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Black students now have a choice of predominantly Black or integrated colleges. This investigation is concerned with the possible differences between Black students at these two types of institutions. It was hypothesized that these two student groups differ significantly in socio-economic status, social mobility expectations, and type of orientation in regard to choice of school.

All information concerning the students' present status, projected status, and type of orientation was obtained from questionnaires mailed to all Black seniors at a predominantly Black school (Bishop College in Dallas, Texas) and administered to all Black seniors at an integrated institution (North Texas State University in Denton, Texas). The total population consisted of 264 Black students, 149 from the Black college and 115 from the integrated institution.

Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was used to measure socio-economic status. This index, which utilizes education and occupation, was also used to compute the students' projected status position. The students whose projected position was one class higher than their present position had medium mobility expectations, while those whose
projected position was two classes higher than the present position had high expectations. The upper class was removed from both populations in the tests concerning mobility expectations, since there was not a class for them to move up to.

Chi-Square (or Fisher's Exact Test when Chi-Square could not be employed) was used to determine whether the observations were significantly different from chance. Goodman's Gamma was used to determine the degree of association between status and mobility expectations. The .05 level of significance was used throughout the study.

The hypothesis that Black students at integrated and predominantly Black schools differ by socio-economic status, i.e., that more upper and middle status students attend integrated institutions, was supported.

Two assertions were contained in the hypothesis concerning mobility expectations: first, that there is a positive relationship between status and mobility expectations; and second, that there is a significant difference between the mobility expectations of the two groups of students.

Only a moderate degree of association (.616113) was found between the two variables in the population from the integrated school. It was even less (.252707) for the other group of students. The hypothesis that there is a statistically significant difference between the mobility expectations of the two groups of students was supported using a one-tailed Chi-Square.
Parsons' instrumental and expressive orientations proved useful in viewing the Black students' subjective reasons for choice of school. The students at the predominantly Black school had expressive orientations, while those at the integrated institution had instrumental orientations. Since the Chi-Square value indicated that the observations were significant, the hypothesis that the two groups of students differ by type of orientation was supported.

In summary, these student groups differ in socio-economic status, degree of mobility, and type of orientation. Additional research in this area is warranted and should be undertaken to gain more knowledge about the Black subculture.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Patterns of Discrimination

Discrimination and segregation of Blacks in the United States has been so inclusive that it persists today. According to most historical accounts, the first Blacks in Colonial America landed at Jamestown in 1619.\footnote{Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York, 1968), p. 207.} They became separated from the rest of the population within forty years, and were treated as servants for life, deprived of their African traditions, yet denied the privileges and even the most elementary of human rights enjoyed by Whites.

The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 only physically freed Blacks from slavery. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth Amendments were adopted to give Blacks the right to vote and the promise of equality, but the inferior position of Blacks was so institutionalized in the social structure that the Blacks' struggle to obtain full freedom was met with both open hostility and legal maneuvers, such as suffrage provisions in Post Reconstruction state constitutions designed to disenfranchise Blacks.
Although segregation of Blacks from Whites was an established way of life, it was not supported by law until 1896 when the Supreme Court upheld the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of separate but equal. Blacks were confronted with segregation and discrimination in all aspects of living: in public institutions such as schools, hospitals, and churches, in public transportation, courthouses, restrooms, restaurants, housing, and voluntary associations.

Thus segregation penetrated every area of the Black man's life. The social, economic, and educational costs of such an inclusive pattern of racial segregation have been great. Although some improvements in the Black man's status have been made, the results of past discrimination and segregation still exist. For example, the median income for Black families in 1968 was $5,590, while the median income for White families in the same year was $8,937. The median income for White families increased $5,780 from 1947 to 1968. The increase for Blacks during this period was $3,976. The median school years completed in 1947 was 8.4 for Blacks aged 25-29. This figure had risen to 12.2 in 1969. Although this represented considerable increase, it still was below the median of 12.6 years of school for Whites.  

\[2\text{Ibid., pp. 209-216.}\]

The major milestones ending segregation in higher education and all major public sectors were the 1954 Supreme Court decision, the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1964, and the Voters Right Act of 1965. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act required that all public institutions of higher learning sign an Assurance of Compliance with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By the beginning of 1966, all but one institution had signed. \(^4\) A major development in this "desegregation era" (roughly from 1948 to 1966) was assistance, both educational and financial, to a large number of predominantly Black institutions. There has been and is a paradox in operation: strengthening predominantly Black institutions and at the same time opening the doors of predominantly White institutions to Black students. \(^5\)

The Choice Open to Black Students

Black students seeking higher education now have a choice; they can attend either a predominantly Black institution, or an integrated one. An intriguing question is why some Black students choose to attend predominantly Black institutions, and others choose integrated ones. One wonders whether these two groups of students have differing characteristics.


Predominantly Black colleges and universities are often considered inferior, both in academics and in morale. Lower Black schools, which often have sub-standard textbooks and equipment, produce inferior students, and the cumulative effect of the lower Black school intensifies the scholastic problems of the predominantly Black college or university. An inevitable occurrence in almost any racially segregated lower-status institution is the lowering of morale. Most individuals who have been rejected, segregated, and excluded by society at large are occasionally, if not frequently, faced with doubts about their worth, gnawing feelings of inferiority, and an overall poor self-concept. Yet some Black students still choose to attend these allegedly inferior institutions, even though they are now easily admitted into, and often recruited for, integrated colleges and universities.

Factors Affecting Students' Choice of Black or Integrated Institutions of Higher Learning

The present study attempts to explore the differences and similarities between Black students who chose an integrated institution, and Black students who chose a predominantly Black college. The factors considered are socio-economic status, social mobility expectations, and

subjectively stated reasons for attending a predominantly Black or integrated institution.

**Socio-Economic Status**

One of the best documented explanatory variables in the field of sociology is the relationship between socio-economic rank and attitudes, values, and behavior. In a sense, socio-economic rank dictates the kind of car a person drives, his child-rearing practices, how he votes, what type of mental illness he has, whether or not leisure time is spent participating in voluntary associations, whether he prefers baseball to football, and numerous other aspects of social behavior.  

Socio-economic rank is also related to education. Middle and upper status individuals tend to value education more than lower status individuals do, and consequently place greater emphasis upon the importance of obtaining higher education. It is hypothesized in this study that socio-economic status plays an important part in the Black student's choice of whether to attend an integrated school or a predominantly Black one.

Some authors believe that upper and middle status Blacks identify predominantly with middle status Whites,

---

*See Louis Kriesberg, "The Relationship Between Socio-economic Rank and Behavior," Social Problems, X (Spring, 1963), 334-335; and Chapter III in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Lispet, editors, Class, Status and Power (New York, 1965), 271-359, which contains articles by various authors who have studied differential class behavior.*
and internalize their goals and values to a greater extent than do lower status Blacks. In *Black Bourgeoisie*, Frazier asserts that middle status Blacks have become "exaggerated" Americans because they attempt to conform to the values and behavior of the White community in the most minute details.\(^8\) Parker and Kleiner's study supports Frazier's thesis. Their study, which put Frazier's contention into the wider context of reference group theory, investigated the relationship between the status position and ethnic identification of Blacks, and between ethnic identity and mobility. Their results led Parker and Kleiner to conclude that higher ranked Blacks, as compared to lower ranked Blacks, have values that are more similar to the values of the White middle class, and have stronger desires to associate with Whites.\(^9\)

The values internalized by upper and middle status Blacks include getting a "good" education. This includes attending a White college, since Black colleges are considered inferior. Therefore, it is hypothesized that there are more middle and upper status Black students at integrated institutions as a result of the Black students' and their parents' internalization of the values and goals of White

---


middle class society and their stronger desire to associate with Whites.

Research has shown that socio-economic rank is also positively related to social mobility expectations and aspirations. It has been found that middle status students expect additional schooling and higher status positions, and desire these to a greater extent than do lower status students. A large part of the literature suggests that lower status White individuals have lower aspirations and upper status individuals have higher aspirations. However, in the case of social status and aspirations of Black lower status youths, some investigators have found relatively high aspirations. These, however, were aspirations, not expectations. Lower status Black youths in one study, for example, had high aspirations but were a distinct minority in the academic programs preparing students for college at their schools. If they had been questioned as to what they actually expected to do, the results might well have been significantly different.


Despite the evidence presented above that lower status Black youths have relatively high aspirations, a positive relationship between mobility expectations and socio-economic status is expected between students at both Black and integrated colleges. The differences by socio-economic status would probably be small since it can be inferred that both the lower and middle status students are upwardly mobile as they are seeking a college degree.

Reference Group Theory

Reference group theorists maintain that there are groups that individuals use as their frame of reference. A person may belong to this reference group or groups or may be a non-member. Merton identifies several types of reference groups. The group to which an individual compares himself is his comparative reference group. The same individual may describe himself as belonging to a particular group which Merton terms his descriptive reference group. An individual may also use a group that he is not a member of; but desires to belong to, as his frame of reference.\(^{12}\) Kemper asserts that reference group theory is almost devoid of real theory, and at best represents only a concept. He identifies three types of reference groups: normative groups, whose functions are to assign individuals to roles and to specify standards;

comparison groups to provide a basis for satisfaction with one's fate, legitimize actions and opinions, show how roles should be played, and to provide a basis of accommodation to the behavior of others; and audience groups which create pressure for achievement. Kemper's contention is that all three types of reference groups are necessary in the socialization process for the realization of individual potential. Although there are many classifications of reference groups, the present study will deal with what Kelly has defined as the normative reference group, i.e., that group in which an individual holds membership, and which articulates the standards which he follows. One of the major functions of reference groups is to set and enforce standards (group norms) for the individuals in the group.

It has been empirically established that students frequently have aspirations and/or expectations similar to the normative aspirations and/or expectations found within their group. The reference group modifies the attitudes of the members. This has been demonstrated within a school setting; Wilson found that expectations of students of a particular socio-economic status varied with the overall socio-economic


status of the school. The lower status students who attended upper status schools had social mobility expectations that had a greater similarity to the expectations of the upper status students. In addition, the upper status students attending lower status schools had relatively low expectations, similar to the lower status students. Group expectations served as an intervening variable between socio-economic status and mobility expectations with the students conforming to the normative reference group standards within their school setting, modifying the effect of their socio-economic status.

Earlier it was argued that integrated schools are middle or upper status schools when compared to predominantly Black ones. If students conform to the standards set by their normative reference groups, i.e., their school settings, Black students at integrated schools will have higher social mobility expectations because their values have become more like those of their normative reference group.

Subjective Reasons for Attending a Black or Integrated School

Bradley maintains that Black students choose to attend integrated state institutions because they have no real choice, i.e., that the integrated schools are less expensive than alternative options.

16 Ibid.
than Black and White private schools, and offer more and better educational opportunities. However, it might be argued that Black students who choose to attend predominantly Black institutions and those who choose integrated ones have different orientations to goals.

In formulating theories in *Working Papers in the Theory of Action*, Parsons and his associates used the terms "instrumental" and "expressive" to indicate "broad trends of 'directionality' on the orientation of action." An instrumental orientation is concerned with the attainment of specific goals as related to adaptive exigencies, whereas an expressive orientation is concerned with the direct acting out of a need disposition, i.e., a search for immediate and direct gratification of needs without regard to goals requiring adaptive manipulation.

This differentiation was developed in relation to parental roles, but will be used differently here. Parsons and Bales theorized that the basic role structure of the nuclear family was one of instrumental superiority (father),


19Ibid.
expressive superiority (mother), instrumental inferiority (son), and expressive inferiority (daughter). The distinctions are interpreted as differentiations of function.\(^ {20}\)

Parsons clarifies the distinction further by stating that

\[ \ldots \text{instrumental function concerns relations of the system to its situation outside the system, to meeting the adaptive conditions of its maintenance of equilibrium, and 'instrumentally' establishing the desired relations to external goal-objects. The expressive area concerns the 'internal' affairs of the system, the maintenance of integrative relations between the members, and regulations of the patterns and tension levels of its component units.} \(^ {21}\) \]

Zelditch simplifies this differentiation of roles by stating that instrumental leadership in the family unit is primarily concerned with task achievement, while expressive leadership is concerned with emotionally supportive behavior.\(^ {22}\)

This ideal type, identifying major axes of role differentiation, can be useful in viewing the subjective aspects of choice of a college by Black students. It might be expected that Black students who choose integrated institutions have instrumental orientations, i.e., they are concerned with the achievement of a task, of attaining a goal anticipated for the future. In contrast, Black students choosing predominantly Black schools perhaps have expressive


\(^ {21}\)Ibid., p. 47.

orientations, being concerned with the immediate gratification of emotional needs.

Since Parsons and Bales suggest a male-female difference, sex will be controlled in the study so that the findings regarding the predominant orientation in each school will not be compounded. Females in America have traditionally been considered emotional, as exemplified in Parsons' role-structure of the nuclear family, thus embracing the expressive orientation. Males are traditionally viewed as more pragmatic and goal oriented. Zelditch even stated that males with expressive orientations are regarded as effeminate in our society. Although this alleged sex difference will not be tested, sex of respondents will be controlled.

Statement of Hypotheses

Based on the foregoing discussion, the present study will test the following hypotheses:

1. Black students at integrated colleges differ significantly from Black students at predominantly Black colleges by socio-economic status.

2. There is a positive relationship between socio-economic status and social mobility expectations among students at both schools, but there is a statistically significant difference between the social mobility expectations of Black students at predominantly Black institutions and those at integrated ones.

23Ibid., p. 339.
3. Black students attending integrated institutions have orientations that are instrumental, whereas Black students attending predominantly Black institutions have expressive orientations in regard to their choice of school.

Significance of the Study

This study is exploratory in that it is not known how typical of Black and integrated schools the two are which were used for collection of the data. However, since comparative studies of this nature are almost unknown, the study should prove useful to planners and administrators of both types of schools, as it will establish significant differences between successful students at the two schools.

Furthermore, it is felt that this study will contribute to the knowledge about social mobility expectations, reference group theory, and instrumental and expressive orientations as they relate to the Black student's choice of a predominantly Black or an integrated school.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Population

Rather than using a sample, the entire senior class at Bishop College and the Black students who were seniors in the first summer semester at North Texas State University were used in the study. Bishop College is a predominantly Black private liberal arts college located in Dallas, Texas. The college is affiliated with the American Baptist Church and is coeducational. The college was established in 1881 and gave its first baccalaureate in 1884. Full tuition for 1970-71 was $742.00 a semester, and part-time tuition was $27.00 per hour. Room and board for this period were $482.00 a semester. The enrollment for the 1971 spring semester was 1,755.2

North Texas State University is located in Denton, Texas, thirty-six miles from Dallas, Texas. The integrated institution is predominantly White, and is coeducational. North Texas was incorporated in 1890 and became a state university in 1961. Full-time tuition for state residents was $50.00 a semester and $200.00 a semester for out-of-state students in 1970-71. Room and board were $151.00

2This information was obtained from the Registrar's office at Bishop College.
a semester. Enrollment for the 1971 summer session was 8,272, of whom approximately 494 were Black.25

Seniors were used in the study so that a more realistic view of the students' social mobility expectations could be obtained. Having reached the senior level of college, it was felt that these students were in a better position to realize the real demands of their occupational choices than were freshmen, sophomores, or juniors. This study is directed to attributes which differentiate two groups of students at this final stage of their undergraduate career.

A list of the 450 students classified as seniors in the spring of 1971 was obtained from the Registrar at Bishop College. Three hundred eighty-three of these students had provided addresses, and questionnaires were mailed to these students with a stamped self-addressed envelope so the students could return them. Only 24.2 percent were returned, and of these 1.3 percent were incomplete. Another 21.1 percent were returned undelivered. Therefore, questionnaires were mailed a second time to those students whose questionnaires were not returned. A note was enclosed urging the students to complete and return the questionnaires. A total of 149 usable questionnaires were obtained, a return rate of 41 percent. (Table I)

25This information was obtained from the Registrar's office at North Texas State University.
### Table I

**Questionnaire Returns from Bishop Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Returns</th>
<th>First Mailing</th>
<th>Second Mailing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mailed</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Completely</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered incompletely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned delivered</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Returned</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(51%)</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a sizable difference between males and females who answered the questionnaire completely in the first mailing. This may be due to the large difference in the "returned undelivered" category. Thirty percent of the questionnaires sent to males were returned undelivered, as compared to 13 percent of those mailed to females. In the second mailing, the direction is reversed; a higher percentage of the males answered the questionnaire completely, and a higher percentage of the questionnaires mailed to females were returned undelivered.

There remains a sizable difference between males and females in the total. Again, this is accounted for mainly in the "returned undelivered" category. The differences between males and females who answered the questionnaire incompletely and who failed to return it are small in both mailings and in the total. Only 4 percent of each sex (of whom it could reasonably be expected that they received it) failed to return their questionnaires.

Unfortunately, no list of Black students exists at North Texas State University. During each day of registration, a table was set up on the outside of the building which was the final registration point. In addition to the sign requesting Black seniors to stop by the table, each Black student entering the building was stopped by the investigator or the student assisting her and asked if he or she was a senior. If the student was a senior, the
purpose of the questionnaire was explained and the student filled it out. Each student was asked if he knew other Black seniors who might be registering late. A list of these students was compiled, and the questionnaires were given to them by the student assisting the investigator. One hundred fifteen students answered the questionnaire completely, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II
QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM NORTH TEXAS STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered Completely</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Incompletely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not known what proportion of Black students this represents, but it is felt that most were contacted. Since there are no data showing how summer school students differ from those attending the regular session, this is a possible source of bias; however, it is not considered that it seriously biases the results.

The final sample consisted of 264 Black students, 149 from a Black college and 115 from an integrated university. There were 117 males and 147 females.
Developing the Questionnaire

In addition to demographic questions on socio-economic status and social mobility expectations, a set of questions was developed to measure the type of orientations the two groups of students had.

The categories for the question concerning choice of a Black or an integrated institution were developed from responses of twenty-five Black seniors at Texas Southern University, a predominantly Black school in Houston, Texas, and twenty-five Black seniors at the University of Houston, an integrated institution. These students answered the following questions: What two most important reasons can you give for attending a predominantly Black school rather than an integrated one, and what two most important reasons can you give for attending an integrated institution rather than a predominantly Black one? The responses were classified into seven reasons for choosing the institution the student was attending: (1) An influential person suggested it; (2) I felt I would be happier; (3) To get a better education; (4) I felt it would be easier; (5) For financial reasons; (6) To get a better job after graduation; and (7) Other.\(^\text{27}\)

\(^{26}\) See Pauline Young, Scientific Social Surveys and Research (New Jersey, 1966), pp. 166-213 for a discussion of the relative merits of these types of questions.

\(^{27}\) See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire and the items used to compute socio-economic status and social mobility expectations.
Responses three, five, and six were considered instrumental, using Parsons' definition of these terms, while responses one, two, and four were considered expressive. The seventh choice, "Other," was classified either instrumental or expressive according to the student's explanation.

Definition of the Variables

Measurement of Socio-Economic Status

Sociologists have utilized many methods of measuring socio-economic status, and there has been disagreement about the validity and reliability of the various measures. Kahl and Davis classify nineteen standard measures of socio-economic status which employ one of the following: occupation, education, income, mean monthly rent, the interviewer's subjective rating of the subject, the interviewer's subjective rating of the subject's house, and self-ratings. Factor analysis of the nineteen measures revealed that they were highly correlated because they all were influenced by one underlying dimension, occupation.28

Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Status Position29 was used in the present study to measure the students' socio-economic status because of its acceptance in the

---


field of sociology as a valid measure and because of its simplicity.

The two factors utilized in this index are education and occupation. There are seven positions on the occupation scale: (1) executives and proprietors of large concerns and major professionals; (2) managers and proprietors of medium concerns and minor professionals; (3) administrative personnel of large concerns, owners of small independent businesses, and semi-professionals; (4) owners of little businesses, clerical and sales workers, and technicians; (5) skilled workers; (6) semi-skilled workers; and (7) unskilled workers.

The positions on the education scale are: (1) graduate or professional training; (2) college or university graduation; (3) partial college training; (4) high school graduation; (5) partial high school training; (6) junior high school; and (7) less than junior high school.

Hollingshead assigns occupation a weight of seven, and education a weight of four. The scale value factor is multiplied by its assigned weight. The sum of the two resulting numbers is the individual's score. Scores can range from a minimum of eleven to a maximum of seventy-seven. The hierarchy of score groups is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores of</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-17</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-27</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-43</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-60</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-77</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classes I and II were considered upper status, class III middle status, and IV and V lower status.

If an individual is a grade-school teacher (minor professional) who graduated from college, he would have scale scores of two and two. Multiplied by the weights, the scores are fourteen and eight, a total score of twenty-two. This person would belong in position II.

The students' father's and mother's socio-economic statuses were computed separately. If there was a difference in status position, the parent with the higher status was used to determine the student's socio-economic status.

Sociologists usually use the father or husband in determining socio-economic status or social class. However, the present study concerns Black students and families, and it is an often accepted view that the mother in the Black family unit is often the chief bread winner and determines her family's social status. Similarly, it is thought that Black women often marry men with less education than they have. Therefore, the parent with the highest status was used to determine the student's present status position. In sixty-three (23.8 percent) cases, this altered the ratings.

Measurement of Social Mobility Expectations

A projected status position was computed on the Hollingshead Index in order to measure the students' social mobility expectations, and all five classes were utilized. The factors used were their expected occupations and level of education. The major field of females who stated that they planned to be housewives and did not intend to pursue an occupation was used to determine the type of occupation they would most likely pursue if they did plan to work. If a student's projected position was one class higher than his present position, he was considered to have medium mobility expectations. If his projected position was two classes above his present position, he was considered to have high social mobility expectations. Since persons in class III are middle status, it is possible for middle status students to have high expectations, i.e., move up two classes. The student whose projected status was the same as his present status was assumed to have no mobility expectations.

Statistical Techniques

The data gathered in this study are both nominal level data, e.g., the subjects were categorized according to type of school attended, type of orientation, and sex; and ordinal level, e.g., socio-economic status, degree of mobility expectations. Since both ordinal and nominal data are involved, the Chi-Square test is the test of significance used to determine whether the observations differ from those
expected according to the laws of chance. The .05 level of significance was used to determine whether the hypotheses should be rejected or supported. The one-tailed test was used when directionality was predicted. In cases where expected cell frequencies were less than five, Fisher's Exact Test was used instead of Chi-Square.

Goodman's Gamma, a measure of association between two ordinal level variables, was used in this study to determine the degree of association between socio-economic status and social mobility expectations.31

31Dean J. Champion, Basic Statistics for Social Research (Pennsylvania, 1970), pp. 130 ff., 155, and 219-224. The use of Chi-Square is somewhat inappropriate since the test is usually employed with samples, rather than a total population which was used in this study.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Socio-Economic Status

Earlier it was hypothesized that Black students at integrated colleges differ significantly by socio-economic status from Black students at predominantly Black colleges, the inference being that more upper and middle status Black students attend integrated colleges than predominantly Black schools.

Analysis of the data revealed that the North Texas population was almost equally divided between the three classes, while a large percentage (slightly less than 50 percent) of the Bishop population was lower class. There were fewer lower class females than males in both populations; however, the difference was very small in the Bishop population. In the North Texas population, 61 percent of the lower status students were male and 39 percent were female. The percentages for lower status Bishop students were 51 percent male and 49 percent female.

Table III shows the socio-economic distribution of both populations. The Chi-Square value of 6.43355 found for the data on socio-economic status indicates that the observations are significantly different from those expected by chance at the .05 level using a one-tailed test. Therefore, the
TABLE III
THE POPULATIONS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<p>| Social Class | N. T. Students | | | | | Bishop Students | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.C.</td>
<td>18 (31%)</td>
<td>22 (38%)</td>
<td>40 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>23 (26%)</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>14 (25%)</td>
<td>20 (34%)</td>
<td>24 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>30 (34%)</td>
<td>43 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.C.</td>
<td>25 (44%)</td>
<td>16 (28%)</td>
<td>41 (35%)</td>
<td>37 (62%)</td>
<td>36 (40%)</td>
<td>73 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57 (100%)</td>
<td>58 (100%)</td>
<td>115 (100%)</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
<td>149 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.43355 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ p = 0.0202 \]

Hypothesis that the populations differ significantly, and that more upper and middle status Black students attend integrated institutions of higher learning is supported.

Social Mobility Expectations

Two assertions are contained in the hypothesis concerning social mobility expectations: first, that there is a positive relationship between socio-economic status and social mobility expectations; and second, that there is a statistically significant difference between the social
mobility expectations of Black students at integrated institutions and those at predominantly Black schools.

In determining the degree of association between socio-economic status and mobility expectations, each population was tested separately. Due to the procedures used to determine socio-economic status, it was known that the upper status students would have no mobility expectations because there was not a class in the structure for them to move up to. For this reason, the upper class students were removed from both populations before the data concerning mobility expectations were subjected to statistical testing. It was possible to ascertain the mobility expectations of the middle status students since these students were in class III and could move up two classes.

North Texas Population

Of a total of 75 students, 41 (55 percent) had high mobility expectations, 29 (38 percent) had medium expectations, and 5 (7 percent) did not have mobility expectations. (See Table IV.) When socio-economic status was considered, it was found that more of the lower status students had high mobility expectations (71 percent). Only 35 percent of the middle status students had high expectations. Conversely, more middle status students had expectations which would keep them at their present status, whereas a smaller percentage of the lower status students were not upwardly mobile.
### TABLE IV

**NORTH TEXAS POPULATION BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND DEGREE OF MOBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Mobility</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>L.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mobility</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Mobility</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mobility</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>29 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's $T = 2.48$ od  
Gamma = .616113  
P = 0.001

Because two of the cells for these data had expected frequencies which were too small (less than five), Fisher's Exact Test, rather than Chi-Square, was used to determine whether the observed frequencies differed significantly from those expected by chance. The value obtained indicated that the observations were significant even at the .001 level. Confident that the observations were statistically significant, Goodman's Gamma was employed to determine the degree of association between socio-economic status and mobility expectations. A value of .616113 was obtained,
which shows a positive but only moderately high degree of association between the two variables.

**Bishop Population**

There was only a small difference between the percentage of students who had high mobility expectations (40 percent) and those who had medium expectations (45 percent). (See Table V.) A slightly larger percentage of the middle status students had medium mobility expectations. There was quite a large difference between the students who did not have

**TABLE V**

**BISHOP COLLEGE POPULATION BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND DEGREE OF MOBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Mobility</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>L.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mobility</td>
<td>16 (37%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Mobility</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>43 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mobility</td>
<td>18 (42%)</td>
<td>28 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 29.50859 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ \text{Gamma} = 0.252707 \]
\[ p = 0.001 \]
mobility expectations. Thirty-seven percent of the middle status students did not expect to be upwardly mobile, as compared to 3 percent of the lower status students.

The Chi-Square value obtained for the Bishop population (29.50859) indicated that the observations differed quite significantly from chance using a one-tailed test at the .05 level. Although the Gamma value obtained (.252707) showed a positive relationship, it indicated a rather low degree of association between socio-economic status and degree of mobility in the Bishop population. There was only 25 percent agreement between the two variables.

**Comparison of the Two Populations**

The second step in testing the hypothesis was to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the mobility expectations of the two groups of students. According to Table VI, 54 percent of the North Texas population and 40 percent of the Bishop students had high mobility expectations. A larger percentage of the Bishop students had medium mobility expectations, but a larger percentage also had no plans for upward mobility. Males in both populations had higher expectations than did females.

A Chi-Square value of 5.62415 was obtained, which is significant at the .05 level using a one-tailed test since directionality was hypothesized. A positive relationship between social mobility expectations and socio-economic
TABLE VI
THE POPULATIONS BY DEGREE OF MOBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Mobility</th>
<th>N. T. Students</th>
<th>Bishop Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mobility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Mobility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mobility</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64%)</td>
<td>(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 5.62415$
$\text{df} = 2$
$p = 0.0303$

status was found and the overall hypothesis that there is a statistically significant difference between the mobility expectations of Black students at predominantly Black colleges and Black students at integrated institutions was supported.

Subjective Reasons for Attending a Black or Integrated School

The third hypothesis states that Black students who chose integrated schools differ significantly from those who chose predominantly Black schools by their reasons for
TABLE VII
THE POPULATIONS BY TYPE OF ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Orientation</th>
<th>N. T. Students</th>
<th>Bishop Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 23.75372 \]
\[ df = 2 \]
\[ p = 0.001 \]

choice of school. It was hypothesized that those students who chose integrated institutions had instrumental orientations and those who chose predominantly Black institutions had expressive orientations, as evidenced by their answers to queries regarding choice of school.

Data for the North Texas population clearly show that these students have instrumental orientations. Fifty-eight percent of the responses of the North Texas students were classified as instrumental, as compared to 22 percent expressive, and 20 percent a combination of both. Two
percent of the responses were not classifiable. The Bishop students were predominantly expressive in orientation. Forty-five percent gave responses that were expressive, while 29 percent were instrumental, and 26 percent were a combination. Five percent of these responses were not classifiable. More females than males in both populations had combination orientations.

In the North Texas population, more males than females had expressive orientations (25 as compared to 19 percent); it was expected that the reverse would occur. There was only a small difference between the proportion of males and females who had expressive orientations.

The Chi-Square value obtained for the hypothesis concerning type of orientation was 23.75372, which is significant at the .001 level; therefore, the hypothesis that Black students who chose integrated institutions have instrumental orientations and those who chose predominantly Black schools have expressive orientations is supported.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the enactment of several laws which prohibit the segregation of all public institutions of higher learning, Black students seeking a college degree have had a choice of either attending a predominantly Black institution or an integrated one. It was hypothesized in this study that three factors, socio-economic status, social mobility expectations, and subjectively stated reasons for attending a predominantly Black or integrated institution, differentiate the Black students who choose integrated institutions and those who choose predominantly Black ones. The results indicate that these two groups of students do differ in these respects.

Socio-Economic Status

The relationship between socio-economic status and attitudes, values, and behavior is one of the best documented explanatory variables in the field of sociology. Among the various attitudes, values, and modes of behavior with which socio-economic status has been found to be correlated is education. Middle and upper status individuals tend to

---

value education more and place greater emphasis upon obtaining higher education. It was hypothesized that socio-economic status plays an important part in the Black student's choice of whether to attend an integrated school or a predominantly Black one. Some authors assert that upper and middle status Blacks identify predominantly with middle status Whites and internalize their goals and values to a greater extent than do lower status Blacks. Empirical investigation of this assertion has shown it a valid one, and has also shown that upper and middle status Blacks have stronger desires to associate with Whites. The values internalized by these Blacks include getting a "good" education, which entails attending a White college because Black colleges are often considered inferior. The results of this study, in which socio-economic status was measured on the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, also support this assertion. Although there was only a small difference between the percentage of middle status Black students at the integrated institution and the percentage at the predominantly Black one, a considerably larger proportion of the students at the integrated school were upper status. It may be that the higher the student's socio-economic status, the greater

33 Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie.


35 Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position.
the likelihood that the student will attend an integrated institution, a supposition which recognizes a clear distinction between upper status students and middle status students.

It has also been empirically shown that socio-economic rank is positively related to social mobility expectations. A large part of the literature supports the contention that lower status White individuals have lower aspirations and upper status White individuals have higher aspirations. However, some investigators have found lower status Black youths to have relatively high aspirations. These, however, were aspirations rather than expectations. This distinction was particularly important in one study in which, although lower status Black youths had relatively high aspirations, very few of those Black youths were enrolled in college preparatory programs. It is quite possible that the results would have been different had the students been questioned about what they actually expected to do.


38 Ibid.
The queries in the present study were related to expectations rather than aspirations, and a projected status position based on these expectations was computed on the Hollingshead Index. It was expected that a positive relationship between the students' social mobility expectations and socio-economic status would be found for both groups of students. In determining the degree of association between the two variables, each population was tested separately. The upper status students were removed from both populations since it was known from the structure of the instrument used to measure status position that these students could have no mobility expectations because there was not a class for them to move up to. After determining whether the observations differed significantly from chance (by using Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Test), the degree of association between the two variables was ascertained by using Goodman's Gamma. The association between socio-economic status and mobility expectations was positive in both populations. However, it was only moderately high (.616113) in the population of students at the integrated institution, and relatively low in the population at the predominantly Black school (.252707).

Reference Group Theory

The second step in testing the hypothesis concerning social mobility expectations was to determine whether there was a significant difference between the mobility expectations of Black students at integrated institutions and those at
predominantly Black institutions. Kelly's definition of a normative reference group is that group in which an individual holds membership, and which articulates the standards which he follows.\textsuperscript{39} It has been empirically demonstrated that students frequently have aspirations and/or expectations similar to the aspirations and/or expectations found within their group. In other words, lower status students in upper status schools have aspirations and/or expectations similar to the upper status students in that school and vice versa. The students conform to the normative group standards within their school setting.\textsuperscript{40}

It was argued that integrated schools are middle or upper status when they are compared to predominantly Black ones. Following these contentions, it was hypothesized that Black students at integrated schools have higher social mobility expectations than do Black students at predominantly Black schools. This hypothesis was supported by statistical testing. Since the students' reference groups were not directly measured, it cannot be concluded that Black students at integrated (upper status) institutions choose that school as their normative reference group and therefore have high mobility expectations. However, it can be inferred that this occurred since the source of higher education, i.e., Black or integrated institution, seems to play a large role in Black

\textsuperscript{39}Kelly, "Two Functions of Reference Groups," 80.
\textsuperscript{40}Wilson, "Social Class and Educational Opportunity," 77-84.
students' expectations for upward mobility. Similarly, it can only be inferred that Black students at predominantly Black schools (lower status) choose their school setting as normative points of reference and because of this have lower mobility expectations. Although there was only a moderate degree of association between status and mobility expectation, and in view of the considerable variance between the two groups, it can be argued the socio-economic status determines mobility expectations. The students at the integrated school were predominantly upper and middle status and had higher expectations than did the Black students at the predominantly Black school who were primarily lower status.

**Subjective Reasons for Attending a Black or Integrated School**

Bradley maintains that Black students choose to attend integrated state institutions because they are less expensive than Black and White private schools, and because they offer better educational opportunities. It was hypothesized in this study that Black students' choice of school is influenced by different orientations to goals. Parsons has identified two polar orientations: expressive and instrumental. An expressive orientation is concerned with the direct acting out of a need disposition, i.e., a search for immediate and direct gratification of needs without regard to goals requiring adaptive manipulation. An instrumental orientation pertains to the attainment of specific goals.

---

goals as related to adaptive exigencies.\textsuperscript{42} The students were questioned as to their reasons for choosing the school they were attending and their responses were classified as either instrumental, expressive, or a combination of both.

This ideal type proved useful in viewing the subjective aspects of choice of a college by Black students. The results, as hypothesized, indicated that Black students at predominantly Black institutions differ significantly from Black students at integrated colleges by type of orientation in their choice of school. Students at predominantly Black schools seem to have expressive orientations, i.e., they are more concerned with the immediate gratification of emotional needs and they are more affective and oriented to the present, as evidenced by their responses. Ninety-four percent of the students at the predominantly Black institution indicated that they felt they would be happier at a Black institution and/or felt that a Black institution would be easier.

The students at the integrated institution had a more pragmatic orientation, were concerned with the achievement of a task, and were more oriented toward the future. Their instrumental orientation is apparent in the large number who chose to attend an integrated institution to "get a better education and better job after graduation."

\textsuperscript{42}Parsons, Bales, and Shils, "Phase Movement in Relation to Motivation, Symbol Formation and Role Structure," 189.
Parsons and his associates suggested a male-female difference in orientation,\textsuperscript{43} and sex was controlled in this study so that the findings would not be compounded. The traditional concept that women are more emotional (thereby embracing the expressive orientation) and men are more pragmatic and task oriented (instrumental orientation) was expected to emerge in both populations. However, the primary male-female difference in both populations was in regard to a combination of orientations. In both groups of students, more females than males had a combination orientation, i.e., their responses were both instrumental and expressive. There are several possible explanations for this occurrence. Perhaps Black women do not fit into this ideal type based on sexually differentiated orientations. It has been argued that the Black family structure is predominantly matriarchal. It may be that the Black woman's sex role has been influenced by the need for her to have both an instrumental and expressive orientation. Or it may be that Black males and females have roles which are more egalitarian. Another possibility is that Black women are no different from their Anglo counterparts, but that both groups of women are at the midpoint of a period in which the traditional sex stereotypes do not apply to women.

\textsuperscript{43}Parsons and Bales, Family Socialization and Interaction Process, pp. 46-47.
Conclusions

Although the results of this study indicate that Black students at integrated and predominantly Black institutions differ by socio-economic class of origin and by the type of orientations they have in regard to choice of school, the problem is in need of refinement and further study. The population of students from the predominantly Black school may not have been representative since responses were obtained from only 41 percent of the total population. However, the population of students from the integrated institution is considered almost completely representative. Another factor which could have biased the study is that the responses were drawn from spring semester students at one institution and from summer school students at the other, if one holds the view that these student groups differ.

These possible sources of bias are acknowledged, and it is recognized that the study is exploratory. However, it is felt that the findings are legitimate and provide a basis for further research. It is also significant that the methods by which the findings were reached demonstrate the utility of Parsons' ideal type and again show the value of employing socio-economic status to predict values, attitudes, and behavior.
Recommendations

Several questions have been raised in this study which warrant additional research. This research could include an in-depth analysis of attitudinal differences between Black students, e.g., Do Black students at integrated schools have attitudes different from those of Black students at predominantly Black schools in regard to "Black Power"? A longitudinal study which would provide for a follow-up study of the students five to ten years after graduation to determine true mobility (as compared to projected mobility) is another possibility. The potential for meaningful research in this area is great, and affords sociologists an opportunity to obtain more knowledge about the Black sub-culture.
APPENDIX

A study is being made of the differences and similarities between Black seniors at Bishop College and North Texas State University. Please answer the following questions, and return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Major
4. Expected occupation
5. Your home town and state
6. Place where you were raised: check the appropriate answer.
   1________ on a farm
   2________ in a small town (less than 10,000)
   3________ in a large town (10,000 to 50,000)
   4________ in a small city (50,000 to 100,000)
   5________ in a large city (over 100,000)
   6________ in the suburbs of a large city
7. Check the amount of formal education your parents have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1_____ Some grade school</td>
<td>1_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2_____ Finished grade school</td>
<td>2_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_____ Some high school</td>
<td>3_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4_____ Finished high school</td>
<td>4_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5_____ Some college</td>
<td>5_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6_____ Finished college</td>
<td>6_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7_____ Graduate or professional school</td>
<td>7_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| after college | |
8. What is your father's occupation (or if he is retired or deceased, what was his occupation)? Please answer in detail.

9. About how much was your family's income last year?

1. less than $3,000  5. $10,000 to $14,999
2. $3,000 to $4,999  6. $15,000 to $19,999
3. $5,000 to $7,499  7. $20,000 to $29,999
4. $7,500 to $9,999  8. over $30,000

10. Whose income are you reporting? Check as many as appropriate.

1. Your father's  4. Your husband's
2. Your mother's  5. Other (List ________)
3. Your own

11. What is your mother's occupation? If you are a married woman, give your husband's occupation and major if he is still in school. Please answer in detail.

12. As far as you can tell now, do you plan to continue your education after receiving a bachelor's degree?

1. Yes, graduate school  What degree?________
2. Yes, professional school
3. Yes, other training  What?________
4. No, I do not plan to continue after the bachelor's degree
13. Why did you choose to attend a predominantly Black college rather than an integrated one? You may choose as many as two answers.

1. An influential person suggested it (parents, teacher, etc.)

2. I felt I would be happier

3. To get a better education

4. I felt it would be easier

5. For financial reasons (Explain: ____________________________)

6. To get a better job after graduation

7. Other (Please state reason: ____________________________)

Your co-operation in filling out this questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope is greatly appreciated.

It is hoped that the results of this study will be incorporated in planning for predominantly Black and integrated colleges so that the needs of Black students will be better served, and so that Black students will reach their maximum potential.

Thanks,

Sandra E. Williams
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