of each sample group. (Infra. p. 48)

**Table XII: Comparison of the Three Sample Groups
in Social Interactions**

Type of Interaction	Alumni When Students With Blks/Whts/Bth			Enrolled Students With Blks/Whts/Bth			Elites With Blks/Whts/Bth		
Friends Party With	75%	12%	13%	54%	24%	20%	60%	10%	22%
Friends Attended Church With	89%	4%	4%	80%	13%	4%	80%	11%	9%
Talk With Confidentially	80%	10%	10%	55%	19%	23%	66%	5%	21%
Black oriented org. membership	63% (campus)			72% (campus)			43% (community)		
Officer Black oriented organization	36% (campus)			35% (campus)			24% (community)		

Where there are differences in the percentages recorded for each sample group and 100%, the missing percentages are for responses other than black (Blk), white (Wht) and both (Bth).

Although there are fluctuations in the percentages from one activity to another, Tables XI and XII give evidence that the black Americans in this study are showing an increase in their assimilation into white society. This phenomenon is most apparent in the decrease of exclusive interactions with blacks and the increase of interactions with whites only or with whites and blacks.

Two questions were used to determine the extent to which the respondents in the study share a common ideology, that is the extent to which they have similar explanations concerning the social position of black people in the United States. (supra. p. 6.) The questions were: "Do you feel that black Americans today have problems that are basically different from those of white Americans?" and "If your answer...is yes, please tell in a few concise sentences what you see as a major problem confronting black Americans

today." Inasmuch as these were not questions which could be answered retrospectively, only responses from the enrolled students and elites are available for comparison.

Ninety-two percent (92%) of the **enrolled students** compared to 88% of the **elites** think that black Americans today do have problems that are basically different from white Americans. However, of the **enrolled students** who think the problems of blacks and whites are different, only 53% described problems of blacks that may be attributed to mainstream whites, a position believed to indicate a stronger black ideology. (surpa. pp. 6-7) Of the **elites** who said yes, 80% described problems of blacks that may be attributed to the white society. (See Appendix E, for a complete listing of the problems identified and the method used for coding them.

Results Of The Hypotheses

Finally the discussion turns to the outcomes in the study as they relate to the hypotheses. Elementary variables generated by several categories of questions, such as those described previously in the background data and assimilation/avoidance behavior sections, were formed into group variables for the analyses. Results of the four hypotheses are discussed in the order in which they were presented in Chapter II.

H₀1: The integration scores (INTEG) of black students on the selected private, predominantly white college campuses are not related to their self-reported assimilation/avoidance behavioral indices (ASSIM).

In testing this hypothesis, I controlled for time period. The alumni when students represent Time Period 1, before major steps were taken toward integrating services and institutions in the United States. The currently enrolled students represent Time Period 2, after the passage and monitoring of equal opportunity and affirmative action laws have

caused the more general integration of services and institutions. Integration, believed to provide the opportunity for assimilation, is the independent variable and assimilationist behavior is the dependent variable. In cross-tabulation using column percentages the results are as follows (note, the actual numbers are enclosed in parentheses):

Table XIII: Black Students' Integration Scores by Assimilation Scores

		Time Period					
		Alumni When Students 1961-1975			Enrolled Students 1984-1988		
		Lo		Hi	Lo		Hi
Assim. Scores	Lo	(16) 53.3%		(4) 33.3%	Lo	(34) 57.6%	(13) 31.0%
	Hi	(14) 46.7%		(18) 66.7%	Hi	(25) 42.4%	(29) 69.0%
	Totals	(40) 100.0%		(22) 100.0%		(69) 100.0%	(42) 100.0%
		Gamma = .39130			Gamma = .50420		

The data in Table XIII display a moderate association between integration and assimilation scores for both groups. Among the alumni who were students between 1961 and 1975, integration scores improve our prediction of assimilation scores by 39% over random prediction.

In the case of currently enrolled students, the association between integration and assimilation scores rises to 50%.

There is an association between the amount of integration to which students in this study have been exposed and the degree to which they have assimilated into the white society.

H_O2: The socioeconomic status of black elites (ELISES) is not related to their assimilation/avoidance behavior indices (ELIASSIM).

Socioeconomic status is the independent variable because, in this study, high SES is believed to provide the gateway for black elites to assimilate into the white society. The data for both variables were dichotomized into "high" and "low" by using the median scores as the separation point.

Table XIV: Assimilation Scores of Black Elites by SES

		Elite SES	
		Lo	Hi
Elite Assim. Scores	Lo	(16) 66.7%	(11) 61.1%
	Hi	(8) 33.3%	(7) 38.9%
Totals		(24) 100.0%	(18) 100.0%

Gamma=.12000

There appears to be only a slight association between socioeconomic status and degree of assimilation into the white society made by black elites in this study. Although gamma is small, the null hypothesis is rejected. Socioeconomic status of the black elites has a slight influence on assimilation/avoidance behavior.

H_O3: The assimilation/avoidance behavior of black students at private, predominantly white colleges in the mid 1980's is not related to the assimilation behavior of black elites in the mid-1980's.

The frequency distribution of assimilation/avoidance scores for the enrolled students and the elites show very few similarities, indicating very little if any

relationship between the assimilation behavior of the two sample groups. Data from **alumni's student** days point to greater similarity between the alumni when students and the currently enrolled students. The higher scores in the table below show a move toward assimilation into white society and avoidance of the population of blacks.

TABLE XV: Frequency Distribution of Assimilation Scores

() = actual numbers

Assimilation Scores	% of Alumni When Studs.	% Enroll Students	% of Elites
1	0%	0%	0%
2	(20) 48%	(54) 54%	(6) 14%
3	(18) 43%	(36) 36%	(21) 50%
4	(4) 10%	(11) 11%	(11) 26%
5	0%	0%	(4) 10%
Totals	101%*	101%*	100%

*(Totals more than 100% due to rounding.)

Obviously, there is a generational difference here. This generational difference is supported by the data on the alumni as students. As students, both groups are similar in their assimilation scores. As the elites have aged, and advanced in mainstream American society, they have shown **more** assimilationist behavior than they did as students.

This hypothesis was included and investigated to determine if the assimilation/avoidance behavior of black students in this study reflects the prevailing adaptive mode of the elites. (Supra. p. 22) Clearly the assimilation/avoidance behavior of the elites is **not** affecting the assimilation/avoidance behavior of the enrolled students. If

the latter were the case, the scores of the enrolled students and the elites should have a similar frequency distribution, rather than the two student groups being similar. For these reasons, the null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{O4}: The career aspirations scores (CarAspir) and assimilation/ avoidance behavioral scores (ASSIM) of black students at private predominantly white colleges are not related to their socioeconomic status (SES).

**Table XVI: Career Aspiration Scores by Assimilation Scores for
Currently Enrolled Students**

		Assimilation Scores	
		Lo	High
Career Aspiration Scores	Lo	(30) 56%	(29) 61.7%
	Hi	(24) 44%	(18) 38.3%
Totals		(54) 100%	(47) 100.0%

Gamma = -0.12621

There is an association between the assimilation and career aspirations of the enrolled students who participated in this study. However, it is a negative association: the higher the assimilation scores, the lower the career-aspiration scores of the respondents. For example, 61.7% of the enrolled students sample have high assimilation scores and low career-aspiration scores, while 44% have low assimilation scores and high career aspiration scores.

Table XVII: Enrolled Students' Assimilation Behavior and Career Aspirations While Controlling for SES

		Enrolled Students' Socioeconomic Status			
		Lo		Hi	
		Assimilation		Assimilation	
		Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi
Career Aspir	Lo	(12) 57.1%	(10) 66.7%	(18) 54.5%	(19) 59.4%
	Hi	(9) 42.9%	(5) 33.3%	(15) 45.5%	(13) 40.6%
Totals		(21) 100.0%	(15) 100.0%	(33) 100.0%	(32) 100.0%
		Gamma = -0.20000		Gamma = -0.09827	

The hypothesis is rejected because the values of the association between assimilation and career-aspiration scores are hardly changed when controlling for SES (Table XVII).

The negative association among the three variables for the student group encouraged me to do a cursory review of the median scores of the alumni when students. The alumni when students had higher career-aspiration scores than the currently enrolled students, although their median socioeconomic score was lower and their median assimilation score was the same as that of the enrolled students.

To summarize, there is an association between the experience of integration the students in this study have had and the degree to which they assimilate into white society. This is true both for the alumni when they were students and for the currently enrolled students.

The research revealed that the socioeconomic status of black elites in this study is only slightly related to their assimilation/avoidance behavior. However, among alumni when students, the currently enrolled students and the elites, black elites show the greatest assimilation behavior of the three sample groups.

The assimilation/avoidance behavior of the enrolled black students in this study is not as great as of the elites. (Supra. p. 53) Therefore, the elites are not affecting the assimilation/avoidance behavior of the currently enrolled students.

Socioeconomic status and assimilation into the white society of the United States are negatively associated with the career aspirations of the enrolled black students in this study.

CHAPTER IV: CHANGES IN STUDENT BEHAVIOR

— SOME OBSERVATIONS AND OPINIONS

This study began with the assumption that the behavior of black students on private, predominantly white campuses in the mid-1980's was different from the behavior of black students on the same campuses in the 1960's and early 1970's. The behavior of central importance to this study is the degree to which black Americans are assimilating into white society and avoiding associations with the larger population of blacks.

A look at the community organizational memberships of the two groups reveals similarities: 14% of the alumni participated in community organizations when they were students with 5% being involved in **black** oriented organizations. Among currently enrolled students, 15% of the enrolled students were active in community organizations and, again, 5% reported involvement in **black** oriented organizations in the community. It will become clear that on-campus activities reveal a greater difference in the behavior of black alumni and black currently enrolled students than the proportions show.

It is important to mention here that, prior to dissemination of the questionnaires, representatives at each of the selected institutions reported that their schools have all experienced some increase in their black student enrollment over the past ten years. This means that black students on these campuses in the 1980's have had a better chance than those in the 1960's and early 1970's to associate exclusively with other black students if they wished. Likewise, they have had a greater opportunity to associate with white students only, or with members of both races.

The alumni when students and enrolled students joined campus organizations in nearly equal percentages. However, as mentioned before, 9% more of the enrolled students than alumni when students were members of black-oriented organizations. This

phenomenon could mean a greater interest generally in joining black-oriented campus organizations by the enrolled students or it could simply mean that more of the selected schools have implemented Black Student Unions and Minority Student Organizations today than in the past. As I have reported, 50% more of the currently enrolled students indicated the presence of minority affairs personnel on their campuses than did alumni. A few currently enrolled students reported as their reason for joining the campuses' black oriented organizations the fact that they were black students. Others provided reasons related more to preference and interest.

When we consider the more personal relationships—such as with whom respondents roomed, dated and studied—enrolled students show increased interactions with members of the white student population when compared with the alumni when students. For example, no black alumni in this sample reported dating whites when they were enrolled in college, although 3% did indicate dating members of other races; 17% of enrolled students reported dating whites. Based on percentage differences in the other two behaviors, roommate selection and study partners, the assimilationist behavior of the enrolled black students is double the assimilationist behavior or interactions with whites of the alumni when students. (Refer to Table XI on page 47 .) When compared with black alumni, currently enrolled black students showed increased interactions with white students in such activities as partying, attending church and talking confidentially (see Table XII, *supra*. p. 48.)

In each of these activities, as the percentage of black interactions with whites increases, the interactions between blacks and members of the total population of blacks are decreasing. Albeit, the decreases in black interactions with each other have been smaller than the increases of assimilation into the white society.

In light of this analysis, I conclude that the assimilation/avoidance behavior of black respondents at the private, predominantly white schools used in this study differs in the 1980's from the behavior of black students in the 1960's and early 1970's. Furthermore, the changes in behavior have been toward assimilation into the white society accompanied by a gradual increase in the avoidance of the population of blacks.

Table XIII on page 50 suggests that some of the behavioral change can be attributed to the generally increased exposure to integration by black students. This has occurred not only in college but also for all the years they were growing up. This observation gives credence to the proposition that **some** black Americans, although they are the decedents of a colonized group, are following a step-wise pattern of assimilation similar to that of the immigrant groups as described by Gordon, Baton and Kitano. (Supra. p. 17). It is obvious, however, that the progress toward structural assimilation made by these colonized Americans moves at a much, much slower pace than has the pace of progress for immigrants. In future years, it will be interesting to observe if the pattern of assimilation for black Americans intensifies or if various factors cause a regression in this area.

A second, and related, issue concerns whether or not black alumni from private, predominantly white colleges show, through their behavior, that they are less supportive of the black population today than did black elite adults when they were students. The better educated, elite black adults have been very important in recognizing needs and promoting changes to benefit all in black communities. This support is still very much needed.

We have shown through Tables XII and XI show that the elites interact less with other blacks and more with whites than the alumni did when they were students. To further illustrate this point, Table XVIII shows a crosstabulation of sample group by assimilation scores.

TABLE XVIII: CROSSTABULATION OF ASSIMILATION SCORES

	Group	% Alumni When Studs	% Enroll Studs	% Elites
Assim Scores	Lo	91%	90%	64%
	Hi	10%	11%	36%
Totals		101%	101%	100%

This decline in the interactions of black elites with the black population suggests they are less supportive of the population of black Americans. This is especially clear when one considers that their behavior includes show a 9% decline in the attendance at predominately black churches (among those who attend church) and a 20% decrease in those participating in black-oriented organizations. Historically these were the types of participation were the primary means of developing leaders in the black communities.

The evidence suggests that the students enrolled in the five private, predominantly white campuses in this study will increase their assimilation/ avoidance behavior after they complete their education. This appears to be a price paid for using the more socially accepted way of functioning in mainstream America. The **enrolled students** already have higher assimilation/ avoidance scores than the alumni when they were students. See Table XV. In addition, the assimilation avoidance scores of the **elites** increased after they graduated and are 26% higher now than when they were enrolled in college. Based on these factors, the assimilation/ avoidance behavior of the enrolled students could very well grow after they have entered the job market.

Two findings in this study may negatively impact the assimilation/ avoidance behavior of enrolled black students when they leave college. First, their career aspirations are not as high as those of the alumni when students (supra. 55). The high socioeconomic

status of the parents and the assimilation into the white society that has accompanied the parents' life styles have undoubtedly contributed some to this decline. (See Tables VI and VII.)

Second, unlike the expectations at the beginning of this study, the data have shown that 50% of the enrolled black students from the five selected private, predominantly white schools elected to attend these schools because of the environment of the school and 25% chose to do so because of the combination of financial aid and the school's environment. (See Appendix F.) None of the enrolled students cited prestige of the school or its potential for future job success as a reason for selecting that particular school. While the alumni when students indicated humanitarian reasons and personal interest as their motivation for selecting the schools, 11% did mention the prestige of the school and the future financial advantages attending such a school would have for them. The evidence seems to point to the fact that the alumni, when students and as elites, have been much more career motivated than the enrolled students.

Finally, there is a **negative** association between the enrolled students' assimilation and career-aspiration scores, as illustrated in Tables XVI and XVII. In this study at least, the higher the assimilation scores of the enrolled students, the lower the career-aspiration scores. This is an important observation and one we are unable to explain at this time. But, since occupational prestige is a major component of the black elites' life style, and the enrolled students do not seem to aspire careers with the highest prestige, they may not find themselves in the types of positions that will allow them the lifestyles to be part of the sub-population of privileged black Americans in the future.

It is more obvious than ever that a much larger, inferential study will have to be conducted in order to answer more fully the question about future black elites and their impact on the total population of black Americans.

An Evaluation Of the Study

As stated in Chapter 1, one of the purposes of this study was to test the methodology for conducting a study to measure the behavior of alumni and enrolled students. One issue concerns the questionnaires especially. Although both questionnaires were rather long, none of the respondents complained about their length and all who responded answered all applicable questions.

Two questions produced minor problems: question 18, which asked the respondents to evaluate their neighborhoods in comparison to others in the same city created some confusion for the respondents; therefore, the results were not used and the question was thrown out. In a few instances, in responses to questions about the black-oriented organizations in which the respondents were members, it was not possible to tell by the title or major purpose of the organization the extent to which it was black-oriented; undeterminable answers were put in a category labeled "insufficient data" and were not used in the assimilation score average. No other questions produced problems, and they served to provide the kind of information being sought in the study.

Studies of this type are feasible. However, more formal procedures need to be established with the participating schools. For example, it would be better if the researcher could gain permission to obtain lists of alumni and enrolled students, so that direct contact with the subjects would be possible. Direct contact would give the researcher the greatest degree of control over the dissemination of the questionnaires and thus produce a more representative sample. With proper sampling techniques, an inferential rather than a descriptive study could be conducted.

Two follow-up mailings should be made to the alumni and enrolled students. The additional mailings could raise the response rate would be higher.

Finally, as with most data-generated research, this project was rather expensive and required a considerable amount of time. Therefore, a future project of this type would need to be underwritten by a grant to cover expenses and to provide staff assistance.

It is hoped that the methodology employed here has identified a new way of exploring student relationships that may be used and improved upon by other sociologists who seek answers to these and other important questions.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(1-5)

Please fill in the blanks or check the correct answer.

1. You are attending _____.
(name of college or university (7))
2. Please briefly explain your reason(s) for selecting this college or university. Print or write clearly. _____
_____.
3. Your major in college is _____.
4. Your career goal is to become a (an) _____
_____.
5. Briefly explain why you have selected this particular career objective _____
_____.
6. Your sex is: _____ male _____ female
(9) (9)
7. Your age is: _____ years.
(11-12)
8. Your race is: (14) a. _____ Black (Afro-American, Negro)
b. _____ White (not of Hispanic origin)
c. _____ Oriental (Asian or Pacific Islander)
d. _____ Hispanic (Latin American)
e. _____ American Indian or Alaskan native
f. _____ other, specify _____
9. Your classification in college is: (16) 1. _____ freshman
2. _____ sophomore
3. _____ junior
4. _____ senior
10. Your grade point average in college is closer to
(18-20) _____ A+ [4.5] _____ C+ [2.5]
_____ A [4.0] _____ C [2.0]
_____ B+ [3.5] _____ D+ [1.5]
_____ B [3.0] _____ D [1.0]

11. During the years that you were growing up you lived mostly in

1. ____ a rural area
2. ____ a small town or city (up to 100,000)
3. ____ a moderate sized town or city (up to 1,000,000)
4. ____ a large city (over 1,000,000)
5. ____ a suburb of a large city (22) _____
(leave blank)

12. When you were growing up you lived with

- (24)
1. ____ mother only
 2. ____ father only
 3. ____ both parents
 0. ____ someone other than your natural parents

If you did not live with your parents, please indicate the relationship of the person(s) with whom you lived _____.

13. The highest level of formal education achieved by your parents or guardians:

	(26) father	(28) mother
elementary school	1. _____	_____
some high school	2. _____	_____
high school graduate	3. _____	_____
some college	4. _____	_____
college graduate	5. _____	_____
graduate degree	6. _____	_____

14. Your parents or guardians occupations are:

(If the title does not indicate what the person actually does, please include a brief description following the job title. Write or print clearly.)

Father's occupation _____

Is your father self-employed ? ____ yes ____ no

(30-31) _____
(leave blank)

Mother's occupation _____

Is your mother self-employed? _____ yes _____ no

(33-34) _____
 (leave blank)

15. The best estimate of your family's total income before taxes in 1986 was

- (36-37)
- 0. _____ less than \$9,999
 - 1. _____ between \$10,000 and \$19,999
 - 2. _____ between \$20,000 and \$29,999
 - 3. _____ between \$30,000 and \$39,999
 - 4. _____ between \$40,000 and \$49,999
 - 5. _____ between \$50,000 and \$59,999
 - 6. _____ between \$60,000 and \$69,999
 - 7. _____ between \$70,000 and \$79,999
 - 8. _____ between \$80,000 and \$89,999
 - 9. _____ between \$90,000 and \$99,000
 - 10. _____ \$100,000 or more

16. Between the time you were two and your present age, the longest period of time your family spent in a single neighborhood was _____ years.
 (39)

17. The neighborhood in which you lived the longest, i.e. the one to which you referred in number 16, is located in

_____, _____
 (town or city) (state)
 (41) _____
 (leave blank)

18. In comparison to other neighborhoods in the town or city where you lived the longest, the average family income in your neighborhood seemed to be

- (43)
- 1. _____ lower than any other neighborhood
 - 2. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were lower incomes
 - 3. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods
 - 4. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were higher incomes
 - 5. _____ higher than any other neighborhood

19. The black to white ratio in the neighborhood that you lived in for the longest period of time while you were growing up was

(45) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the families were black
 2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white families
 3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
 4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
 5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
 6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black families

20. The high school that you attended was

(47) 1. _____ public 2. _____ private 3. _____ parochial

21. The black to white ratio in the high school that you attended was

(49) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the students were black
 2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white students
 3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
 4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
 5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
 6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black students

22. The black to white ratio in the college/university you are attending is

(51) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the students are black
 2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white students
 3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
 4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
 5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
 6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black students

23. Please give the following information about each campus organization of which you are now or have been a member. DO NOT include Greek organizations.

[1] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

_____ joining voluntarily
 _____ being elected by your peers
 _____ being appointed
 _____ other means, explain _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

Current status in this organization:

_____ active _____ inactive

If inactive, give reason for no longer
participating in the organization:

_____.

[2] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

_____ joining voluntarily
_____ being elected by your peers
_____ being appointed
_____ other means, explain _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

Current status in this organization:

_____ active _____ inactive

If inactive, give reason for no longer
participating in the organization:

_____.

[3] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

_____ joining voluntarily
 _____ being elected by your peers
 _____ being appointed
 _____ other means, explain _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

Current status in this organization:

_____ active _____ inactive

If inactive, give reason for no longer
 participating in the organization:

 _____.

(If more space is needed, list additional campus organizations on back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(53-54) _____
 (leave blank)

24. Please give the following information about each community organization of which you are currently a member or have been a member since entering college.

[1] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[2] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[3] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

(If more space is needed, list additional community organizations on back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(56-57) _____
(leave blank)

25. Please give the following information about any honors, awards or special recognition you have received since you have been in college. List all, not just those awarded by your college.

[1] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

[2] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

[3] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

(If more space is needed, list additional honors, awards and recognitions on the back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(59-60) _____
(leave blank)

26. Are there Greek organizations on your campus?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, are you a member of one?

_____ yes _____ no

If you are a member, please give the name of your
fraternity or sorority. _____

27. The Greek organizations on your campus are considered to be

_____ traditionally black _____ traditionally white

_____ there are both kinds on the campus

28. You are a member of

_____ a traditionally black fraternity/sorority

_____ a traditionally white fraternity/sorority

_____ no Greek organization

(62) _____
(leave blank)

29. Are you a college athlete, i.e. do you represent your school in individual or team sports?

_____ yes _____ no

30. For each of the activities listed below, indicate with whom you are most likely to be with while engaging in the activity:

1. eating in the dining hall

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone

_____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

2. studying

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone

_____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

3. partying

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone

_____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

4. going to church

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone

_____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

5. talking confidentially

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ no one

_____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

(64) _____
(leave blank)

31. Do you have a roommate?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, is he/she someone you selected for a roommate?

_____ yes _____ no

Is your roommate of the same racial background as you?

_____ yes _____ no

(66) _____
(leave blank)

32. Whom do you date most frequently?

_____ a black friend _____ a white friend _____ no one

_____ a friend of some other background, describe _____

(68) _____
(leave blank)

33. Are there minority student affairs personnel on your campus, i.e. a director of minority affairs or a dean of minority affairs?

_____ yes _____ no

34. Suppose that during the school year you were to have a problem about which your parents would not have to be told, but about which you needed advice from an older person. With whom on the following list would you discuss this problem first? Assume that all of the following are equally available to you and that the gender of the person is not an important factor. Check only one.

1. _____ a black dean, director or counselor on campus
2. _____ a black friend in the community
3. _____ a black person in the church I attend
4. _____ a white dean, director or counselor on campus
5. _____ a white friend in the community
6. _____ a white person in the church I attend

(70) _____
(leave blank)

35. Do you feel that black Americans today have problems that are basically different from those of white Americans?

_____ yes _____ no

If your answer to number 35 is yes, please tell in a few concise sentences what you see as a major problem confronting black Americans today. Use the back of this sheet. Write or print clearly.

(72) _____
(leave blank)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE !

APPENDIX B

ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE

(1-5)

Please fill in the blanks or check the correct answer.

1. You attended _____
(name of college or university (7))
from _____ to _____.
(years of attendance)
2. Please briefly explain your reason(s) for selecting this college or university. Print or write clearly.

_____.
3. Your major in college was _____.
4. Your career goal was to become a (an) _____.
5. Briefly explain why you selected this particular career objective _____
_____.
6. Did you succeed in attaining the career goal you set while
you were college? _____ yes _____ no
If no, why not? _____

_____.
7. Your sex is: _____ male _____ female
(9) (9)
8. Your age is:
(11-12)
 1. _____ 24 or less
 2. _____ between 25 and 35
 3. _____ between 35 and 40
 4. _____ between 40 and 50
 5. _____ over 50

9. Your race is:

- (14)
- a. ____ Black (Afro-American, Negro)
 - b. ____ White (not of Hispanic origin)
 - c. ____ Oriental (Asian or Pacific Islander)
 - d. ____ Hispanic (Latin American)
 - e. ____ American Indian or Alaskan native
 - f. ____ other, specify _____

10. You completed college in (i.e. the amount of time):

- (16)
- 1. ____ 3.5 years
 - 2. ____ 4.0 years
 - 3. ____ 4.5 years
 - 5. ____ 5.0 years
 - 6. ____ more than five years
 - 0. ____ did not graduate

11. Your cumulative grade point average in college was closer to

- (18-20)
- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| ____ A+ [4.5] | ____ C+ [2.5] |
| ____ A [4.0] | ____ C [2.0] |
| ____ B+ [3.5] | ____ D+ [1.5] |
| ____ B [3.0] | ____ D [1.0] |

12. During the years that you were growing up you lived mostly in

- 1. ____ a rural area
 - 2. ____ a small town or city (up to 100,000)
 - 3. ____ a moderate sized town or city (up to 1,000,000)
 - 4. ____ a large city (over 1,000,000)
 - 5. ____ a suburb of a large city
- (22) _____
(leave blank)

13. When you were growing up you lived with

- (24)
- 1. ____ mother only
 - 2. ____ father only
 - 3. ____ both parents
 - 0. ____ someone other than your natural parents

If you did not live with your parents, please indicate the relationship of the person(s) with whom you lived _____.

14. The highest level of formal education achieved by your parents or guardians:

	(26) father	(28) mother
elementary school	1. _____	_____
some high school	2. _____	_____
high school graduate	3. _____	_____
some college	4. _____	_____
college graduate	5. _____	_____
graduate degree	6. _____	_____

15. Your parents' or guardians' occupations when you were in college were:

(If the title does not indicate what the person actually did, please include a brief description following the job title. Write or print clearly.)

Father's occupation _____

Was your father self-employed? _____ yes _____ no

(30-31) _____
 (leave blank)

Mother's occupation _____

Was your mother self-employed? _____ yes _____ no

(33-34) _____
 (leave blank)

16. The best estimate of your parent's annual income while you were in college was:

(36-37)

0. _____ less than \$4,999
1. _____ between \$5,000 and \$9,999
2. _____ between \$10,000 and \$14,999
3. _____ between \$15,000 and \$19,999
4. _____ between \$20,000 and \$24,999
5. _____ between \$25,000 and \$29,999
6. _____ between \$30,000 and \$34,999
7. _____ between \$35,000 and \$39,999
8. _____ between \$40,000 and \$44,999
9. _____ between \$50,000 and \$54,999
10. _____ \$55,000 or more

17. Between the time you were two and college age, the longest period of time your family spent in a single neighborhood was _____ years.
(39)
18. The neighborhood in which you lived the longest, i.e. the one to which you referred in number 17, was located in
_____, _____
(town or city) (state)
(41) _____
(leave blank)
19. In comparison to other neighborhoods in the town or city where you lived the longest while growing up, the average family income in your neighborhood seemed to be
(43) 1. _____ lower than any other neighborhood
2. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were lower incomes
3. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods
4. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were higher incomes
5. _____ higher than any other neighborhood
20. The black to white ratio in the neighborhood that you lived in for the longest period of time while you were growing up was
(45) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the families were black
2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white families
3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black families
21. You attended high school from 19____ to 19____.
22. The high school that you attended was
(47) 1. _____ public 2. _____ private 3. _____ parochial
23. The black to white ratio in the high school that you attended was
(49) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the students were black
2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white students
3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black students

24. The black to white ratio in the college/university you attended was

- (51) 1. _____ all black: 100% of the students were black
 2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white students
 3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
 4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
 5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
 6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black students

25. Please search your memory and give the following information about each campus organization of which you were a member while you were in college. DO NOT include Greek organizations.

[1] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

- _____ joining voluntarily
 _____ being elected by your peers
 _____ being appointed
 _____ other means, explain _____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[2] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

- _____ joining voluntarily
 _____ being elected by your peers
 _____ being appointed
 _____ other means, explain _____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[3] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

You became a member by:

_____ joining voluntarily
 _____ being elected by your peers
 _____ being appointed
 _____ other means, explain _____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

(If more space is needed, list additional campus organizations on back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(53-54) _____
 (leave blank)

26. Were there Greek organizations on your campus when you were in college?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, were you a member of one?

_____ yes _____ no

If you were a member, please give the name of your
 fraternity or sorority. _____

27. The Greek organizations on your campus were considered to be

_____ traditionally black _____ traditionally white

_____ there were both kinds on the campus

28. You were (are) a member of

_____ a traditionally black fraternity/sorority
 _____ a traditionally white fraternity/sorority
 _____ no Greek organization

(56) _____
 (leave blank)

29. Were you a college athlete, i.e. did you represent your school in individual or team sports?

_____ yes _____ no

- 30 Please give the following information about each community organization of which you were a member while in college.

[1] Name of the organization_____

Major purpose:_____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[2] Name of the organization_____

Major purpose:_____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[3] Name of the organization_____

Major purpose:_____

Did you hold an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

(If more space is needed, list additional community organizations on back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(58)_____

(leave blank)

31. For each of the activities listed below, indicate with whom you were most likely to be while engaging in the activity during your college days.

1. eating in the dining hall

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone
 _____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

2. studying

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone
 _____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

3. partying

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone
 _____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

4. going to church

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ alone
 _____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

5. talking confidentially

_____ black friends _____ white friends _____ no one
 _____ friends of other backgrounds, describe _____

(60) _____
 (leave blank)

32. Did you have a roommate while in college?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, was he/she someone you selected for a roommate?

_____ yes _____ no

Was your roommate of the same racial background as you?

_____ yes _____ no

(62) _____
(leave blank)

33. While in college whom did you date most frequently?

_____ a black friend _____ a white friend _____ no one
_____ a friend of some other background, describe _____

(64) _____
(leave blank)

34. Were there minority student affairs personnel on your campus,
i.e. a director of minority affairs or a dean of minority
affairs?

_____ yes _____ no

35. Suppose that during the school year while you were in college you had a problem
about which your parents did not have to be told but about which you needed
advice from an older person. With whom on the following list would you have
discussed this problem first? Assume that all of the following were equally
available to you and that the gender of the person was not an important factor.
Check only one.

1. _____ a black dean, director or counselor on campus
2. _____ a black friend in the community
3. _____ a black person in the church I attended
4. _____ a white dean, director or counselor on campus
5. _____ a white friend in the community
6. _____ a white person in the church I attended

(66) _____
(leave blank)

36. Please list any advanced degrees you have completed:

(66) 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

37. Your occupation/profession is:

(If the title does not indicate what you actually do, please
include a brief description following the job title. Write
or print clearly.) _____

Self employed? _____ yes _____ no

(68) _____
(leave blank)

38. Are you married? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, does your spouse work?

_____ yes _____ no

39. The best estimate of your or your total family's income before taxes in 1986 was

- (70-71)
0. _____ less than \$9,999
 1. _____ between \$10,000 and \$19,999
 2. _____ between \$20,000 and \$29,999
 3. _____ between \$30,000 and \$39,999
 4. _____ between \$40,000 and \$49,999
 5. _____ between \$50,000 and \$59,999
 6. _____ between \$60,000 and \$69,999
 7. _____ between \$70,000 and \$79,999
 8. _____ between \$80,000 and \$89,999
 9. _____ between \$90,000 and \$99,000
 10. _____ \$100,000 or more

40. You currently live in

1. _____ a rural area
 2. _____ a small town or city (up to 100,000)
 3. _____ a moderate sized town or city (up to 1,000,000)
 4. _____ a large city (over 1,000,000)
 5. _____ a suburb of a large city
- (73) _____
(leave blank)

41. Your current home is located in

_____, _____
(town or city) (state)

42. In comparison to other neighborhoods in the town or city where you live, the average family income in your neighborhood seems to be

- (75)
1. _____ lower than any other neighborhood
 2. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were lower incomes
 3. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods
 4. _____ about equal to all other neighborhoods except one and in it there were higher incomes
 5. _____ higher than any other neighborhood

43. The black to white ratio in the neighborhood in which you currently live is

- (77)
1. _____ all black: 100% of the neighbors are black
 2. _____ almost all black: 5% or fewer white neighbors
 3. _____ mostly black: not more than 30% white
 4. _____ fairly evenly mixed: approximately 50/50 black and white
 5. _____ mostly white: not more than 30% black
 6. _____ almost all white: 5% or fewer black neighbors

44. For each of the activities listed below, indicate with whom you are most likely to be while engaging in the activity.

1. having lunch

_____ black colleagues _____ white colleagues _____ alone

_____ members of another race, identify _____

2. working

_____ black colleagues _____ white colleagues _____ alone

_____ members of another race, identify _____

3. partying

_____ black colleagues _____ white colleagues _____ alone

_____ members of another race, identify _____

4. in attendance at the church of your choice

_____ black colleagues _____ white colleagues _____ alone

_____ members of another race, identify _____

5. talking confidentially

_____ black colleagues _____ white colleagues _____ alone

_____ members of another race, identify _____

(79) _____
(leave blank)

45. Please give the following information about each community, political and professional organization of which you are currently a member. Write or print clearly.

[1] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[2] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

[3] Name of the organization _____

Major purpose: _____

Do you hold or have you held an office in this organization?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, give title of office held:

(If more space is needed, list additional organizations on back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(81-82) _____
(leave blank)

46. Please give the following information about any honors, awards or special recognition you have received in recent years.

[1] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

[2] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

[3] Name of the award or honor _____

Purpose or type _____

Given by (name of organization) _____

(If more space is needed, list additional honors, awards and recognitions on the back or attach an extra sheet. Please remember to give all information requested about each.)

(84-85) _____
 (leave blank)

47. Do you feel that black Americans today have problems that are basically different from those of white Americans?

_____ yes _____ no

If your answer to number 47 is yes, please tell in a few concise sentences what you see as a major problem confronting black Americans today. Use the back of this sheet. Write or print clearly.

(87) _____
 (leave blank)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

APPENDIX C

Questions Designed to Measure Variables for Each Hypothesis

Variable: Assimilation/Avoidance Behavior

Question Number on Student	/	Alumni Questionnaire	Subject
23		25	campus organizations —purpose and degree of participation in black oriented ones
24		30	black oriented comm. organizations while in college
25		46	black oriented honors, etc. received
28		28	Greek affiliation
30		31	choice of companions, etc. while in college
31		32	choice of roommate
32		33	choice of college dates
34		35	choice of adult counselor
35		47	current opinion about minority problems
		44	choice of adult friends, colleagues
		45	memberships as an adult

Variable: Career Aspirations

2	2	reason for selection of college
4	4	prestige score of career goal
5	5	why career choice

Variable Integration

19	20	blackwhite ratio of community while growing up
21	23	of high school
22	24	of college

Variable: Socioeconomic Status

12	13	lived with while growing up
13	14	formal education of parents
14	15	parents' occupation
15	16	estimate of family income while in college

Question Number on Student	/	Alumni Questionnaire	Subject
20		22	type of high school attended
		36	advanced degrees
		37	own occupation prestige score
		39	current income

Variable: General Background Information

	6	success in attaining career goal
6	7	gender
7	8	age
8	9	race
9		classification
	10	time in college
10	11	GPA in college
16	17	years in one place
17	18	name of city, state where grew up
	21	dates in years of high school attendance
26	26	Greek organization
27	27	type on campus
29	29	college athlete?
33	24	minority aff. pers.
	38	married or single
	41	location now living

APPENDIX D

Income Levels

The low, medium and high categories were set for this particular group of respondents and do not reflect the **actual** economic levels during either time period.

Income Scale for the Parents of the Currently Enrolled Students and for Elites (Time Period: 1980's)		Income Scale for the Parents of Alumni When the Alumni Were Students (Time Period: Approximately 1961 to 1975)	
1 Low	1 = Less than \$ 9,999		1 = Less than \$ 4,999
	2 = \$10,000 - \$19,999		2 = \$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999
	3 = \$20,000 - \$29,999		3 = \$10,000 - \$14,999
2 Medium	4 = \$30,000 - \$39,999		4 = \$15,000 - \$19,999
	5 = \$40,000 - \$49,999		5 = \$20,000 - \$24,000
	6 = \$50,000 - \$59,999		6 = \$25,000 - \$29,000
	7 = \$60,000 - \$69,999		7 = \$30,000 - \$34,999
3 High	8 = \$70,000 - \$79,999		8 = \$35,000 - \$39,999
	9 = \$80,000 - \$89,999		9 = \$40,000 - \$44,999
	10 = \$90,000 - \$99,999		10 = \$45,000 - \$49,999
	11 = \$100,000 or more		11 = \$50,000 or more

APPENDIX E

**Problems of Black Americans Identified as
Being Basically Different from Those of White Americans**

The responses to the questions were assigned codes based on to whom the basic problems of Black Americans seemed to be attributed by the respondent. It should be noted that the coding of individual responses took into consideration the context of the whole statement, which in some instances included more than one of the examples listed below. The table includes responses from both the Student and Alumni Questionnaires. While members of both groups identified many of the same problems, those responses followed asterisks were given by elites (i.e. alumni) only.

Problems Attributable to Blacks Themselves (code = 4)

- Lack of Cohesion, disunity of the black race; self-destructiveness
- Class development, with those who have made it forgetting their roots and other blacks
- Experiencing the scorn of other blacks, being labeled "not black enough" and having "sold out"; segregation among blacks
- Not accepting the fact that there are problems and acting to solve them; complacency
- Feeling the necessity to integrate into the white society rather than feeling they are already a part of a society
- Having a complex about racism, thinking that any act against them is racist
- The need for more black mothers to show an interest in their children's schooling
- The need for more black leaders
- Poor use of the English language
- A lack of motivation*
- A lack of determination to make things happen*

Problems Attributable To The White Majority and The Black Sub-Culture (code = 3)

- Drugs, poverty, unemployment and the refusal of black males to face responsibilities; teenage pregnancies
- Negative images on T.V.
- Feelings of inferiority / low self-esteem
- The feeling that white America "owes" black America something. "It's time to get over this. We must deal with the situation **that we've been put in.**" (Emphasis mine.)
- Assimilation into white society

Problems Attributable To The White Majority (code = 2)

- Blacks having to deal with the misconceptions of whites; stereotyping of blacks
- Racial prejudice and discrimination
- Lack of opportunities, inequality; economic differences
- Blacks have to work harder than whites for the same recognition / successes; living up to white standards
- Seeking identity in American society / not losing [black] identity while becoming integrated into the predominantly white society
- Poor or low self image (stated in a different context from the references to images, etc listed under code 3.)
- Blacks being educationally disadvantaged
- The ignorance of whites about black history, culture and contributions; the continuation of their ignorance by not correcting literature and other textbooks
- The legacy of slavery
- Racism never being truly addressed
- The lack of acceptance by whites
- An invisible ceiling that restricts blacks from moving into the upper echelons of corporate America*
- Lack of opportunities for good jobs / opportunities too limited and selective*
- Blacks being required to prove themselves*
- Structural segregation: lack of equal access to decision makers, not being able to know the right people for getting ahead*
- Working in isolation in the professional world*
- Just "being black in America"*

Insufficient Data To Determine To Whom Problem Is Attributable As Stated In The Response (code = 1)

- Differences in attitudes toward life
- Lack of role models
- Low wages resulting in a lack of adequate housing, nourishment, medical attention and other basics of life
- Mental and economic dependency on white America
- Adjusting to the environment at predominantly white colleges
- Defining an "Afrocentric point of view that we as Black-Americans must fight to uphold in this Eurocentric world. . ."
- Double discrimination of the black female
- Blacks' perceptions of themselves and of others
- Need for change, lack of knowledge about how to go about attaining it
- Reverse discrimination—too much attention to blacks and others feeling cheated as a result of it
- Uncertainty about whether opportunities granted are due to merit or are because of affirmative action policies
- Problems are similar for blacks and whites, but fewer solution options are available to blacks

APPENDIX F**Reasons for Selecting the College**

Prestige of School (weighted code = 9)

- Academic reputation of the school
 - The particular college was presumed to be of an advantage in gaining entry to professional school or a profession
 - It was a predominantly white college
 - It was considered to be a good school for the selected area of study
-

Financial Aid / Scholarship Awarded (weighted code = 7)

- (self explanatory)
-

Environmental Factors (weighted code = 3)

- Faculty to student ratio; size of student body
 - Geographical location; proximity to home—close or far
 - Beautiful campus
 - Social climate observed during visit
-

Other Miscellaneous Reasons (weighted code = 1)

- Church affiliation of the school
 - The school's use of an honor system
 - On the advice of friends
 - Because of the respondent's sports interest
 - Only school where the respondent was accepted
 - Respondent's previous affiliation through work
 - The results of poor planning
-

APPENDIX G**Reason for Selection of the Career Goal**

Prestige, etc (code = 5)

- Prestige
- Good pay, money
- Offers the best opportunities where I plan to live
- Upward mobility inherent in the career/profession
- Desire for a decision making, powerful position

Ability (code = 4)

- Respondent reported making the best grades in the subject area while in high school
- Talent or a strong background in the chosen area

Interest (code = 3)

- Respondent reported being interested in some aspect of the career/profession
- Self fulfillment

Humanitarian Reasons (code = 2)

- Love for home state
- Desire to help others
- Concern for the state of Black America
- To aid the recipients of the service from the particular occupation/profession
- Desire to shape an aspect of American culture

Other Miscellaneous Reasons (code = 1)

- Influenced by members of the chosen profession, either directly or indirectly
 - Desire for adventure
 - Challenges of the job
 - Family influences / father's occupation
 - Flexibility in the job market
-

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Walter. "Black Students' Academic Performance, Satisfaction With College Higher at Black Institutions." Rev. of "Gender and Campus Race Differences in Black Student Academic Performance, Racial Attitudes and College Satisfaction," by Allen. Black Issues in Higher Education. 1 June, 1986:1+.
- Allen, Walter R. "Trends and Prospects in the Higher Education of Black Americans." Conference, International Sociological Association. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. 1986.
- Arbeiter, Solomon. "Black Enrollments." Change, The Magazine of Higher Learning. May/June 1987.
- Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. California: Wadsworth. 1973.
- Banton, Michael. Race Relations. London: Tavistock Publications. 1967. •
- Blau, Peter M. Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press. 1977.
- Bohrnstedt, George W. and David Knoke. Statistics for Social Data Analysis. Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. 1982.
- Bottomore, T. B. Elites And Society. Maryland: Penguin Books. 1964.
- Bottomore, Tom, ed. Crisis and Contention in Sociology. London and California: Sage Publications Ltd. 1975.
- Bottomore, Tom et al, eds. A Dictionary of Marxist Thought. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1983.
- Brown, Shirley Vining. Minorities in the Graduate Education Pipeline. A Research report of the Minority Graduate Education (MGE) Project. Educational Testing Service. 1987.
- Carter, Ann L. "Black Americans and Education: An Historical Perspective." Journal of NAWDAC Winter (1979): 14-39.
- Cheatham, Harold E. "Equal Access: Progress or Retrogression." Journal of Student Personnel May 1986: 202-204.
- Conley, Joy. "Poussaint: Subtle Racism Still Exists." Black Issues in Higher Education 1 Apr. 1986:6.
- Davis, J. A., and A. Borders-Patterson. Black Students in Predominately White North Carolina Colleges and Universities. Research Report 2. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

- Davis, James Allen and Smith, Tom W.: General Social Surveys, 1972-1985. [machine readable data file]. Principal Investigator, James A. Davis; Senior Study Director, Tom W. Smith. NORC ed. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, producer, 1985; Storrs, CT: Roper Public Opinion Research Center, University of Connecticut, distributor. 1 data file 18586 logical records and 1 codebook (554p.).
- Downie, N. M. and A. R. Starry. Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. New York: Harper and Row. 1977.
- Evans, Gaynelle. "Colleges Say Black Students' Lack of Interest Has Led to Athrophy of Minority Affairs Units." The Chronicle of Higher Education. April 1986: .
- _____. "Fact-File: Racial and Ethnic Makeup of College and University Enrollments." The Chronicle of Higher Education 23 July, 1986: 25-34.
- Fleming, Jacqueline. Blacks In College: A Comparative Study of Students' Success in Black and in White Institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1984.
- Fleming, Jacqueline. "Black Retention Mandates Connection to Environment." Review of "Minorities In College: Issues in Recruitment and Retention," Speech by Jacqueline Fleming. Black Issues in Higher Education 1 Apr. 1986:2
- Frazier, E. Franklin. Black Bourgeoisie: The Rise of a New Middle Class in the United States. 1957 New York: The Free Press (Collier Books) 1966.
- Freeman, Richard B. Black Elite: The New Market for Highly Educated Black Americans (A Report Prepared for The Cargeie Commission on Higher Education). New York, etc.: McGraw-Hill Book Company 1976.
- Gershman, Carl and Kennith B. Clark. "Race Vs Class". The New York Times Magazine Section. 5 Oct. 1980.
- Gibbs, J. T. "Patterns of Adaptation Among Black Students at a Predominantly White University." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 44 (1974): 728-740.
- Golden, Patricia M. The Reseach Experience. Illinois: F. E. Peacock. 1976.
- Gordon, Milton M. Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity. New York: Oxford Press 1978.
- Grevious, Carole. A Comparison of Occupational Aspirations of Urban Black College Students." The Journal of Negro Education 54.1 (1985): 35-42.
- Hurst, Charles E. "Race, Class, and Consciousness*" American Sociological Review 37 (1972): 658-670.
- Kilson, Martin. "The Black Bourgeoisie Revisited." Dissent 30 (1983): 85-96.
- Kitano, Harry H. L. Race Relations. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Printice Hall. 1980
- Kluegel, James R. "The causes and Cost of Exclusion From Job Authority." American Sociological Review 43 (1978): 285-301.

- Lee, Frank F. "The Race Relations Pattern By Areas of Behavior in a Small New England Town." American Sociological Review 19 (1954): 138-143.
- Lieberson, Stanley and Donna K. Carter. "Making it in America: Differences Between Eminent Blacks and White Ethnic Groups." American Sociological Review 44 (1979): 347-366.
- Matney, William C. ed. Who's Who Among Black Americans, 5 Edition. Lake Forest, Illinois: Educational Communications, Inc. 1988
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. London: Oxford University Press. 1956.
- Morris, Aldon D. The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement. New York: Free Press. 1984.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma, The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy Volumn II. New York: Harper and Row. 1944.
- Newman, William M. American Pluralism: A Study of Minority Groups and Theory. New York: Harper & Row. 1973.
- Nisbet, Robert A. Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development. New York: Oxford University Press. 1969
- Osberg, Lars. Economic Inequality in the United States. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc. 1984
- Parsons, Talcott and Kenneth B. Clark, eds. The Negro American. 1965 Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- Pruitt, Anne S. ed. In Pursuit of Equality in Higher Education. New York: General Hall, Inc. 1987.
- Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr., ed. Racism and Inequality: The Policy Alternatives. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co. 1975.
- Ruffin, Robert P. "Black Students at White Universities Identify Conflicts Attributed to Cultural Adaptations." First Annual Conference of the Benjamin E. Mays Academy of Scholars. Green Tree Marriott Hotel, Pittsburgh, 27-28 of October. 1986. (Personal correspondence to investigator.)
- Sedlacek, William E. and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. Racism in American Education: A Model for Change. 1976. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1978.
- Sedlacek, William E. "Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research". Journal of College Student Personnel, 28.6 (1987): 448 - 495.
- Sinclair, William A. The Aftermath of Slavery. 1905. New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1969.

- Simpson, George Eaton and J. Milton Yinger. Racial and Cultural Minorities: an Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination. 4th. ed. New York: Harper & Row. 1972.
- Smith, Donald H. Admission and Retention Problems of Black Students at Seven Predominantly White Universities. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1980:5.
- Smith, Donald H. "Social and Academic Environments of Black Students on White Campuses." Journal of Negro Education, 50 (1981): 299-306.
- Skinner, B. F. About Behaviorism. 1974 New York. Vintage Books 1976.
- Taylor, Charles A. "Blacks on Predominantly White Campuses in the 1980's." Journal of College Student Personnel May 1986: 196-201.
- Thompson, Daniel C. A Black Elite: A Profile of Graduates of UNCF Colleges. New York: Greenwood Press. 1986.
- Thompson, Edgar T. and Everett C. Hughes, eds. Race: Individual and Collective Behavior. Illinois: The Free Press. 1958.
- Thiers, Naomi. "Education Report on Black Students Disputed". Guidepost American Association for Counseling and Development. 30.6 29 Oct. 1987. 1+
- van den Berghe, Pierre L. The Ethnic Phenomenon. New York: Elsevier. 1981.
- van den Berghe, Pierre L. Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1970.
- Webster, Murray, Jr. and James E. Driskell, Jr. "Status Generalization: a Review of Some New Data." American Sociological Review 43 (1978): 220-236.
- Weeks, John R. Population and Introduction to Concepts and Issues 3rd ed. California: Wadsworth. 1986.
- Willie, C. V. and A. McCord, eds. Black Students At White Colleges. New York: Prager. 1972.
- Wilson, Julius Wilson. The Declining Significance of Race, Blacks and Changing American Institutions. Illinois: The University of Chicago Press. 1978.
- Wright, Olin Erik, et al. "The American Class Structure." American Sociological Review, 47 (1982): 709-726.
- Wynn, Daniel W. The Black Protest Movement. New York: Philosophical, Inc. 1974.
- _____. "Election Social." Time. Nov. 1986:n. pag.