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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the influence of participation in an anti-racist educational (ARE) program upon the perceptions of, critical assessments of, and self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism in a sample of 11th-grade students enrolled in a public school district that had recently undergone compulsory, court-ordered desegregation. This quasi-experimental study measured hypothesized differences between the scores of a group of high school students on a quantitative data-gathering instrument before their participation in an Undoing Racism curriculum, with their scores on that same instrument re-administered three months after their completion of that course. It then compared the degree of pre-intervention/post-intervention changes in this experimental study group with changes in scores on two concurrently administered rounds of the study instrument obtained from a peer control group who did not participate in the Undoing Racism program.

Following the second round of testing, the qualitative component of this study involved the researcher conducting interviews with sub-sets of study subjects drawn from both the experimental and control groups. These interviews included questions about judicially mandated racial desegregation in the school district.

Quantitative results of the study did not support any of the six study hypotheses. However, qualitative study results revealed differences in the experimental and control groups regarding their attitudes and beliefs about institutional racism. Based on the results of the study, the researcher recommended follow up studies to identify long term effects of the treatment on the study participants.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of the Study's Purpose

This study investigated the influence of participation in an anti-racist educational (ARE) program on the perceptions of, critical assessments of, and self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism in a sample of 11th-grade students enrolled in a public school district that had recently undergone compulsory, court-ordered desegregation. The study measured hypothesized variance between the scores of a group of Lafayette Parish, Louisiana high school students on a quantitative data-gathering instrument before their participation in an Undoing Racism curriculum with their scores on that same instrument re-administered three months after their completion of that course. The researcher then compared the degree of pre-intervention/post-intervention changes in this experimental study group with variance between scores on two concurrently administered rounds of the study instrument obtained from a peer control group who did not participate in the Undoing Racism program. Following the second round of testing, the researcher conducted interviews with sub-sets of study subjects drawn from both the experimental and control groups. These interviews included questions about judicially mandated racial desegregation in the Lafayette Parish school district. Results generated through these procedures yielded study findings about the efficacy of the Undoing Racism curriculum as an intervention for changing student sensitivity to, appraisals of, and actions toward institutional racism in their school, their community, and American society at large.

B. Definition of Terms

In order to avoid any undue misunderstanding the key terms used throughout this study were operationally defined as follows:
Racism: A system of personal beliefs, held consciously or otherwise, alleging the inferiority of members of one supposedly biologically different group to those of one's own group.

Institutional racism: Race-related differences in negative outcomes that result from institutional practices, policies, processes, and interpersonal climates.

Stereotype: An oversimplified generalization about what people are like yielding an exaggerated, negative image of their characteristics, without regard to individual attributes.

Prejudice: An unfavorable or disparaging attitude toward a category or group of people or toward individuals by virtue of membership in the group.

Discrimination: Behavior that denies equal treatment to people because of their membership in some group.

First-generation racial segregation in public schools: The physical segregation of students by race into different schools within the same school district.

Second-generation racial segregation in public schools: The physical segregation of students by race through overtly "race-neutral" policies, including assignment to special education classes, severe disciplinary sanctions, ability grouping, and curriculum tracking.

C. Background to the Research Problem

While more than half a century has elapsed since the United States Supreme Court's landmark ruling in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), recent research findings clearly demonstrate that a substantial percentage of African American youngsters still attend public schools in which they constitute a majority of the student body. From their analysis of survey data pertaining to the racial composition of public schools in eleven Southern states, Orfield and Yu (1999) concluded that de facto racial segregation in that region remains prevalent and has, in fact, intensified of late. They reported that in 1998 only 32.8 percent of African American students in these eleven states attended majority-White schools and that this represents a
significant decline from the 43.5 percent level achieved a decade earlier. The principal mechanism that explains this pattern is the residential concentration of African American households in low-income school districts and intra-district neighborhood attendance zones. Socioeconomic disparities along racial lines, reinforced by "white flight" from inner-city and other communities in which minority group members predominate, are manifested in the physical separation of White and African-American students. Prior to judicial intervention in the year 2000, the Lafayette Parish school district exemplified this pattern of racial segregation upheld by sharp differences in the respective mean socioeconomic status of White and African-American households.

The available evidence strongly suggests that the academic underachievement of African American public school students is, at least partially, an outcome of de facto first-generation segregation (Steele 1992). Several studies have shown that mean scores on standardized achievement tests for both African American and White students who attend public schools in which the former substantially outnumber the latter are significantly lower than those of students who attend schools in which White students are in the majority (Brown 1990). In the state of Louisiana in which the study was carried out, Bankston and Caldas (1996, 1997) found that the degree of minority group concentration in public schools had a strong inverse correlation with individual student scores on the state's Graduation Exit Examination. In and of themselves, these negative educational outcomes for African American students directly reflect institutional racism.

Even when African American students attend predominantly White schools, they are vulnerable to what Mickelson (2001) and others have termed "second-generation" segregation. From their analysis of public school districts in the United States with 15,000 or more students,
Meir, Steward and England (1989) found that African American students are frequently separated from their White counterparts through the seemingly "race neutral" mechanisms of ability grouping, curriculum tracking, special education assignments, and disciplinary actions. As many educational researchers have noted, even after controlling for variations in IQ, African Americans are prone to placement in "lower-ability" group classrooms and "bottom-rung" curriculum tracks in which White students are under-represented (Hallinan 1996; Oakes, 1996; Schofield, 1989). In addition (and again controlling for IQ), African Americans students are significantly more likely to be assigned to special education programs than are White counterparts (Gottlieb, Alter, Gottlieb & Wishner, 1994; Jackson, 2001). Finally, even after controlling for the severity/frequency of attributed offenses or violations, African American students are more likely to receive suspensions and expulsions as disciplinary sanctions than are their White students attending the same school (Carter & Jackson 1982, Coalition of Advocates for Students 1998; Jackson, 2001; Skiba & Peterson 1999). Through each of these institutional mechanisms, African Americans undergo racial re-segregation and suffer detrimental educational consequences.

Mechanisms of institutional racism in public education reinforce racial stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination toward African Americans on the part of White students. Several studies have shown that African American students at schools that use ability grouping/curriculum tracking suffer more racist remarks from their White peers and report poorer cross-racial relations than those in schools that do not separate students according to "ability" (Braddock & Slavin 1993; Hallinan & Sorenson, 1985; Hallinan & Teixeira 1987; Schofield & Sugar, 1977). Institutional racism in the form of second-generation segregation validates the racial stereotypes, prejudices, and discriminatory behavior of White students toward
their African American counterparts and, indeed, all African Americans (Bigler & Leben 1993; Hidalgo, McDowell & Siddle 1992; Steele 1999). White students gain the impression that African Americans enrolled in the same school are under-represented in the classes and programs which they are privileged to participate because members of this minority group are inherently less intelligent, lazier, and prone to severe forms of misbehavior. Moreover, as O'Brien (2001) has observed, White students characteristically deny the existence of institutional racism in their schools and in American society as a whole.

What becomes evident is that abolition of de jure racial segregation in American public schools has not, in fact, led to de facto integration. Instead, as a consequence of persistent and glaring socioeconomic inequalities, African American students in at least some regions of the United States are more likely to attend schools in which they find themselves in the majority. Their attendance at these predominately African American schools is unequivocally associated with inferior educational outcomes. Even when they are enrolled at racially integrated schools, a variety of practices, policies, and procedures tends to separate them from extensive, intra-classroom contact with their White peers and to constrain their academic achievement. The systematic overlap between "first generation" and "second generation" racial segregation contributes to and validates racial stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination directed toward African Americans by White students. Absent direct instruction in how institutional racism negates prospects for genuine racial equality of educational opportunity, White students are predisposed to see, evaluate, and treat African Americans as their inferiors and in response African American students feel highly vulnerable to psychological and physical threats. Any effort to improve inter-racial relations in public schools that fails to incorporate anti-racist
education (ARE) will only yield superficial progress that is susceptible to reversal under the weight of institutional racism.

D. Theoretical Background

For the past half century Gordon Allport's "contact hypothesis" has served as the salient theoretical construct in the field of race relations. First appearing in Allport's The Nature of Prejudice (1954), the contact hypothesis asserts that increased contact between members of different racial groups will not necessarily reduce racial prejudice. For that to occur, the hypothesis posits that four preconditions must be met: (1) equal group status within the situation, (2) common goals that require a measure of member interdependence to reach, (3) inter-group cooperation, and (4) authority support for cooperation.

The translation of the contact hypothesis into racial relations improvement programs in public school settings has taken the form of Cooperative Learning (CL). Although the primary rationale for the initiation of Cooperative Learning arrangements is that they enhance student academic performance, several literature reviews have concluded that, when the conditions of the contact hypotheses are satisfied, the use of racially-heterogeneous student CL teams is associated with improved cross-racial relations (Johnson & Johnson, 1992; Khmelkov & Hallinan, 1999; Slavin & Cooper 1999). The main pathway through which this occurs is believed to be the individual student's re-formulation of group membership criteria to include students previously consigned to an out-group, African Americans, for example, into an expanded in-group (Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell & Pomare 1990).

Nevertheless, exclusive reliance upon the Cooperative Learning format as a means for reducing racial prejudice in public school classrooms is subject to significant practical limitations. Owing to second-generation segregation mechanisms, the number of African-
Americans in "high-ability" and "college-bound" classes is often too small to permit their representation on teams comprised of three or four students. Moreover, the racial assumptions that White students bring with them into CL classes militate against the attribution of "equal group status" to the African-American students who are assigned to their teams. Hence, there is a "Catch-22" type dilemma involved in using Cooperative Learning to enhance racial relations in public schools. Status equity among students is a precondition of inter-racial contact that must be fulfilled for CL to prove effective in the improvement of race relations, but under baseline circumstances, first- and second-generation segregation operates powerfully against equality of status for African American students in the perceptions of their White counterparts.

Anti-racist educational (ARE) programs, including the Undoing Racism intervention used in this study, may utilize learning teams comprised of White and minority group students. But as a means for improving race relations in public school settings, ARE interventions proceed from a much different theoretical platform than CL. As opposed to the latter, ARE employs direct, didactic techniques for teaching students about both personal and institutional racism. Indeed, the instructional content of ARE curricula is confined to lessons that are specifically relevant to racial prejudice and inequality (McGregor 1993; Bigler 1999).

In this context, ARE is substantially more focused than multi-cultural education (MCE). Unlike MCE, anti-racist education concentrates its attention upon critical assessments of the racial status quo with a strong call for actions to reconfigure the existing power structure upholding racial inequality (Grinter 1992; Pinderhughes 1997). As McGregor has stated, "antiracist teaching confronts prejudice through discussions of past and present racism, stereotyping and discrimination. It is not the understanding of cultural differences that is important, but the awareness of the economic, structural, and historic roots of inequality for
which racism is a justification" (1993, 216). Anti-racism education is meant to alter student perceptions of race relations, their critical assessments of organizational (including school) policies and practices that lead to unequal outcomes for White and African American students, and, in the end, to motivate student efforts to counteract institutional racism.

Anti-racist education presents both White and African-American students with curricular content that stands in sharp contradiction with their baseline assumptions about what racism is, how it operates, and why it continues to exert a pervasive influence in society to the detriment of minority group members. In essence, it deliberately seeks to induce cognitive dissonance. According to Festinger (1957), cognitive dissonance arises when individuals are presented with information that is not compatible with their existing beliefs. Thus, a White student exposed to an antiracist educational intervention will find his or her pre-existing ideas about race relations actively challenged by course contents. Inconsistencies between student pre-intervention beliefs and what they are taught through anti-racist education creates psychological pressures for cognitive restructuring.

In contrast to Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, Festinger (1957) formulated his cognitive dissonance construct as a general theory of the linkage between thought and behavior that is not specifically geared to inter-racial relations. Among others, however, Devine (1989) has incorporated a cognitive dissonance mechanism into a "dissociation" model of cross-racial perceptions. The dissociation model stipulates that when individuals experience a conflict between normative values, "fairness" for example, that they have attributed to themselves with information about their own attitudes and behaviors that is contrary to those norms, use of racial stereotypes for instance, they are moved to change the latter. This change process has both cognitive and affective dimensions. Not only do the individual's perceptions and attitudes
undergo change, the degree of empathy extended by him or her to those "harmed" by uncritical acceptance of pre-exposure attitudes and actions increases as they come to identify with the perspectives of the victims of racial prejudice and injustice (Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein, & Hightberger 1997; Stephan & Finlay 1999).

Anti-racist education is intended to transform the perceptions of students, to alter how they "see" reality by enhancing and expanding their awareness and understanding of what racism is. At the same time, it deliberately targets seemingly "race neutral" evaluation criteria for the purpose of changing how students assess both institutional policies and personal practices related to race. This, in turn, is aimed at motivating students to adopt new forms of behavior in light of revised critical assessments, including the use of strategies to dismantle institutional racism or to mitigate its effects (Kehoe 1994, 354-355).

The empirical base of anti-racist education is significantly smaller than that of MCE evaluation research, but some reviewers have concluded that it is effective in changing White perceptions of minority group members and subsequently improving racial relations in organizational contexts (McGregor 1993). Most studies of ARE in educational settings have investigated its effects upon college and graduate students (Garcia & Van Soest 1997; Herda-Hipps, Westhuis & Diehl, 2001; Van Soest, 1996; Wittig 1998; Wodarski, Felt & Green, 1995). Nevertheless, the Undoing Racism program as designed and conducted by members of the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond has been adapted for use in secondary schools (2002).  

E. Research Question

The primary research question governing inquiry in this study was:

Did exposure to an anti-racism educational program in the form of the Undoing Racism curriculum change the perceptions of, assessments of, and behaviors of students enrolled in the
11th grade of a high school within the Lafayette Parish school district toward institutional racism?

F. Study Variables

The independent variable in this study was subject participation in the Undoing Racism program. It was operationalized through the construction of two study groups: (1) an "experimental" group comprised of approximately forty (N = 40) 11th grade students who took part in the program; and, (2) a "control" group of similar size who did not take part in that program during the sampling period.

The six dependent or outcome variables in this study were:

(1) Subject understanding of, awareness of, and sensitivity toward institutional racism in American society at large as measured by Examples of Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale (Barbarin 1996).

(2) Subject understanding of, awareness of, and sensitivity toward institutional racism at the school which they attend as measured by the Climate for Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale.

(3) Subject critical assessment of the effectiveness of various strategies to counter-act institutional racism in American society at large as measured by the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale.

(4) Subject critical assessment of ongoing efforts by school administrators within the Lafayette Parish School District to reduce institutional racism as measured by the Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale.

(5) Subject critical assessment of their own efforts to reduce institutional racism as measured by the Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale.
(6) Subject self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism as measured by the Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale.

G. Statement of Study Hypotheses

This study formally tested six, inter-related research hypotheses. Consistent with the express purpose of the Undoing Racism intervention and the research findings concerning ARE reported to date in the literature, the study's hypotheses were:

Study Hypothesis #1: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Examples of Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #2: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Climate for Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #3: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #4: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.
Study Hypothesis #5: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #6: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Use of Strategies to reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

H. Description of the Research Venue

The research venue for this study was selected on the basis of current socioeconomic and racial composition variables within the Lafayette Parish and its school system, combined with historical efforts to address perceived institutional racism in the latter. Hence, a fairly extensive description of the community/school system in which the investigation took place is relevant at this juncture.

Lafayette Parish is located in southwestern Louisiana's Acadiana region. According to the United States Census Bureau, in the year 2000, the total population of Lafayette Parish stood at 187,000, the majority of whom (114,000) resided within the central city of Lafayette itself. At that time, about 76 percent of Lafayette Parish's residents were classified as Caucasian, while 23 percent were categorized as African American. In the year 2001, approximately 29,000 students attended public schools under the jurisdiction of the Lafayette Parish School Board. Of these, 38.5 percent were African American while virtually all of the remainder were White.

As Caldas, Growe and Bankston (2002) have described it, in terms of race relations, the Acadiana region has historically departed from conditions elsewhere in Louisiana and, indeed, in
the southeastern United States. The majority of the White residents in Lafayette Parish are of French (or Creole) descent and cultural background, while their predominant denominational affiliation is Roman Catholic. Unlike the Anglo-American Protestants whose culture prevails throughout most of Louisiana (and the Deep South), the Acadiana Whites have not maintained any attachment to the "Jim Crow" South's tradition of racial separation. Indeed, owing in part to the anti-Catholicism of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK), the populace of the region has generally opposed White supremacist ideologies. As a consequence, Acadiana Whites have customarily displayed much more favorable and tolerant attitudes toward African Americans and toward inter-racial contact than has generally been the case in Louisiana at large. Thus, for example, when the White supremacist David Duke ran successively for the governor's office and a United States Senate seat from Louisiana with the explicit backing of the KKK, his campaigns encountered stiff opposition from voters and organized political interests in Acadiana.

Relative to Louisiana at large, Lafayette Parish as a whole enjoys an above-mean level of household income and a superior profile of educational attainment, with 23 percent of its inhabitants holding a bachelor's degree as opposed to the state's average of 16 percent and a national average of 20 percent. These figures mask deep disparities in socio-economic status along racial lines. At last count, while only 23 percent of whites living in Lafayette City had incomes below the federal household poverty level of $15,000 a year, 58 percent of Black families in that municipality reported annual incomes of less than $15,000. The divide is even greater when only households with school-aged children are taken into consideration. Most African American children of school age in Lafayette City (55 percent) live in households that have incomes below the federal poverty level in contrast to only 12 percent of their White counterparts.
Geographic residential patterns mirror the socio-economic gap between "middle-class" White families and "working class/poor" African American households. A large proportion of the Parish's African American families reside within the northeast quadrant of Lafayette City, a community that is 70 percent African American and that has a mean household income which is less than half that of the Lafayette City as a whole.

Since public school attendance zones are drawn along neighborhood lines, *de facto* racial segregation has prevailed within Lafayette Parish. According to Caldas and his associates, during the school year 2000-2001, "at least 22 of the parish's 39 schools were still racially identifiable as White or Black" (Caldas, Growe & Bankston 2002, p.47). The former are located in middle-class communities within Lafayette City and its environing suburbs, the latter are situated in the comparatively impoverished neighborhoods of northern Lafayette City.

I. The History of School Desegregation in Lafayette Parish

Following the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), Louisiana became the first state in the South to dismantle *de jure* racial segregation in public schooling. In many portions of the State, the prospect of racial integration in public schools provoked an extremely hostile reaction from Whites, including a short-lived boycott in New Orleans as parents refused to send their children to racially integrated facilities. Due to its unique cultural heritage, however, there was very little popular resistance to *de jure* racial integration of public schools within the Acadiana region, including Lafayette Parish.

However, as an artifact of neighborhood attendance zones coinciding with the residential separation of Caucasians and African-Americans, *de facto* segregation remained an evident feature of the Parish's public school system. In 1965, supported by the state chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) a group of African
American parents filed a federal lawsuit under the title of Trahan et.al. v. Lafayette Parish School Board et.al., asserting that the district officials had failed to take adequate steps to integrate public schools. In June of that year Federal District Court Judge Richard Putnam ruled in favor of plaintiffs and ordered the Board to take immediate action to reduce racial segregation.

The Lafayette School Board responded to Judge Putnam's mandate with a "freedom of choice" plan. Initially restricted to 12th graders and subsequently expanded to include younger students, the plan allowed Caucasian and African American parents to enroll their children in schools outside of their officially designated residential attendance zones. The net result was the admission of some 800 to 900 African American students into formerly all white schools. In 1968, however, the United States Supreme Court's decision in Green v. County School Board held that such "freedom of choice" plans did not result in meaningful racial desegregation, and this ruling led to Lafayette Parish's approach being declared unconstitutional. Although both White and African American parents resisted the abandonment of the freedom of choice approach, Judge Putnam imposed a modified school busing arrangement. It called for transporting African American students from two predominantly African American schools in northeast Lafayette City to White schools and for the Board to undertake some fairly modest revisions in the district's existing neighborhood attendance zones.

By the late 1970s, the Lafayette School Board had devised a plan under which kindergarten through fifth-grade students would remain in their neighborhood schools, thereby avoiding wide-scale recourse to busing. Concurrently, the Board converted a predominantly African American high school into a magnet school and attempted to draw White students to that facility. The United States Department of Justice accepted this compromise and it withdrew from the Trahan complaint after issuing a statement in which it declared that the Board was in
compliance with Judge Putnam's decree as issued eleven years earlier. Although de facto racial segregation remained in place, a modus vivendi of sorts had been reached.

In the mid-1990s, however, the Lafayette Parish School Board undertook the construction of four new schools to accommodate growth in the district's student populace without seeking the court's approval. This construction program necessitated a rezoning of school attendance boundaries. Despite efforts to remain in compliance with the court's order, when the Board unveiled its revised attendance zones for several elementary and middle schools, some parties, most notably NAACP representatives, complained that the plan violated the Trahan Court's ruling. On the other hand, because the rezoning changes required some parents in the district to send their children from highest performing (predominantly White) schools to lowest performing (predominantly African-American) schools, and made other changes perceived as threatening to White interests, it evoked the ire of some White parents. They approached the Board insisting on a return to the original attendance zones, but the Board refused to accede to their demands. Some of these same parents then filed a motion to strike down the new plan, but a Federal court dismissed it. At this juncture, a significant "White backlash" erupted. Some White parents moved from the district, others elected to send their children to local parochial schools, still others opted to home school their children.

In May 2000, Judge Richard Haik assumed jurisdiction over the Trahan lawsuit. He ruled that Lafayette Parish was in violation of Judge Putnam's order. Just three months later, Judge Haik disclosed his own plan to achieve racial desegregation in the public schools of Lafayette Parish. In sharp relief to the compromises accepted by the Justice Department in the late 1970s, this order called for drastic measures. Judge Haik mandated the closing of two predominantly African-American elementary schools whose students were to be bused to five predominantly
White schools. He also ordered extensive school personnel exchanges along racial lines: six school principals at African-American schools in the district were transferred to predominantly White schools whose principals would assume the positions of the former, and similar reassignments of district teachers were required. Without any of the negotiations that had taken place in the past, Judge Haik's plan was implemented in August, 2000.

According to Caldas et.al. (2002), Haik's mandate was viewed as draconian by many White parents, and the initial wave of "white flight" from the community and its schools accelerated dramatically. On the other hand, African American parents initially welcomed the Judge's order. In a fairly brief period of time, however, this support eroded. African American parents began to express their dissatisfaction with the closing of neighborhood schools, the mandatory busing of their children, and the prospect of their children being taught by White teachers who might well resent court-ordered transfer to lower performing schools. Through a series of small-scale, informal surveys, Caldas et al. found that African American parents were also dismayed by the intensification of "white flight" that had taken place. By mid-October, 2000, of the 39 African American parents with whom Caldas et.al. spoke, "the large majority… were opposed to every court-ordered desegregation measure currently being used in Lafayette Parish" (2002, p.55). Somewhat ironically, by the end of the year 2000, Whites and African Americans in the community (including public school teachers of both races) "felt the whole school system was worse off as a result of the court-ordered remedies" (Caldas et.al. 2002, p.58).

It is not known whether these negative perceptions of the Haik order have undergone any change during the past several years. But the foregoing account strongly suggests that the issue of institutional racism is far more prominent in Lafayette Parish than in the vast majority of public school districts in the United States today. Given the turmoil that Judge Haik's approach
to counteracting *de facto* racial segregation in the study's research site has provoked, it is anticipated that a program aimed at teaching students about institutional racism might have a beneficial impact upon race relations among high school students in this district. At the very least, it would serve to clarify the perceived need for measures to address *de facto* racial segregation in public education.

**J. Study Limitations**

Both the validity and the reliability of study findings were subject to certain limitations. Subject recruitment into the Undoing Racism workshop and in the interview portion of the study was entirely voluntary. Consequently, subject self-selection phenomena could have arisen at two junctures in the study's implementation. It was quite possible that the students who chose to take part in the study held baseline views of institutional racism that deviated from those of most students at their school.

The study was conducted at a single site, selected on the basis of convenience, that is, the willingness of district and building administrators to permit the Undoing Racism program and the study to take place. The fieldwork venue chosen through this non-probabilistic means may not have been representative of all high schools within the Lafayette Parish district.

As discussed at length in this chapter's description of the study site, the Lafayette Parish school system has been subjected to judicially mandated measures intended to reduce *de facto* racial segregation. Given these extraordinary circumstances, the generalization of findings to subjects attending schools in other districts is plainly suspect.

As a quasi-experimental study conducted in a field setting, a host of confounding variables may well have influenced the validity and reliability of study findings. Plainly, institutional racism was a salient issue within the community in which study subjects resided.
Apart from the Undoing Racism program, then, subjects were likely to have encountered personal and public (media) views on institutional racism and may well have been exposed to such information during the study's prospective sampling interval.

The size of the study sample (N = 57) was comparatively small. In itself, this represents an inherent limitation upon the reliability of findings from its quantitative components. The interview samples were even smaller, raising the question of whether findings derived from interviewee responses could be generalized beyond the sample.

The quantitative data-gathering instrument, Oscar Barbarin's Institutional Racism Scale (1996) has been found by its author to be reasonably valid and reliable (see Chapter 3). Nevertheless, it called for subjects to indicate their opinions and to provide self-report information. Such responses were vulnerable to distortions, including (but not limited to) a social desirability bias.

The qualitative dimension of the study consisted of interviews conducted with a subset of the experimental and control groups recruited on a voluntary basis. Hence, subject participation in this aspect of the study was also susceptible to a self-selection phenomenon. Moreover, the research study employed minors as subjects. Hence it did require parental authorization through consent forms, and there was no assurance that a sufficient number of parents would allow their children to take part in the prospective study.

The interview protocol covered five broad topical domains and was constructed by the researcher (see appendix). While the researcher did test pilot the schedule, its validity cannot be guaranteed or even objectively ascertained. Subject responses to interview questions were influenced by the researcher's skills in eliciting accurate and meaningful information. Finally, the
interpretation of subject interview responses was vulnerable to limitations in the researcher's interpretive abilities and unacknowledged bias (es) on his part.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Introduction

For nearly half a century now, social scientists have been developing an extensive body of theory-driven empirical research aimed at the construction of effective programs to counteract racial prejudice in our nation's public schools. Receiving powerful impetus from the United States Supreme Court's landmark desegregation ruling in Brown v. Board of Education (1954) and attendant policy gains achieved by the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s, this effort has yielded an array of racial bias reduction interventions, many of which have been implemented within American school districts. Nevertheless, in the introductory article of a comparatively recent number of the Journal of Social Issues dedicated in its entirety to this subject, Aboud and Levy (1999) asked the question: "Are we ready to translate research into programs?" Based upon their assessment of the relevant literature, their own answer to this inquiry was somewhat equivocal. They wrote that: "There is enough basic research on social cognition, developmental psychology, and peer relations as they relate to prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping to inform program development and evaluation. At the same time, there are enough race relations programs being developed and implemented to inform theorizing on prejudice" (Aboud & Levy 1999, 621-622). As this statement connotes, considerable strides have been made toward the urgent objective at hand; yet substantial gaps remain in our knowledge of "what" works to improve race relations in public education and in our understanding of "why" such programs succeed or fail in realizing their goal. As it now stands, some fifty years after Brown, the crucial task of facilitating genuine racial integration in U.S. public schools through programs that address prejudicial attitudes, stereotypical beliefs, and discriminatory behaviors is still very much a work in progress.
Stephan and Stephan (2002) have conducted a comprehensive review of published studies that include evaluations of racial bias reduction programs in educational settings and/or tests of the conceptual assumptions upon which these programs are based. Leaving aside cooperative learning (CL) research as a separate category, Stephan and Stephan undertook a meta-analysis of research on five different approaches to the improvement of race relations within the educational domain: (1) multicultural education, (2) diversity training, (3) intergroup dialogues, (4) conflict resolution techniques, and (5) moral education. Owing to deficiencies in research designs assessed against their relatively stringent inclusion criteria, Stephan and Stephan located only 35 studies that they considered to be sound. A meta-analysis based on those studies generated the finding that effect sizes, .25 for measures of attitude outcomes and .38 for measures of behavioral change, were statistically significant, but only modestly so. Examining these results, Stephan and Stephan wrote that, "it appears that most intergroup relations programs were moderately successful in changing attitudes and behaviors, but some programs did not achieve their goals, and in a small number of cases, these programs actually had negative outcomes" (2002, 10). Even among the studies that passed their initial screening, such limitations as small sample sizes, reliance upon subject self-report data, and the use of varied measures of intergroup relations (many of them author-constructed and lacking established validity and reliability coefficients) were commonplace. On the whole, we can only conclude that Stephan and Stephan's findings are disappointing and, above all, inconclusive.

To be sure, we do have a firm understanding that some baseline ingredients of more harmonious racial relations among public school students are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to effectuate attitudinal or behavioral change in the desired direction. We know, for example, that simply bringing white and black students into the same school or the same
classroom will not yield higher levels of racial tolerance. As Johnson and Johnson (1992) have asserted, "physical proximity alone will not necessarily reduce prejudice and rejection" (244). We know too that merely providing objective information about members of a minority group (African Americans for example) to members of a majority group (that is, European American students), is not an effective means for reducing deeply rooted racial prejudice among the latter (Pate 1981, 288). Thus, according to Johnson and Johnson, the available research indicates "that reducing prejudice and discrimination requires more than intellectual knowledge about other groups or the desire to be accepting and appreciative, although both of these factors help" (1992, 265). Neither the opportunity to come into contact with minority group students nor increased knowledge about other races will necessarily induce reductions in prejudice and discrimination among white public school students.

The insufficiency of these seemingly straightforward steps to alter negative racial stereotypes, to diminish prejudicial views, and to promote positive interaction between white and non-white students is acknowledged within the regnant theoretical model of inter-racial group relations improvement. As first articulated by Gordon Allport in his text The Nature of Prejudice (1954), the "contact hypothesis" stipulates that certain conditions must be met to ensure that interactions between members of groups that are racially prejudiced and members of groups that are the targets or "victims" of such prejudice undergo constructive change. In American schools, these preconditions have been operationalized through the use of cooperative learning (or cooperative education) instructional approaches and, on the whole, have proven fairly effective. Moreover, dimensions of the "contact hypothesis" have been incorporated into more recent models, including the "in-group common identity" construct drawn from small group research. As will be brought forth in this chapter, CL approaches that replicate the salient features of
Allport's contact hypothesis and/or yield re-categorizations of group identity have shown considerable promise as means for reducing racial prejudice and discrimination in American schools.

However, as will be demonstrated in the sections of this review that follow immediately below, not only does de facto racial segregation within American public education remain the norm some fifty years after Brown, even within nominally "integrated" schools, "second generation" segregation (based, in part, upon seemingly race-neutral assignments of students to stratified curriculum tracks and/or ability groups) has emerged of late. Indeed, both generations of racial segregation have been reinforced through less overt types of racism, including what scholars currently refer to as "modern" and "institutional" racism. Taken in tandem, "first generation" and "second generation" racial segregation in American school systems and schools have exerted a negative influence upon both the academic achievement of minority group students and upon efforts to reduce prejudice through cooperative learning arrangements.

Consequently, in addition to CL and its groundwork in Allport's contact hypothesis, scholars have explored methods for reducing racial prejudice in white students through the induction of dissonance, utilizing techniques that do not require the participation of non-whites in classroom learning teams. Early efforts along these lines drew theoretical guidance from Leon Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance and have been elaborated through such construct's as Devine's (1989) "dissociation hypothesis." They have sought to mobilize conflicts between extant stereotype-congruent beliefs, prejudicial attitudes, and discriminatory behavior, on the one hand, with contra-stereotypical information and norms such as the value of equal opportunity. Of late, moreover, considerable attention has been devoted to empathy as a mediator of racial prejudice reduction program outcomes. The results of these efforts suggest that while
interventions based upon cross-racial student cooperation within classrooms are certainly desirable, progress can be made toward prejudice reduction even absent the preconditions for CL. They also indicate that the prejudice-reducing effects of CL itself can be enhanced through dissonance techniques that more explicitly activate cognitive, affective, and normative processes in majority group members, including white or European American students.

B. The Historical Background and Context of "First Generation" Racial Segregation in American Public Education

In 1896, the United States Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of statutes mandating or permitting racial segregation in public accommodations, including public schools, in its now infamous Plessy v. Ferguson decision. By doing so, the highest tribunal in the nation endorsed the "separate but equal" doctrine embodied in Jim Crow legislation enacted by southern states after the Reconstruction Era. Since some 90 percent of all African Americans resided in the southern region of the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, the net result was that the vast majority of black Americans were consigned to racially segregated schools. Worse, despite the proviso that educational provisions furnished to "colored" students should be equal to those enjoyed by their white counterparts, unconscionably wide disparities arose in per pupil expenditures between these racially separated systems. Not all of the nation's school systems followed this dual, hierarchical pattern. Indeed, in response to the injustice of the Plessy ruling, by 1910, seven states---Illinois, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania---prohibited de jure segregation in public accommodations, including schooling (Minter & Prettyman, 1995). Arguably the northward migration of African Americans that occurred during the first quarter of the twentieth century was in large measure driven by the desire of blacks to escape de jure discriminatory treatment in the south, with segregated school systems at its core.
Starting in the late 1930s, African Americans turned to the courts in a prolonged and persistent effort to chip away at the "separate but equal" doctrine imposed upon them in the South (and elsewhere). Spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP's) Legal Defense and Education Fund (LDEF), some progress toward racial integration at publicly-supported universities and colleges was realized through US Supreme Court rulings for plaintiffs in such cases as Missouri ex rel. Gains v. Canada (1938), McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1950) and Sweat v. Painter (1950). These suits forced white institutions to admit blacks to their post-secondary, graduate and professional programs upon a showing that no comparable programs for blacks were in existence (Minter & Prettyman 1995). Nevertheless, de jure racial segregation in primary and secondary education remained intact.

It was on May 17, 1954 that the United States Supreme Court opined in the case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka that, "'in the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal'" (cited in Kluger 1976, p.707). In theory, de jure racial segregation in public schooling had come to an end, and one year later, the Court issued an implementation order, directing that states implement desegregation with "'all deliberate speed.'" (cited in Kluger 1976, p.731).

In practice, however, school desegregation did not immediately follow in the wake of the Brown decision. Instead, during the next decade officials in Southern states attempted to block court-ordered public school integration, as epitomized by Governor Orville Faubus literally standing in door of a Little Rock, Arkansas high school to prevent the enrollment of its first black students. Under the Eisenhower and, more forcefully, the Kennedy administrations, the federal government responded to racist obstructionism by direct means, including the
federalization of National Guard troops to enforce school desegregation. It was not until the mid
1960s, however, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act of 1965, that the United States Attorney General and the United States
Congress were granted the legal and, as importantly, the financial powers needed to make public
school racial integration a permanent reality. "With the passage of these acts, the federal
government obtained the fiscal and legal leverage necessary to overcome massive resistance to
desegregation in the South and other parts of the country" (Minter & Prettytman 1995, 861).

Some progress was immediately forthcoming: in 1964, 2.3 percent of southern black
students attended integrated public schools but by 1966, this proportion had risen to 12.5 percent
(Minter & Prettytman 1995, 862). In 1966, however, the Coleman Report brought attention to de
facto racial inequality and segregation in American public education. Its authors noted that
"American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country, including all
those where Negroes form any significant part of the population" (Coleman 1966, iii). The report
observed, for example, that across the United States some 80 percent of all white elementary and
secondary school students attended schools that were 90 percent to 100 percent white. The
persistence of both educational inequality and segregation along racial lines was (and remains in
large part) due to the combination of pronounced residential segregation, entrenched
socioeconomic disparities between whites and blacks, and the American tradition of "local"
control (and financing) over public schools. In 1967, the United States Commission on Civil
Rights issued a report under the title of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, in which it argued
for the establishment of "magnet schools" that would voluntarily draw black students from low-
income urban neighborhoods together with white students from high(er)-income suburban
communities together. The effect of the magnet school program was minimal, owing to
inadequate federal funding and deficiencies in the preparation of black students to enter challenging environments.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the United States Supreme Court issued rulings that did have a powerful effect on de facto racial segregation. The first of these occurred through its decision in the case of *Green vs. County School Board* (1968) in which the Court ordered the immediate desegregation of southern schools through all means necessary, including the mandatory busing of black students to schools located in predominantly white communities. According to Minter and Prettyman (1995), during the 1968-1969 school year, 32 percent of southern black students attended integrated schools, but by the 1970-1971 school year, this had risen to 79 percent (p.862). This was followed in 1971 by the Court's unanimous decision in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board Education*. In that case, the Court demanded that officials in North Carolina immediately achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation by redistributing 14,000 of 24,000 black students attending all-black or nearly all-black schools under the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school board's jurisdiction to integrated schools via busing.

*Swann* was relatively effective in achieving a measure of racial integration in pockets of southern resistance, but its reliance upon busing provoked a backlash, most notably in the north. As Minter and Prettyman (1995) apprise us, "in the aftermath of *Swann*, many who had been stalwart in their opposition to de jure segregation in the South reversed their position and argued against busing in the North by charging that busing was an infringement on the authority of local school districts and on the prerogatives of parents" (863). Indeed, during the 1974-1975 school year, mandatory busing proposals to facilitate racial desegregation spawned violent riots in such northern cities as Boston. Based upon costs, convenience, and the "home rule" tradition of
American education, ostensibly "low-prejudiced" whites actively resisted busing as an antidote for school segregation grounded in residential segregation.

During the ensuing decades, this stand-off in further progress towards *de facto* de-segregation of American schools has remained in place. A survey conducted in 1990 by the National School Boards Association reported that 63 percent of African American students attended schools that it classified as segregated (Orfield & Montfort 1992). Indeed, in the South, there has been an actual reversal of gains. According to Orfield and Yun (1999), desegregation in eleven Southern states peaked in 1988, when 43.5 percent of African-American students attended majority-White schools. By 1998, however, the proportion of African-American students in majority-White schools dropped to 32.7 percent, the smallest percentage since 1970.

The driving force behind the "re-segregation" of American schools and school districts has been the "white flight" from the nation's cities to its burgeoning suburbs that has unfolded since the post-World War II period and gathered momentum since (Bradford 1993). Extreme racial segregation in housing patterns led to inordinate concentrations of minority populations in urban areas and concentrations of the White population in suburban areas. Combined with a tendency of parents of all racial groups to object to busing this has resulted in a pattern whereby "urban school districts have increasingly fewer White students, whereas suburban school districts still have few minority students" (Khmelkov & Hallinan 1999, 635-636). This outcome has been fueled by self-reinforcing factors. According to Bankston and Caldas (1996), "the pursuit of (racial) integration (in public education), "has arguably led to the exacerbation of another form of segregation: residential segregation…. (as) white families have increasingly fled to school districts with small African American populations" (537-538). Given reliance upon local sources of public school financing the net result is that white students typically attend all or nearly all
white suburban schools that enjoy substantially greater expenditures per pupil that the urban schools in which non-white students predominate. De facto, American public education remains racially segregated and decidedly "unequal."

C. "Second Generation" Racial Segregation in Education and Modern/Institutional Racial Discrimination

Concern with the persistence of "first generation" segregation in American public schooling has been augmented and intensified of late by the appearance of what some scholars refer to as "second generation" segregation or "re-segregation." As Mickelson (2001) delineates the pertinent distinction, "first generation segregation generally involves the racial composition of schools within a single district, and has been the focus of national desegregation efforts since Brown. Second-generation segregation involves the racially correlated allocation of educational opportunities within schools typically accomplished by tracking" (p.216). During the late 1980s, research teams began to investigate another mode of racial segregation that occurs within otherwise "integrated" schools. In 1989, for example, Meir, Steward and England (1989) carried out a statistical analysis of all of the nation's school districts with 15,000 or more students. They found that "resegregation" along racial lines was prevalent and that it occurred through the seemingly race-neutral mechanisms of ability grouping, curriculum tracking, special education assignments, and disciplinary actions.

Turning to the third and fourth of these mechanisms, we note with Jackson (2001) that" for over twenty-five years, African-American students have continued to experience overrepresentation in special education, disproportionate suspensions and expulsions, and a higher drop-out rate" (p.25). In their study of student assignments to special education classes, Gottlieb, Alter, Gottlieb and Wishner (1994) found that poor non-white students are inordinately prone to be identified as "learning disabled" and placed in "special education" classes outside of
the mainstream student body. Gottlieb et.al. concluded the "vast majority" of such students are not, in fact, learning disabled but, instead, "victims" of low socioeconomic backgrounds (Gottlieb, Alter, Gottlieb & Wishner 1994, 456).

Several researchers have found that African American students comprise an inordinately large proportion of all suspensions and expulsions from public schools; indeed, nationally, more than half of all such disciplinary actions are imposed on African American males (Carter & Jackson 1982, Coalition of Advocates for Students 1998, Jackson 2001). From their examination of the data, Skiba and Peterson (1999) concluded that a "double standard" along racial lines was at work under the banner of "zero tolerance" policies.

It is, however, primarily through within school curriculum tracking and the closely-related practice of ability grouping that "second generation" racial segregation is said to take place even within schools that are said to be racially integrated. In the former, students are assigned to one in a stratified system of tracks----"college bound" or "accelerated" versus "vocational" or "regular"---while in the latter, students are grouped within classes according to their purported academic abilities. Research has conclusively shown that this system favors white students at the expense of their black peers. For example, from his examination of a desegregated middle school, Schofield (1989) reported that more than 80 percent of eighth-grade students assigned to "academically accelerated" track were white while, conversely, more than 80 percent of eight-grade students assigned to a "regular" track were black. In her study of two school districts, Oakes (1996) discovered a similar pattern of racial segregation at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. An examination of relevant data prompted Hallinan (1996) to conclude that when compared to their white counterparts, black students are less likely to move up levels in school tracking systems and more likely to move down to "lower" tracks.
Mickelson (2001) confirmed this same pattern in the eleven high schools of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina public school district. Not only were blacks more likely than whites to be placed on the "lower" tracks, Mickelson's study revealed that "Black and White students with comparable academic abilities are found in different academic tracks. Blacks are far more likely to be in lower tracks than their similarly able White counterparts" (p.217). On this basis, Mickelson concluded that the school district in question had utilized curriculum tracking to subvert the intention of the Supreme Court's order in Swann.

These results reflect the presence of a form of racial prejudice in our nation's schools that is far less overt than the blatant racism of the past and is often referred to as "modern" and/or "institutional" racism. Through what appear to be "race-neutral" or "meritocratic" criteria and evaluation mechanisms, such as scores on standardized tests using European American content, majority group educators and school officials justify the separation of white and black students within "integrated" schools via curriculum tracking/ability grouping (Mickelson 2001). Reinforced by the overlap between race and socio-economic status, because such modern or institutional discrimination is indirect, it is difficult to prove. Nonetheless, modern or institutional racism does appear to be pervasive within American schools and correlates with "traditional" racial prejudice. In a revealing study that included 5284 fifth-grade students and 886 teachers working in 94 elementary schools, Epstein (1985) found that those teachers who opposed racial integration in education were far more likely to favor curriculum tracking and ability grouping than those who supported racial integration.

It is not surprising to find that both "overt" and "modern" racism persists in American society. According to Slavin and Cooper (1993), "research shows that many youths still carry the legacy of ethnic and racial hatred engendered by their parents, grandparents, and community."
Although acts of intolerance and racism, in most cases, are more subtle than they were 20 years ago, we are seeing a resurgence of overt racist and violent manifestations of discrimination and prejudice on school campuses" (659). Consider that when Bigler and Leben (1993) asked 75 white elementary school children to attribute positive or negative traits to "only White people," "only Black people," or "both White and Black people," over half of their young subjects said that "only Black people" can be "bad," "cruel," "dirty," "mean," "naughty," "stupid," "selfish," and "ugly." Grounded in deep-rooted stereotypes formed in early childhood, majority group members assume negative appraisals of minority group members (most notably of African Americans) that persist into adulthood. As an expression of "modern" racism, they typically believe that white people hold a dominant position in American society because they "deserve" to do so by virtue of their superior attributes and efforts (Hidalgo, McDowell & Siddle 1992). White youngsters and adults characteristically deny the existence of structural mechanisms that operate against African Americans in educational and employment domains, including (but not limited to), curriculum tracking/ability grouping assignments based upon standardized tests that are culturally biased towards European Americans (Cummins, 1986; O'Brien 2001). Moreover, as O'Brien (2001) has concluded, there are strong associations between scores on such instruments as the Modern Racism Scale and the denial that institutional racism exists.

D. The Impact of Segregation and Modern Racism on Black Students

The academic underachievement of African Americans in public schools has been amply documented. Steele (1992), for example, has noted that in preschool years there is very little variance between black and white children on standardized test scores. However, beginning in the first grade and undergoing a dramatic acceleration after the fourth grade, a racial achievement gap on national norm referenced tests emerges, with black students under-
performing their white counterparts by a large and progressively widening margin. Indeed, this phenomenon is evident even after socio-economic factors such as household income and parental educational attainment are controlled (Steele 1992, 1999).

As mentioned above, despite *de jure* de-segregation, most African Americans public school students today attend predominantly black schools. Using data from the 1990 National Educational Longitudinal Study, Brown (1990) has found that the average levels of academic achievement for both white and black students are higher in *de facto* integrated schools than they are in racially segregated schools. In a series of studies encompassing all the public high schools in the state of Louisiana, Bankston and Caldas (1996, 1997) found that the degree of minority group concentration in schools exerted a strong negative effect upon individual student scores on the Louisiana Graduation Exit Examination (GEE). This effect, which cannot be explained by socioeconomic factors, has a negative impact for both whites and blacks, but is most powerful in its negative effects on African American student learning outcomes (Bankston & Caldas 1996). Moreover, using data drawn from the same sampling universe, Bankston and Caldas (1997) found that the academic achievement gap between whites and blacks is smallest in predominantly white schools and greatest in predominantly black schools. In this study, blacks who attended predominantly white schools performed much better on the GEE than blacks who attended predominantly black schools.

As we might anticipate, first generation racial segregation exerts a very powerful influence upon social interactions between white and black students. In a longitudinal study of twelve schools, Patchen (1982) found that white students had more friendly inter-racial contact with black peers as the percentage of blacks in their school increased.
Second generation segregation through such practices as curriculum tracking and ability grouping also exerts a depressive effect upon the academic achievements of African American students. Epstein (1985) reported that African American students in classes that are not ability grouped and that use cooperative learning methods enjoy significantly higher levels of academic achievement than blacks in classes that are strictly divided into ability groups.

Curriculum tracking and ability grouping tend to curtail cross-racial interaction and friendship formation. In an early observational study of cross-racial contacts in a school cafeteria, Schofield and Sugar (1977) found that cross-racial contact among 7th graders who were not (yet) assigned to curriculum tracks was much higher than interaction between curriculum-tracked 8th grade students. Subsequently, Hallinan and Sorenson (1985) reported that student best friend choices by elementary school students were concentrated among students in their own ability group and that such concentration tended to increase as students advanced in grade level. Thereafter, Hallinan and Teixeira (1987) found that white students were much more likely to name a black student as one of their "best friends" if the two were in the same ability group. Finally, Braddock and Slavin (1993) found that black students in schools utilizing curriculum tracking reported more racist remarks and worse inter-racial relations than did blacks in schools that did not use curriculum tracking.

A number of researchers have developed evidence that the academic achievement of African American students is negatively influenced by their perceptions of being objects of discriminatory stereotypes and institutional racism. On the first count, Steele (1999) conducted a series of studies that led him to conclude that when what he called "stereotype threat" is present, blacks under-perform whites on measures of academic ability but that when stereotype threat is removed, black students perform as well as their white counterparts. In one of these
investigations, Steele and a colleague (Aronson) asked a sample of European American and African Americans students on verge of taking a difficult test to tell them about their preferences in sports and music. When the test was presented to their subjects as a measure of ability, the black students "spurned" things African-American such as basketball, jazz, hip-hop to a greater extent than whites. However, when the test was presented to their subjects as unrelated to academic ability, black students indicated strong preferences for stereotypically African-American music and sports (Steele 1999).

Schmader, Major and Gramzow (1999) undertook research into academic "disengagement" within a sample comprised of 676 undergraduates attending the University of California at Los Angeles (184 African Americans, 270 Latinos and 222 European Americans). They reasoned that individuals disengage from activities in which their below-mean performance threatens their self-esteem. Subjects responded to a questionnaire item intended to measure psychological engagement in academic pursuits in the form of the statement: "Being good at academics is an important part of who I am." Subjects also indicated their level of agreement with four items on tapping into their perceived sense of racial injustice, including one that stated: "Differences in status between ethnic groups are the result of injustice." Schmader et.al. (1999) then collected semester grades for all of the students in their study sample. Their analysis of this data led to the finding that for both European American and Latino students there is an association between disengagement from academics and classroom grades. By contrast, among the African American students in this study, academic disengagement was not significantly associated with school grades but was significantly correlated with perceived racial injustice.

What we find, then, is that both "first generation" and "second generation" forms of public school segregation adversely affect the academic performance and the cross-racial
interactions of African American students. Such segregation is linked to both overt and "modern" or "institutional" racism. Moreover, perceived racism on the part of its victims may well exert a negative impact on African American academic achievement through the mechanisms of stereotype threat and psychological disengagement from academic pursuits.

E. Theoretical Models Informing Racial Prejudice Reduction Programs in Public Schools

According to Slavin and Cooper (1999) "Social science inquiry on race and intergroup relations has been dominated by tenets of Gordon Allport's research. Allport's The Nature of Prejudice (1954) has served as the basis for the study of intergroup relations since the mid-1950s" (649). As mentioned at the outset of this review, Allport's "contact hypothesis" states that increased contact between members of different racial groups will not necessarily reduce cross-group hostility and prejudice among those individuals. In order for such contact to reduce racial prejudice, Allport asserted, four basic conditions must be met: (1) equal group status within the situation, (2) common goals that require a measure of member interdependence to reach, (3) intergroup cooperation, and (4) authority support for cooperation. Allport's contact hypothesis has undergone a number of modifications over the years. The most frequently noted of these is Pettigrew's addition of a fifth condition; that is, "the contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends" (1998, 76). Moreover, several scholars have observed that satisfying all of these conditions is exceedingly difficult (Wittig 1998, Forbes 1997). Nevertheless, as we review the research on the effectiveness of cooperative learning, we find that many forms of CL do attempt to meet all of the prerequisites for prejudice reduction embodied in Allport's contact hypothesis.

Allport did not supply a detailed explanation of why contact under the conditions that he specified would reduce racism. What has become known as the "common in-group identity
approach" as advanced by, among others, Gaertner and Dovidio, posits that equal status, cooperative interaction, interpersonal interaction, and supportive norms reduce racial bias because they alter members' cognitive representations of membership categories from an "us" versus "them" dual categorization to a more inclusive `we'" category (Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman & Anastasio 1994, 226).

Another salient theoretical underpinning of prejudice reduction interventions undertaken in school settings originates in Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance. Festinger argued that when people experience self-inconsistency they feel uncomfortable and will therefore be moved to engage in behavioral or cognitive change to eliminate that inconsistency. For example, individuals who think of themselves as being "fair-minded" or egalitarian may change racially biased beliefs about and/or actions towards members of other racial groups when they are reminded of their adherence to these norms.

This dissonance mechanism is, in fact, a crucial assumption under-girding Devine's (1989) dissociation model. Here we note with Monteith and Walters (1998) that white Americans have conflicting tendencies in their attitudes toward non-whites and that "across a variety of studies, approximately 78% of the sampled (white) populations indicated that they should respond with less prejudice than is apparent in their actual responses" (1998, 186). Thus, "for those (whites) who have integrated egalitarian ideals into their value system," Devine (1989) has asserted, "conflict would exist between these (racially tolerant) ideals and expressions of racial prejudice" (1989, p.15). As Devine has put it, "for change to be successful, each time the stereotype is activated the person must activate and think about his or her personal beliefs. That is, the individual must increase the frequency with which the personal belief structure is activated when responding to members of the stereotyped group" (Devine 1989, p.16). By
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reminding them of their consciously-held values, the subconscious or "automatic" stereotypes embedded in the memories of such individuals can be repressed in a manner that is akin to breaking a habit, motivation stemming from perceptions of self inconsistency.

The mobilization of cognitive dissonance to generate reductions in racial prejudice can also be accomplished by instructing majority group members to take the perspective of a victim of discrimination, and this mechanism is a presumed part of various role-playing exercises that have been employed to counteract racial bias. Role-playing, however, may also tap into the prejudice-reducing capacities of empathizing with victims of racial discrimination (Stephan & Finlay 1999). As defined by Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein, and Highberger (1997) empathy is "an other-oriented emotional response congruent with another's perceived welfare; if the other is oppressed or in need, empathic feelings include sympathy, compassion, tenderness and the like" (p.105). In a recently published article, Stephan and Finlay (1999) asserted that there are two basic types of empathy; cognitive and affective. In essence, cognitive empathy amounts to taking the perspective of another person as, for example, in attempting to view a discriminatory situation from the standpoint of the victim. Affective empathy, Stephan and Finlay (1999) maintain, has two forms: "parallel" empathy in which an individual experiences emotional responses similar to that of another person, and reactive empathy, in which an individual has his or her own affective reaction to the emotional experience of another person.

Recent research suggests that techniques which direct individuals to empathize with a member of a racial group that is subject to discrimination can yield measurable declines in prejudice. The precise channels through which empathy serves as a mediator of attitudinal/behavioral change are still under investigation. According to Stephan and Finlay
"researchers have proposed several explanations to account for the mediational role of empathy in improving intergroup relations" (1999, 734). For their part, Batson et.al. (1997) have outlined a three-stage process through which empathy for a member of a out-group (a racial minority group) can change attitudes towards all members of that same group. In the first of these stages, the subject (prejudiced) individual experiences empathic concern for a member of an out-group. This, in turn, segues to a second stage in which he or she begins to value the welfare of that same out-group individual. In the third stage, concern for the welfare of an individual leads to generalization to the group of which the person is a member, generating "more positive beliefs about, feelings toward, and concern for the group" (Batson et.al. 1997, 106). Instructing individuals to vicariously "feel" what a member of an out-group in a situation that involves discriminatory treatment thereby lessens racially prejudiced attitudes towards all members of that out-group.

Finlay and Stephan (2000) have also found that empathizing with members of an out-group may work by reducing perceptions that out-group members pose a threat to their well-being. Stephan, Diaz-Loving, and Duran (2000) have developed what they term the "integrated threat theory" of racial prejudice. In their taxonomy, perceptions of out-group members can generate four types of threat: (1) objective (or realistic); (2) symbolic; (3) in-group anxiety; and (4) negative stereotypes. Realistic threats have some basis in fact, as when affirmative action policies favoring minority group members are objectively assessed as being detrimental to the interests of majority group members. As such, they are not implicated directly in racial prejudice. Subjective or symbolic threats "arise because of perceived group differences in morals, values, norms, standards, beliefs and attitudes. Symbolic threats are threats to the in-group's worldview" (Stephan et.al. 2000, 241). Group anxiety occurs when people feel threatened by interactions
with out-group members because they are worried about being rejected, embarrassed, ridiculed, or exploited. Lastly, "negative stereotypes are implied threats to the in-group because they lead the in-group members to fear that negative consequences will befall them in the course of intergroup interaction" (Stephan et.al. 241).

Stephan, Diaz-Loving, and Duran (2000) tested their integrated threat model in a study of relations between European American and Mexican college students. They recruited 126 students attending New Mexico State University and 130 students enrolled at the La Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. They directed these subjects to complete a Likert-type scale instrument developed by Stephan to indicate the degree to which they felt 12 different evaluative or emotional reactions toward members of respective outgroups (American or Mexican). This questionnaire also included items measuring realistic threats ("there should be stricter limitations on the number of foreigners allowed to work in my country"), symbolic threats ("there are very few differences in the values of U.S. citizens and Mexican citizens," intergroup anxiety (items tapping into how subjects felt working with member of out-group), and stereotype threats (items asking for estimates of the percentage of outgroup members possessing each of 12 stereotypical traits). Stephan et.al. found that scores for all four of the threat dimensions were predictive of evaluative or emotional reactions toward members of the out-group. For the American subjects in this study, prejudicial attitudes were more strongly associated with anxiety about interaction and negative stereotyping than with realistic and symbolic threats. For both groups of students in the sample, Stephan and his colleagues found that prejudicial attitudes were more heavily influenced by the quality of contact with out-group members than by frequency of such interaction.
F. The Influence of Cooperative Learning Arrangements on Racial Prejudice

Of the six generic types of racial prejudice reduction interventions examined by Stephan and Stephan (2002), cooperative learning was found to be the most fully documented. In contrast to multicultural education, CL is an indirect method for reducing prejudice. Its primary purpose is, in fact, to enhance learning outcomes. Many studies have reported that cooperative learning can be successful in accomplishing both of these objectives. As their examination of the literature suggested to Khmelkov and Hallinan (1999), "research has found cooperative learning methods to be quite successful in improving inter-racial relations, while improving the academic performance of all students, but especially Black and Hispanic children" (638).

There are many different sub-types of CL; Slavin and Cooper (1999) have identified no fewer than eight different forms of cooperative learning that are currently being used in American public schools. Nevertheless, Slavin and Cooper were able to summarize the basic features of all CL methods in a passage that reads:

The term applies to a set of instructional strategies that involve students working collaboratively in groups with little teacher supervision….Cooperative learning methods attempt to reduce competition in classrooms by rewarding students based on the performance of all individuals in their groups…In some cooperative learning methods, the group is awarded points or recognition based on the average academic performance of each member of the group. Teachers often delegate authority and responsibility for group management and learning to the students… The instructional methods used are structured to give each student a chance to make substantial contributions to the team, so that the teammates will be equal, at least in the sense of role equity specified by Allport. It is important to note that group work does not in itself constitute cooperative learning…but that cooperative learning groups place emphasis on the
academic learning success of each individual member of the group (Slavin & Cooper 1999, p.650).

CL is effective as a means for reducing racial prejudice when members of different racial groups, white and black students, for example, are assigned to the same cooperative team. As Slavin and Cooper's synopsis implies, CL classroom arrangements typically satisfy all four of the preconditions specified by Allport in his contact hypothesis for the reduction of prejudice.

Without attempting to calculate effect sizes Slavin and Cooper (1999) conducted an informal box count of research concerning the influence of cooperative learning on racial prejudice. They reported that, "with only a few exceptions, this research has demonstrated that, when the conditions outlined by Allport are met in the classroom, students are more likely to have friends outside their own racial groups than they would in traditional classrooms, as measured by responses to such sociometric items as 'Who are your best friends in this class?'" (Slavin & Cooper 1999, 653).

Johnson and Johnson (1992) carried out a meta-analysis of 180 studies that compared the relative impact of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic classroom instructional methods on student interpersonal attraction toward members of outgroups in their classes. They discovered that cooperation promotes greater interpersonal attraction among team participants compared with competition. The effect sizes (Cohen's d) were .66 for CL versus competitive arrangements and .60 for CL versus individualistic teaching methods, Johnson and Johnson noting that "these findings are strong ones" (p.249). Among the studies included in this exercise was an investigation carried out in 1980 by Cooper, Johnson, Johnson and Wilderson. They randomly assigned 60 white and black students at a lower-income, inner-city junior high school to cooperative, competitive, and individualistic conditions for a period of three hours a day over
a two week time span. Their results indicated that participation in the cooperation mode promoted more positive cross-ethnic relationships than did taking part in competitive or individualistic arrangements.

The Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD) program is one of the most popular forms of cooperative learning, and from their review of relevant studies Slavin and Cooper (1999) found that "evidence linking STAD to gains in cross-racial friendships is strong" (653). Among such studies, Slavin (1977) assigned a group of middle school students to racially heterogeneous teams using STAD for a period of twelve weeks. He then measured the number of cross-racial friendships gained during that three-month period with those of a control group that were not taught by STAD methods. He reported that the former exceeded the latter by a statistically significant margin. After a year's time, Slavin (1979) re-tested the same sample. At that temporal juncture, students in the control group listed an average of less than one friend of another race (9.5 percent of their friendship choices), while those in the STAD group, averaged 2.4 friends outside their own race (37.9 percent of their friendship choices). Hansell and Slavin (1981) conducted an identical investigation of STAD's influence upon cross-racial friendships with a sample of 424 seventh and eighth grade students. In this study, the researchers measured the strength of friendship ties. They found that exposure to STAD exerted an effect upon both the number and the strength of cross-racial friendships.

Another form of CL that has come into widespread usage is the Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT). DeVries, Edwards, and Slavin (1978) undertook four field experiments using Teams-Games-Tournaments version of CL with 558 7th through 12th grade students. As in the STAD studies, the outcome measure in DeVries et.al. was the number of reported cross racial friendships gained during exposure to TGT (ten to twelve weeks). DeVries and his colleagues
found that TGT was "more effective than control treatments in increasing both the number and percentage of cross-racial sociometric choices" (360).

Approaching CL from the standpoint of in-group identity theory, Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell and Pomare (1990) assigned a sample of 474 students in general psychology to 79 racially heterogeneous six-person groups. They sought evidence of group re-categorization being facilitated through cooperative learning endeavors. Gaertner et.al.'s (1990) study results were congruent with the premise that cooperative tasks alter group categorical boundaries. They stated that: "cooperation degraded the two-groups representation and induced the memberships to re-categorize themselves as one larger group. Also, the more strongly the aggregate was regarded as one group, the more highly out-group members were evaluated, a consequence that contributed substantially to the reduction of intergroup bias" (Gaertner et.al. 1990, 700).

Using a sample of 1,375 students enrolled at a multi-cultural high school, Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman and Anastasio (1994) explored the influence of the contact hypothesis's four preconditions upon race relations at that school. Based upon student report, they found that equal status, cooperative interdependence, interaction and egalitarian norms supported by authority were all associated with reduced perceived intergroup bias.

As this selective sampling of relevant studies has suggested, cooperative learning arrangements utilizing teams comprised of individuals from different racial groups are evidently effective in reducing racial prejudice and discrimination as reflected in such sociometric measures as friendship choices. There is, however, a strong practical constraint that limits reliance upon CL as a prejudice reducing method in American public schools. As noted above, the combined effect of first-generation and second-generation segregation severely constricts opportunities to form cross-racial CL teams. With that in mind, the review now turns to methods
that have been employed to reduce racial prejudice that do not require the joint participation of students from different racial groups.

G. The Influence of Multicultural Education upon Racial Prejudice

According to Banks and Banks (1993), multicultural education (MCE) emerged in the 1960s as an educational reform movement aimed, in part, at counteracting the European American content bias of public school curricula. "Traditional" textbooks and lesson plans used in public schools rarely, if ever, make positive reference to non-whites. As a means of remedying this form of institutionalized racism, multicultural education includes lessons that highlight the accomplishments and contributions of non-whites. Multicultural education has three distinct goals: (1) generating closer equivalency in the academic achievements of white and non-white students; (2) promoting pride and self-esteem in minority group students; and, (3) promoting more positive intergroup relations by reducing prejudicial attitudes held by majority group students (Kehoe 1994). From the standpoint of this study's interests, multicultural educational programs "typically aim to expose (white) children to minority groups using symbolic models, with the goal of reducing racial bias that is assumed to result from ignorance about other ethnic and racial groups" (Bigler 1999, 689). Unlike CL, prejudice reduction is, in fact, an explicit goal of multicultural education.

The earliest studies of MCE's influence upon the racial attitudes of majority group students reported disappointing results. Many studies of MCE conducted during the 1970s, including those of Litcher, Johnson and Ryan (1973) and Best, Smith, Graves and Williams (1975) Lessing and Clarke (1976) generated "nonsignificant effects" for MCE's influence upon the racial attitudes of white students. Williams and Morland (1976) reviewed four well-designed and well-executed MCE intervention studies, of which only one showed any significant impact
on racial attitudes. They concluded that, "attitude modification via classroom curriculum procedures is, at best, very difficult to accomplish" (p.165). Moreover, when significant results for MCE were reported, the effects did not persist over time. For example, Katz and Zalk (1978) carried out a story reading intervention aimed at reducing racial bias in majority group children. Although immediate post-intervention measures displayed a significant improvement in the racial attitudes of Katz and Zalk's subjects, upon six-month follow-up these effects disappeared. More recently, Neville and Furlong (1994) investigated the impact of participation in a cultural awareness program upon the racial attitudes and social behaviors of 75 first-year college students at a West Coast university. The intervention itself consisted of subjects attending six multicultural workshops, and the researchers administered the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) before and after this intervention. They failed to find statistically significant differences in responses to the MRS of the workshop participants when compared to those of a control group participating in a personal development program.

Several advocates of multicultural education now maintain that insofar as prejudice reduction among majority group students is concerned, MCE has not proven to be an effective means for realizing that end. Thus, Banks (1995) has stated that "curriculum interventions can help students to develop more positive racial attitudes, but….the effects of such interventions are not likely to be consistent. The conflicting findings from the careful studies reviewed attest to the difficulties of curriculum-intervention studies" (622). Arriving at an even more negative estimation, Bigler (1999) has recently observed that "a surprising finding in the intervention literature is that some of the children included in the experimental program routinely developed more biased attitudes as a result of exposure to multicultural programs and experiences" (693).
Part of the problem here may well lie in the classroom implementation of MCE curricula by teachers who are not adequately versed in multiculturalism. Morelli and Spencer (2000) conducted a survey of the extent to which teachers, administrators, counselors, and social workers in five school districts in the northwestern United States use multicultural education and/or anti-racist education. Their study suffered from a low response rate (under 50 percent) and a commensurately small final study sample (N = 44). Nevertheless, 82 percent of those responding said that they used some form of MCE in their classrooms/schools. However, the definitions of MCE and its core concepts supplied by Morelli and Spencer's subjects varied widely. Moreover, the researchers noted that "in most cases, MCE was used as a supplement to the regular curriculum, without the benefit of training or support" (2000, 173). By contrast, only 29 percent of the respondents stated that anti-racist education (ARE) was used in their classrooms and schools. On this front, Morelli and Spencer gathered from their subjects' responses that "teachers and administrators were unwilling to use ARE because they had insufficient knowledge of its objectives and methods and feared negative community reaction" (173). Of those who were knowledgeable about ARE, however, several indicated their belief that it would be more effective than MCE in reducing racial bias among white students. But these subjects also reported uncertainty about the difficulties that they would encounter if they attempted to use ARE in school communities that are resistant to change.

H. The Influence of Anti-Racist Education upon Racial Prejudice

Many African American scholars and advocates, including Grinter (1992) and Pinderhughes (1997), have argued that multicultural education, while highlighting the achievements of non-whites, fails to address structural inequities that support racism in American society and thereby inadvertently reinforces institutional racism. According to Grinter
(1992), while MCE assumes that American society is "perfectible" through the adoption of shared values, ARE assumes that society is a power arena in which conflict between dominant and oppressed racial groups is inevitable. ARE is, in fact, stronger, more direct, and far more critical in its approach to racial inequality and discrimination. As McGregor has put it, "antiracist teaching confronts prejudice through discussions of past and present racism, stereotyping and discrimination. That approach differs from a cultural information program because it is not the understanding of cultural differences that is important, but the awareness of the economic, structural, and historic roots of inequality for which racism is a justification" (1993, 216). The goals of ARE are declines in white ethnocentrism, in authoritarian beliefs, and in "belief in a just world" (essentially that people "get" what they deserve), accompanied by increased empathy for the victims of overt, modern, and institutional racism (Kehoe 1994, 354-355).

According to Bigler (1999) examples of antiracist activities in the classroom include "learning to define concepts such as prejudice and tolerance, analyzing group difference in power and economic status, and using role playing to solve problems involving instances of discrimination" (Bigler 1999, p.690).

McGregor (1993) conducted a manual search of the extant data base on the prejudice reducing effects of both role playing (see below) and antiracist education. This search included all studies contained in Psychological Abstracts, Dissertations Abstracts International, Canadian Education Index and British Education Index between 1966 and 1987 along with a computerized search of the ERIC database. McGregor located 17 studies such studies, 13 of which involved role playing and 7 of which utilized antiracist teaching to reduce racial prejudice. McGregor then calculated effect sizes for both types of interventions. The average effect size for 7 studies of anti-racist education calculated by McGregor was +.479, suggesting moderately strong statistical
significance. Moreover, the effect size for ARE was greater than that for role playing and the average duration of prejudice reducing effect was longer for antiracist teaching than it was for role playing interventions. McGregor (1993) did qualify these encouraging results by observing that, "most of the programs studied were one-shot attempts to reduce prejudice, not systematic, long-term efforts. Furthermore, few programs were integrated into the existing school system. In addition, the strategies require a high degree of teacher competence to implement effectively" (McGregor 1993, 223). Nevertheless, given the significant effect size for ARE upon racial prejudice, this study strongly suggests that it is more effective than MCE as an anti-prejudice intervention.

Studies published after McGregor's meta-analysis lend some support to this assessment. Garcia and Van Soest (1997) interviewed 43 Master of Social Work students enrolled in a required course on diversity and racial oppression. Of the 23 white/non-Jewish participants, 48 percent stated that the course increased their awareness of their own privileged status in society, 61 percent said that it had deepened their understanding of oppression, while 91 percent reported greater hope and their desire to become more active in combating racism in the future. These same subjects, however, allowed that fear of alienating friends and families was a major barrier to the implementation of their plans to confront racial oppression.

Wittig (1998) examined the effects of the Southern California Racial Awareness Program (RAP). As described by Wittig, RAP has three components: (1) information to combat racial stereotypes (to influence the cognitive dimension), (2) experiential learning that encourages affective, not merely intellectual involvement (to influence the affective dimension), and (3) taking action to achieve racial equality (to influence the behavioral dimension). The college student "facilitators" in Wittig's study voluntarily participated in a one-day, six hour training
session after which they led eight weekly one-hour discussions with middle and high school students using the RAP curriculum. Both the facilitators and the classroom teachers were then asked by Wittig to complete surveys on RAP's effects. The 29 teachers felt that RAP had allowed their students to feel more comfortable talking about racial issues, increased student recognition about the equal worth of all racial groups, and enhanced student openness to the development of cross-racial friendships. However, data collected by Wittig from 181 students, using a pre- and post measurement design with items on a 7-point Likert scale, failed to yield significant correlations. Summarizing the study's main findings, Wittig wrote, "in sum, the results presented… document the strength of the relationship of both teacher and facilitator perceptions of classroom inter-racial climate to their estimates of student outcomes, while showing that those estimates are uncorrelated with actual student outcomes" (Wittig 1998).

Lopez, Gurin and Nagda (1998) conducted intergroup dialogues that fulfilled the preconditions of Allport's contact hypothesis. Led by trained facilitators, CL-type groups discussed such topics as their experience with stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination as well as current problems between racial groups. Lopez et.al. (1998) found that the college student subjects who participated in a semester long dialogue program had a better understanding of the relationship between social structural factors and racial inequality than those who had not. In a follow-up study conducted a year later, Gurin, Peng, Lopez and Nagda (1999), reported that the college students who had participated in the course perceived more commonalities with members of other races than did members of a control group, and opined that the dialogues had helped to reduce racial divisiveness on campus.

Aboud and Fenwick (1999) investigated the effectiveness of talking about race and racial evaluations in reducing prejudice through three separate, but interrelated studies. In the first of
these, 80 white and 46 black fifth grade students were exposed to an 11-week course in which they were directed by their teacher to focus on "internal" attributes rather than "external" racial characteristics as a means of distinguishing among individuals. The intervention also included discussion of racial stereotypes and how they are formed. Aboud and Fenwick administered the Multiresponse Racial Attitude scale (MRA) to measure prejudice in their study subjects immediately before and immediately after the intervention. They reported that the "high prejudiced students in the intervention classes obtained significantly less biased scores at the posttest, reaching levels comparable to those of the low-prejudice students" (Aboud & Fenwick 1999, 775). In their second study, Aboud and Fenwick first divided 88 white elementary school children into low- and high-prejudiced classes, and then formed pairs consisting of representatives from each of these groups. Subsequently, these dyads discussed racial stereotypes. Over time, the racial evaluations of the high-prejudiced children became more similar to those of their low-prejudiced partners. In a third study, Aboud and Fenwick exposed forty white college students to a taped simulation of a phone conversation. While listening to this tape, study participants were asked to imagine talking with a female partner. Unexpectedly, the taped simulation included both an off-color racial joke and a racial slur. Aboud and Fenwick then recorded subject responses to these unexpected expressions of racism. Both the low- and the high-prejudiced subjects in this study objected to the simulated jokes/slurs. Summarizing their findings from these three studies, Aboud and Fenwick reported that, "results overall support the assumption that talking about race and racial attitudes can reduce prejudice under certain conditions, and that peers may be valuable sources of influence in this dialogue" (1999, 767).
I. The Influence of Empathy, and Dissonance upon Racial Prejudice

Several studies have attempted to activate empathy and/or dissonance as a means of altering racially prejudiced attitudes. Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein, and Highberger (1997) asked student subjects to read scenarios involving individuals suffering from AIDS and homeless persons. They then measured subject attitudes towards groups before and after exposure. Some of the students were asked to replicate the feelings of the victims, others were asked to merely take note of scenario contents. Batson et.al. found that reading such scenarios under emotional empathy instructions led to more favorable attitudes toward the victim's group than did reading the same stories with instructions designed to minimize empathy.

Finlay and Stephan (2000) instructed a sample of white students to read vignettes about racial discrimination in the form of short essays written in first person by African American freshmen attending metropolitan college. These stories reported incidents of the (fictitious) black author having been falsely accused of committing a crime, denied check writing privileges, and overhearing racial epithets. They also contained indications of victims' feelings---anger, annoyance, discomfort---in response to these situations. Subjects in the empathy condition were instructed to try to imagine how the writer felt and to identify with those feelings; subjects in the control condition did not receive these instructions. Both the experimental and control group subjects were then asked to evaluate both African Americans and Whites. Finlay and Stephen reported that "the central finding of this study was that reading vignettes to empathize with the victims eliminated differences between the evaluations of African Americans and Whites that were found in the control condition." (360).
As reported in the same article, Finlay and Stephan (2000) recruited a sample of 141 white students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the University of New Mexico. The participants were asked to read scenarios that depicted discriminatory treatment against either African Americans or against members of their own (white) racial group (white students attending a Hong Kong university). Subjects were divided into two groups receiving different empathy instructions. One group was instructed to take the perspective of the authors, members of the second were directed to attend to their own emotions in responses to described victimization. When reading about discrimination toward African Americans, subjects had more negative feelings (disgust) than when reading about discrimination towards members of their own racial group. In Finlay and Stephan's interpretation of this result, it reflects higher levels of cognitive dissonance since the African Americans in the first scenario clearly did not deserve the treatment that they were accorded. Under both sets of empathy instructions, the reading of these scenarios reduced differences in subjects' attitudes toward minority group and non-minority group members.

Both empathy and cognitive dissonance have been mobilized to reduce prejudice through role-playing exercises. In such exercises, "participants assume the cognitive perspective of that member of a stigmatized group as well as appreciate the affective stage of that member of an oppressed group and these cognitive and emotional experiences lead to the transformation of attitudes and behaviors" (Byrnes & Kriger 1992, 465). As McGregor (1993) has stated, role playing directed toward prejudice reduction hinges upon instructing a member of one group (a white student, for example) to assume the part of a member of another group (a black student, for instance) confronting a racially charged situation. For the 13 studies that tested the efficacy of
role-playing as a prejudice reducing technique located by McGregor, the average effect size was +.419, that is, moderately significant but less than that of ARE.

One popular form of anti-prejudice is the so-called "BLUE EYES-BROWN EYES" simulation. On one day, a classroom teacher focuses negative comments on all of the students in her class with blue eyes and praises those with brown eyes; on the following day, he or she disparages students with brown eyes and lauds those with blue eyes. Without reporting the details of the methodology used in their evaluation procedure, Byrnes and Kriger (1992), replicated this technique with a sample of university education students. They reported that all of the participants found the simulation meaningful, that "the statistical evidence supporting the effectiveness of the activity to reduce prejudice was moderate" and that virtually all of the participants, including the moderator, experienced stress from the activity (p.459). Focusing on the bias-reducing properties of the exercise, Byrnes and Kriger used the "Social Scenarios Scale" to measure change in racial attitudes for subjects when compared to a control group. They found that after controlling for variance in pretest scores, the participants exposed to this intervention scored significantly higher (less prejudiced) than subjects in the control group. The authors noted that their study design did not allow for the determination of the perceived prejudice reduction effect's duration or its correlation with actual behavioral change.

Mobilizing cognitive dissonance, Rokeach (1971) found that when college students were confronted with a discrepancy between their attitudes and behaviors toward minority group members, on the one hand, and their reported normative beliefs in freedom and equality, they responded by changing both their attitudes and their behaviors in the desired direction.

Drawing upon such research results, Devine (1989) formulated her "dissociation hypothesis." She asserted that both low- and high-prejudiced individuals harbor negative
stereotypes towards members of minority racial groups, but that the latter consciously override embedded racial prejudice. To test these assertions, Devine (1989) conducted three experimental studies. In the first study, 40 white introductory psychology college students were asked to list components of racial stereotypes and then to complete the Modern Racism Scale (MRS). Devine found that high and low prejudiced subjects were equally knowledgeable about content of cultural stereotypes. For her second study, Devine directed 129 college students to complete the MRS. She then assigned them randomly to judgments, recognition, and guess conditions. Devine found that when subjects' ability to consciously monitor stereotype activity was precluded, both high- and low-prejudiced subjects produce stereotype congruent or prejudice-like responses. In a third study, Devine used a sample comprised of 67 white college students and divided them into low- and high-prejudiced groups based upon their responses to the MRS. She then presented them with scenarios in which the applicability of negative racial stereotypes to the reported behavior of a member of that group was ambiguous and asked them to record their comments. She found that even under these conditions, the low-prejudiced subjects "apparently censored and inhibited automatically activated negative stereotype-congruent information and consciously replaced it with thoughts that expressed their nonprejudiced values" (1989, 15). Taken collectively, these findings lent support to Devine's dissociation model: all subjects harbored racial stereotypes, but those scoring "low" on racial prejudice measures inhibited the expression of these stereotypes because they were in conflict with their self-conceptions as racially tolerant individuals. Similar results were reported by Zuwerink, Devine, Monteith and Cook (1996). In their study, low-prejudiced individuals displayed "compunction" about expressing views that embody negative racial stereotypes, while high-prejudiced subjects displayed no such compunction.
Monteith and Walters (1998) recruited 244 non-Black college students all of whom rated as high in prejudice on the MRS. They then presented subjects with eight conceptions of egalitarianism. Monteith and Walters found that even among high-prejudiced individuals, those who defined egalitarianism in terms of equal opportunity felt that they had a moral obligation to temper their feelings of prejudice. On the other hand, those subjects who defined egalitarianism in terms of individualism reported no such moral obligation. On this basis, the researchers wrote that "people may think of themselves as egalitarian, but if they do not conceptualize it in terms of equality of opportunity or outcomes, such a self-conception apparently does not conflict with prejudice, and is not likely to provide a motivational impetus for prejudice reduction" (Monteith & Walters 1998, 197).

Finally, Lieppe and Eisenstadt (1994) directed one group in their sample of white college students to write an essay in which they argued for a policy that benefited black students at the expense of white students (transferring scholarship funds from a general account to an account for African Americans only). A second study group was given the choice of either arguing for or against the policy. Lieppe and Eisenstadt found that the prejudicial attitudes of the first set of students were reduced after they were compelled to write a "pro-black" position paper, while the racial attitudes of the subjects in the second group were not. They concluded that change in racial attitudes could be effectuated through induced compliance.

J. Conclusion

Since the public school desegregation movement of the Civil Rights era, behavioral scientists have attempted to devise methods for reducing racial prejudice directed toward African Americans by European American students. Cooperative learning methods using racially mixed study teams and replicating the preconditions for change identified in Allport's contact
hypothesis have demonstrated efficacy as means for counteracting racial prejudice in public school students. But owing to the persistence of first-generation segregation and the pervasiveness of second-generation segregation in the American educational system, exclusive reliance upon CL may not prove feasible when there are very few nonwhites at a school on the same curriculum track. That being so, researchers have sought to augment CL with interventions that do not require the physical presence of minority group members in the classroom. Although multicultural education may well achieve other objectives, it does not appear to be effective in altering the negative stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes of white students towards nonwhites. Anti-racist education, on the other hand, does seem to have efficacy in challenging both "traditional" and "modern" racist views. Interventions that tap into cognitive dissonance and/or mobilize empathy at odds with racial prejudice may well have promise as means for reducing racial bias and discriminatory behavior.
CHAPTER III
METODOLOGY

A. Study Design

The study was a quasi-experimental investigation that encompassed quantitative and qualitative components. The quantitative dimension involved measurement of variance between pre-intervention and post-intervention subject responses on a standardized data-gathering instrument to test a set of formal hypotheses. These hypotheses assert that participation in an Undoing Racism curriculum will influence subject perceptions of, assessments of, and behavior toward institutional racism. The study's qualitative component consisted of semi-structured interviews with sub-sets of its experimental and control groups conducted by the researcher following the completion of the anti-racism educational intervention. The interview protocol was aimed at eliciting subject reports about observed institutional racism, their opinions concerning racial desegregation efforts in the school district in which they were enrolled, and evaluations of their experience with the Undoing Racism program.

B. Selection of the Research Site

The research site in which this study was conducted was a public high school within the Lafayette Parish, Louisiana school district. This district was chosen by the researcher on the basis of evidence that institutional racism had been a determinant of the racial distribution of students among its six secondary schools. In addition, the Lafayette Parish School Board had recently undertaken steps to comply with a judicial order mandating a concerted effort to reduce de facto racial segregation.

At present, there are six high schools within the Lafayette Parish public school system. One of these facilities was converted into a magnet school in the late 1970s and was excluded as a candidate for use as a research venue. The final selection of a research site from among the
remaining high schools was determined by non-probabilistic means in consultation with district and building administrative decision-makers. As more than one school was made available for the Undoing Racism program and the researcher's investigation of its effects, the preference was for the facility that most closely matched the racial composition of the district as a whole. Consistent with that criterion, the researcher did seek a school with a student body that was predominantly White but that also included significant African American representation, i.e., in excess of 20 percent of enrolled students.

C. Overview of Research Design

The study was a quasi-experimental investigation that was implemented through original fieldwork conducted by the researcher at a high school within the public school district of Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. The final research site was chosen on the basis of prospective cooperation from school district and school building administrative decision-makers in permitting the implementation of the Undoing Racism workshop, and the researcher's planned efforts to measure its effects.

The study included both quantitative and qualitative data-gathering and analysis components. The former entailed the administration of Barbarin's Institutional Racism Scale (IRS) to an initial sample of approximately 80 11th grade students prior to initiation of an Undoing Racism program. From this initial sample, forty students were selected to take part in the anti-racism curriculum during the spring of 2004 and served as the study's experimental group. The remaining forty students comprised a control group who did not participate in the Undoing Racism curriculum. After the completion of the spring, 2004 curriculum, that is, approximately 12 to 14 weeks following an intensive two-day workshop, the IRS was re-administered to the entire sample. It was anticipated that the responses of the experimental group on the six sub-scales of the IRS would exhibit significant changes upon re-test when compared to
their pre-intervention scores. It was also anticipated that the responses of the control group on the six sub-scales of the IRS would not exhibit significant changes upon re-test when compared to their scores on the initial administration of that instrument.

With the conclusion of the Undoing Racism curriculum at the end of the spring semester, 2004, the researcher conducted interviews with 16 students, nine drawn from the study's experimental group and seven drawn from its control group. These discussions were guided by a semi-structured interview protocol tapping into student perceptions of, assessments of, and self-reported actions toward institutional racism within the Lafayette Parish school system. The interviews also aimed to seek confirmation of the study's quantitative research findings by asking about any changes that interviewees may have perceived in their stance toward institutional racism. Lastly, feedback concerning participant experience in the Undoing Racism program was solicited from those interviewees drawn from the experimental study group.

D. Recruitment of Study Subjects

Following final administrative approval and the selection of the particular facility in which the anti-racism education program was held, the researcher worked in concert with district officials to enlist the voluntary participation of study subjects in the Undoing Racism course. One month prior to the scheduled start of the spring, 2004 school year, the parents of all 11th grade students enrolled at the chosen high school received a package of materials mailed to their home addresses. The registration packet contained a letter that explained the nature and purposes of both the Undoing Racism program and the researcher's investigation of its effects. The letter also furnished parents with assurance that the researcher would adhere to strict confidentiality safeguards. The mailing included a consent form seeking parental permission for their child to participate in the program and serve as a study subject along with a stamped, pre-addressed
return envelope. Contingent upon the receipt of at least 80 signed consent forms, a brief (one-hour) orientation meeting was held a few days before the start of the spring, 2004 school year at the research site for both prospective study subjects and their parents. Subject recruitment, then, was on a purely voluntary basis through a non-probabilistic method.

E. Construction of Study Groups

As consent forms were received, the researcher developed a roster of the students whose parents had agreed to their participation in the intervention and the study. It was arranged in alphabetical order and a study code number was assigned to each entry. Immediately prior to the first Undoing Racism workshop session, the researcher distributed code numbered cards to the students in attendance, asking them to indicate whether they were "White," "African American" or "Other." The cards were collected, the race of each study participant was recorded on the master subject list and the cards were then destroyed. Once this procedure had been completed, the trainers from the Undoing Racism program explained that half of the students in the total sample would receive instruction during the spring of 2004, while the other half would receive instruction at some point in the future. All of the subjects who were assigned an "odd" number code designation participated in the spring, 2004 sessions which served as the study's experimental group. All of the subjects who were assigned an "even" code number did not participate in the 2004 sessions and served as the study's control group. Thus, the construction of the experimental and control groups were determined at random through probabilistic means.

F. Description of the Undoing Racism Program

The Undoing Racism program's Workshop for Youth was originally designed and is presently conducted by the staff of the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond, a non-profit organization committed to the cause of racial equality and justice in the United States. Since its inception in 1980, the People's Institute has held Undoing Racism youth workshops and follow-
up sessions across the nation. According to the New Orleans office of the People's Institute, "the Undoing Racism curriculum is designed to provide young people with a basic understanding of racism and a historical analysis of power inherent in "White privilege" that will help them to build relationships cross culturally" (The People's Institute 2002).

The Undoing Racism program consists of an intensive, 16-hour workshop that is typically held over the course of three successive days and six biweekly follow-up sessions scheduled over a three-month time span. The purpose of the workshop session as described by the People's Institute is "to educate, challenge, and empower people to undo the racist structures that hinder effective social change. The training is based on the premise that racism has been systematically effected and that it can be 'undone' if people understand where it comes from, how it functions, and why it is perpetuated" (The People's Institute 2002). Six "action" themes inform the Undoing Racism program:

(1) Analyzing Power: includes analysis of the reasons for continuing poverty, how institutions perpetuate socioeconomic disparities, and the identification of specific interests who are responsible for the status quo.

(2) Defining Racism: includes analyses of racial prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination at both the inter-personal and institutional levels.

(3) Understanding Manifestations of Racism: focuses upon social, cultural, and linguistic conventions that contribute to or reinforce inequitable outcomes for African Americans and other minority groups.

(4) Learning from History: delineates the historical forces behind the current inequitable distribution of power in American society along racial lines.

(5) Sharing Culture: highlights opportunities for and benefits of cross-racial exchanges.

(6) Organizing to Undo Racism: includes principles for effective organization and collective action to counteract institutional racism.

Multi-racial teams of four trainers (one African American male, one White male, one African American female, and one White female) serve as instructors of the workshop sessions.
The course is designed to accommodate approximately 40 participants. The instructors assign participants into teams of four or five members. Lecture sessions presented to all participants are followed by team sessions in which students undertake activities related to the information that they have received with trainers circulating among eight to ten groups.

Following completion of the intensive workshop session, participants are periodically re-assembled for a series of one-hour follow-up discussions held, in this case, after school hours on school grounds, that are led by People's Institute trainers. These meetings are intended to reinforce the curricular content of the workshop. Participants are encouraged to discuss examples of inter-personal and institutional racism that they have observed and the actions that they took in response to them. The entire Undoing Racism program, then, encompasses 22 hours of interactive instruction over a three-month time span. Its purpose is to enhance participant awareness of institutional racism, alter the assessment criteria through which participants evaluate institutional policies and practices, and encourage participants to take individual and collective action in response to institutional racism.

G. Description of the Quantitative Data-Gathering Instrument

The data-gathering instrument through which quantitative study results were generated was the Institutional Racism Scale (IRS) as designed at the University of Michigan by Barbarin and published in 1996. According to the author, the IRS "measures the manner in which individuals construe racism, as well as personal and institutional commitment to confront and eliminate racism" (Barbarin 1996, p.375). Permission was granted by the instrument developer to utilize it for data collection in this study (see Appendix B).

The six sub-scales of the IRS are all comprised of forced-response items. Response categories to items embodied in two of the sub-scales are arranged in 7-point, Likert-type continua; those in two of the sub-scales are arranged in 4-point Likert-type continua; the
remaining two sub-scales involve paired semantic differentials with 5 response categories for each item.

The Examples of Racism sub-scale of the IRS measures the sensitivity of individual perceptions concerning manifestations of institutional racism at large. Each of its eight items consists of a description of a race-related outcome and then asks the respondent the extent to which they consider it to be indicative of institutional racism. One such item, for example, raises the topic of "disproportionately high suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students," and then asks subjects how sensitive those rates are to institutional racism, ranging from "1 = not at all" to "7 = most sensitive." Items in this sub-scale cover outcomes common to work and educational settings.

The IRS's Agency Climate for Racism sub-scale consists of 6 declarative statements concerning a specific organizational setting in which subjects participate, in this instance, the school in which the subjects are enrolled. It measures their perceptions of racism within that setting. One such item, for instance, is phrased as (in my school) "there is very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups." Subjects are directed to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with these statements along a seven-point continuum ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

The Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Racism sub-scale consists of 11 items describing strategies to reduce racism. The strategies include voting for politicians who are sympathetic to altering racist practices, lobbying for the enactment of anti-discrimination laws, and providing education about the subtleties of racism. Subjects are asked to assess the effectiveness of each of these strategies on a four-point scale of "poor," "fair," "good," or "excellent."
The Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the IRS is comprised of twenty pairs of adjectives. They are:

(1) Active/Passive;
(2) Democratic/Autocratic;
(3) Constructive/Destructive;
(4) Resistance/Cooperation;
(5) Impractical/Practical;
(6) Involuntary/Voluntary;
(7) Reluctance/Eagerness;
(8) Accurate/Inaccurate;
(9) Positive/Negative;
(10) Vigorous/Feeble;
(11) Strong/Weak;
(12) Private/Public;
(13) Closed/Open;
(14) Willingly/Grudgingly;
(15) Uninformative/Informative;
(16) Contrived/Natural;
(17) Realistic/Unrealistic;
(18) Movement/Inertia;
(19) Flexible/Rigid; and,
(20) Precise/Ambiguous.

Subjects are directed to assess the extent to which ongoing efforts by administrators at their organization (the high school) can be characterized along a five-point continuum for each of these paired descriptors. Thus, a check mark closest to the "Active" pole of the first pair would indicate that the subject evaluates such efforts as being very active, while a mark closest to the "Passive" pole would indicate that the subject judges such efforts to be very passive.

The same twenty semantic differential descriptors are presented in the Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the IRS, which directs subjects to assess their own efforts to reduce institutional racism, as, for example, "active" or "passive."

The Personal Use of Strategies sub-scale corresponds to seven items from the Effectiveness of Strategies sub-scale. It asks respondents to indicate the extent of their use of such strategies as demonstrating against racism, persuading White friends that racism is harmful
to them, and the like, along a five-point continuum ranging from "never" to "very frequently." It provides a measure of self-reported behavior in response to institutional racism.

The internal consistency reliabilities for the six sub-scales of the IRS range from $r = 0.72$ to $r = 0.94$. The $r$-values for test-/retest correlations are somewhat lower, but, in Barbarin's estimation, they are still "sufficiently high to suggest some degree of consistency in response pattern over time" (p.379). Based upon their correlation with demonstrably valid measures of racism, each of the IRS's sub-scales was judged by Barbarin to be of acceptable validity.

H. Restatement of the Study's Formal Hypothesis

As measured through the six sub-scales of the IRS, the study's six hypotheses can now be restated and the anticipated direction of program participation influence can be clarified as follows:

Hypothesis #1: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Examples of Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would correlate with an increase in subject perceptions that certain race-relayed outcomes, e.g., "disproportionately high suspension rates or flunk out rates of minority students," were indicative of institutional racism.

Hypothesis #2: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Climate for Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would show an inverse correlation with subject perceptions that policies, practices, and inter-personal climates at their school were sensitive to or effective in promoting racial equality.

Hypothesis #3: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce
Institutional Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would correlate with subject assessment that more of the eleven strategies, e.g., "active lobbying for the enactment of anti-discrimination laws," were effective in reducing institutional racism.

Hypothesis #4: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would correlate with less favorable, e.g., weak as opposed to strong, assessment of school administrator efforts to reduce racism.

Hypothesis #5: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would correlate with more favorable, e.g., strong as opposed to weak, assessment of subjects' personal efforts to reduce racism.

Hypothesis #6: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Use of Strategies to reduce institutional racism sub-scale of the Institutional Racism Scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

It was anticipated that participation in the Undoing Racism program would correlate with greater frequency of subject self-reported behaviors to reduce institutional racism.

I. Administration of the Institutional Racism Scale

   It was estimated that subjects would need 25 to 30 minutes to complete each round of the Institutional Racism Scale. The researcher personally administered the IRS to all study subjects immediately prior to their division into experimental and control groups on the first day of the
Undoing Racism workshop. This initial round was used to generate base-line scores for both groups, including pre-intervention scores for participants in the 2004 program. Three months later, at the final follow-up session of the 2004 program, the researcher re-administered the IRS to experimental group subjects. Shortly thereafter, the researcher convened the subjects in the control group for a re-administration of the IRS.

J. Description of the Study's Qualitative Data-Gathering Methods

At the conclusion of the Undoing Racism program, the researcher recruited 10 subjects from the experimental group and 8 subjects from the control group to participate in interview sessions. To facilitate recruitment, the researcher offered a small ($10.00) stipend in exchange for interview participation. Subject recruitment for this component of the study was non-probabilistic: The responses of the first 10 subjects in each group who agreed to take part in and who completed the interviews were included in the final data set. All interview sessions were held after-hours on school grounds, were conducted personally by the researcher on a one-to-one basis, and required between thirty minutes to one hour to complete. All interviews were recorded on separate audio tape recorder cassettes and marked for identification with the subject's designated study number as it appeared on the master subject list.

Interviews were governed by a semi-structured protocol that was finalized by the researcher. It was anticipated that the final interview protocol would encompass some twenty to thirty questions with attendant prompts. The interviews covered five broad topical domains. First, the interviews included questions about the role of institutional racism in situations that subjects had observed at their school, as, for instance, the under-representation of African American students in "high ability" classes. Second, they inquired about subject perceptions of institutional racism in their community, as for instance, in residential concentrations along racial lines. Third, questions concerning the impact of inter-personal and institutional racism on the
lives of the interviewees were included in the final schedule. Fourth, the interviews solicited subject opinions about the impact and effects of court-ordered racial desegregation in the Lafayette Parish school district. Lastly, feedback was sought from experimental group subjects about their experience in/evaluation of the Undoing Racism program.

K. Analysis of Interview Data

The contents of the audiocassettes were transcribed by the researcher into digital text, after which the cassettes themselves were erased as a means of ensuring the confidentiality of subject responses. The researcher content analyzed the transcribed interviews, searching for recurrent phrases and themes, for differences in the responses of experimental and control group subjects, and for "outlier" responses that deviated from "majority" or "consensus" views.

L. Confidentiality and Related Safeguards

The researcher was assiduously aware of the need to maintain stringent standards of subject confidentiality and other procedural safeguards throughout this investigation. The names of the study participants (and their racial backgrounds) appeared only on a single master list maintained by the researcher. All study materials, including subject responses to the IRS and audiocassette interviews, were marked with an identifying code number. Separate parental consent forms were obtained for participation in the Undoing Racism program, the quantitative component of the study, and the interviews. Subjects and their parents were informed that they were at liberty to withdraw from any of these activities without stipulating a reason and without penalty of any kind.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The findings from the study are presented in this chapter. Demographic findings are presented first, followed by the quantitative analyses of the six hypotheses guiding the study. Lastly, the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews conducted with the study participants at the 3-month post-test interval are presented.

A. Demographic Characteristics

The study was conducted at a large public high school located in a small city in Southern Louisiana. The completed sample included 57 participants. Students were asked to write their age, race and gender on the Institutional Racism Scale (IRS) questionnaire. The first demographic characteristic on which study participants were described was their race. Most of the experimental group (n = 26, 76.5%) reported that they were Caucasian. Among the participants in the control group, a slightly smaller percentage (n = 13, 61.9%) reported their race as Caucasian. Only one study participant indicated a race other than Caucasian or African American, and the race reported was Mexican American by a member of the experimental group (n = 1, 2.9%). The race of the study subjects is reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two participants in the experimental group did not provide information regarding race.

The second demographic characteristic on which study participants were described was their gender. Most of the experimental group (n =19, 52.8 %) reported they were male. Among
the participants in the control group, a slightly larger percentage ($n = 12, 57.1\%$) reported they were female. The gender of the study participants is reported in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third demographic characteristic on which study participants were described was their age. Most of the experimental group ($n = 19, 52.8\%$) reported they were sixteen years of age. In contrast, the majority of the participants in the control group ($n = 12, 57.1\%$), reported they were seventeen years of age. The age of the study participants is reported in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Analysis of Quantitative Data

Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients were used to estimate the reliability of the six sub-scales on the IRS. This technique was chosen over the test-retest for two reasons: 1) the treatment itself would produce a confounding effect in accurately measuring reliability in this group and 2) the control group was too small to have confidence in the measure. Values for these measures were: Examples of Racism $a = .79$, Effectiveness of strategies for reduction in racism $a = .86$, Use of strategies for reduction of racism $a = .78$, Climate for Racism $a = .56$, Personal efforts to reduce racism $a = .91$, and administrative efforts to reduce racism $a = .81$. 
This research study sought $N = 80$ for this quantitative analysis but only received $n = 57$. However, due to two factors, the investigator was unable to collect pretest data for these 23 students: 1) Some of the students who were identified to participate in the study never showed up even for the initial meeting to collect pretest data. And 2) some of the students who showed up did not have the required parental consent form and were not permitted to participate even in completing the pretest measurements.

Additionally, the original research idea for analysis of these data was to use a factorial analysis of variance with treatment group and race as the two independent variables and each of the six-sub-scale gain scores as the dependent variables. However, with the small numbers of African American students in each of the treatment groups (7 in the experimental group, only 6 of which had complete data, and 8 in the control group only 4 of which had complete data), this procedure seemed statistically infeasible. As differences were not found there was little credible evidence to do a race pre-test/post-test treatment group analysis.

**Study Hypothesis One**

The first hypothesis of the study was that "the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Examples of Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale." This hypothesis looked at whether subject participation in the Undoing Racism program would be associated with increased understanding of, awareness of, and sensitivity toward institutional racism in American society at large. To accomplish this objective, the researcher first described the subjects in the experimental group that participated in the Undoing Racism Program on their perceptions regarding the extent to which the items included in the “Examples of Racism” sub-
scale were an indication of institutional racism. The response scale utilized in the sub-scale was a seven-point scale ranging from 1 = "Not at All" to 7 = "Most Sensitive." One of the items included in this sub-scale ("Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges) was a reverse coded item. While a higher response on the other seven items in this sub-scale is indicative of more understanding of institutional racism, for this item a lower response is indicative of more understanding of institutional racism. Therefore, the coding was reversed for responses to this item prior to summarizing the data.

Prior to interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher established an interpretive scale for describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Not at All,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Slightly,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Somewhat,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “A Good Index,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Very Sensitive,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Most Sensitive.” Additionally, since one of the items in this sub-scale was a reverse coded item, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use with this item that was reflective of the response provided by study participants. This reverse interpretive scale included the following values and descriptors: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Most Sensitive,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Very Sensitive,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “A Good Index,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “Somewhat,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Slightly,” 6.50 – 7.00 = “Not at All.” A summary of the pre-test and post-test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Examples of Racism” Sub-scale for Participants in the experimental group is presented in Table 4.

When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges” (mean = 4.56). Using the appropriate reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Somewhat.”
The second highest rating was for the item “Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than White students” (mean = 4.44). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the pretest, was “Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, and organizations” (mean = 4.63). This item was described as “Somewhat” on the interpretive scale. Overall, six items were in the “Neutral” category, and two items were in the “Somewhat” category.

Table 4
Examples of Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.56/1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than white students.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.44/2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minority populations having minimal knowledge about organizational events and opportunities.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.40/1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Higher automobile insurance rates for inner city areas.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.28/1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, or organizations.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.63/1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Someone who has been working at a company longer than others as a major criteria or need for promotion.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.69/1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of standardized reading tests to advance to higher grade levels in high school.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.81/1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee selection based on written tests.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.03/1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale Scores</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.19/0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Not at All,” 2 = “Slightly,” 3 = “Somewhat,” 4 = “Neutral,” 5 = “A Good Index,” 6 = “Very Sensitive,” and 7 = Most Sensitive.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for directly coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Not at All,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Slightly,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Somewhat,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “A Good Index,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Very Sensitive,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Most Sensitive.”


At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Allowing Whites to attend
historically Black colleges” (mean = 4.96). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Somewhat.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than white students” (mean = 4.48). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test, was “Employee selection based on written tests” (mean = 3.04). This item was described as “Somewhat” on the interpretive scale. Overall, five items were in the “Neutral” category, and three items were in the “Somewhat” category.

A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Examples of Racism” Sub-scale for the Non- Participants in the Undoing Racism Program for the control group is presented in Table 5. When interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher also referred to the interpretive scales outlined earlier when describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Not at All,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Slightly,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Somewhat,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51.- 5.49 = “A Good Index,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Very Sensitive,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Most Sensitive.” Additionally, since one of the items in this sub-scale was a reverse coded item, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use with this item that was reflective of the response provided by study participants. This reverse interpretive scale included the following values and descriptors: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Most Sensitive,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Very Sensitive,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “A Good Index,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “Somewhat,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Slightly,” 6.50 – 7.00 = “Not at All.”

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale
was “Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges” (mean = 5.22). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Somewhat.” The second highest rating was for the item “Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than White students” (mean = 4.22). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item, which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the pretest, was “Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, or organizations” (mean = 2.89). This item was described as “Somewhat” on the interpretive scale. Overall, four items were in the “Neutral” category, and four items were in the “Somewhat” category.

Table 5
Examples of Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.22/1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, or organizations.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89/1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Higher automobile insurance rates for inner city area.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56/1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minority populations having minimal knowledge about organizational events and opportunities.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.83/2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than White students.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.22/2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee selection based on written tests.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.59/2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of standardized reading tests to advance to a higher grade level in high school.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.47/2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Scale Scores | 18   | 3.74/1.18 | 14   | 3.40/ .77     |

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Not at All,” 2 = “Slightly,” 3 = “Somewhat,” 4 = “Neutral,” 5 = “A Good Index,” 6 = “Very Sensitive,” and 7 = Most Sensitive.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for directly coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Not at All,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Slightly,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Somewhat,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “A Good Index,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Very Sensitive,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Most Sensitive.”


At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item
which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Allowing Whites to attend historically Black colleges” (mean = 5.57). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, or organizations” (mean = 4.07). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the post-test was “Use of standardized reading tests to advance to higher grade levels in high school” (mean = 2.43). This item was described as “Slightly” on the interpretive scale. Overall, one item was in the “Neutral” category, five items were in the “Somewhat” category, and two items were in the “Slightly” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items in the “Examples of Racism” sub-scale, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Examples of Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the eight items included in the sub-scale with the calculations completed after the reverse scaled item had been re-coded. The overall “Examples of Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from 3.69 to 4.63 with a mean value of 4.19 (SD = .97). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 3.04 to 4.96 with a mean value of 3.91 (SD = .92).

When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores ranged from 2.89 to 5.22 with a mean of 3.74 (SD = 1.18). The overall post-test score for the control group was 3.40 (SD = .77) with values ranging from 2.43 to 5.57.

These overall “Examples of Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the first hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Examples of Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Examples of Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from -2.00 to +2.50
with a mean difference score of -.23 (SD = 1.11). When the difference score was examined for the control group, the mean difference score was -.69 (SD = 1.66) with values ranging from -3.50 to + 2.63.

These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Examples of Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score ($t_{34} = 1.01, p = .32$) (see Table 6). Therefore, Hypothesis one was not confirmed by the data in this study.

Table 6
Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Examples of Racism Sub-scale Scores by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated (Experimental)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate (Control)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Hypothesis Two

The second study hypothesis was that “the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Climate for Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” This hypothesis assessed whether subject participation in the Undoing Racism program would be
associated with increased understanding of, awareness of, and sensitivity toward institutional racism in the school system in which they were enrolled at the time of the study.

The Institutional Racism Scale Climate for Racism sub-scale consists of 6 declarative statements concerning a specific organizational setting in which subjects participate, in this instance, the school in which the students were enrolled. This sub-scale measures their perceptions of the climate for racism within that setting. One such item (item # 1), for instance, is phrased as (in my school) “There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups.” Students are then directed to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with these statements along a seven-point continuum ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Two of the items in this sub-scale (“Few attempts have been made to alter services/ and or resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of minority groups,” and "Minority groups have less voice than Whites about decisions which affect functioning in this high school"), were reverse coded items. While a higher response on the other four items included in this sub-scale is indicative of a more positive perception of the “Climate for Racism” (more positive indicating that the climate discourages racism in the school), for these two items a lower response is indicative of a more positive perception of the “Climate for Racism.” Therefore, the coding was reversed for responses to these two items prior to summarizing the data.

Prior to interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher established an interpretive scale for describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Strongly Disagree,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Disagree” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Mildly Disagree,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Uncertain,” 4.51- 5.49 = “Mildly Agree,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Agree,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Strongly Agree.” Additionally, since two of the items in this sub-scale were
reverse coded items, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use with these items that was reflective of the response provided by study participants. This reverse interpretive scale included the following values and descriptors: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Strongly Agree,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Agree,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Mildly Agree,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Uncertain,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “Mildly Disagree,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Disagree,” 6.50 – 7.00 = “Strongly Disagree.” A summary of the pre-test and post-test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Climate for Racism” Sub-scale for Participants in the experimental group is presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Climate for Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Scale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Many changes have been made to make services and/ or resources</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.31/1.41</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=4.35/1.37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or accessible to minority students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.08/1.73</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=4.35/1.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between minority and non-minority groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This high school goes out of its way to make minority group</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.06/1.90</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=4.17/1.27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members feel at home and accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.83/1.70</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=3.96/1.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences among ethnic or racial groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minority groups have less voice than whites about decisions</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.61a/1.74</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=3.78a/1.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which affect functioning in this high school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Few attempts have been made to alter services and/ or</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.14a/1.56</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>m/SD=3.48a/1.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale Scores</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>m/SD=4.57/1.80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>m/SD=4.01/1.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 2 = “Disagree,” 3 = “Mildly Disagree,” 4 = “Uncertain,” 5 = “Mildly Agree,” 6 = “Agree,” and 7 = Strongly Agree.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for directly coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Strongly Disagree,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Disagree,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Mildly Disagree,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Uncertain,” 4.51 - 5.49 = “Mildly Agree,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Agree,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Strongly Agree.”


When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale, was “Many changes have been made to make services and/ or resources accessible to minority students” (mean = 4.83). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Mildly Agree.” The second highest rating was for the item “Minority groups have
less voice than whites about decisions which affect functioning in this high school” (mean = 4.61). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was classified in the “Mildly Disagree” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the pretest, was “This high school goes out of its way to make minority group members feel at home and accepted” (mean = 4.06). This item was described as “Uncertain” on the interpretive scale. Overall, one item was in the “Mildly Agree” category, one item was in the “Mildly Disagree” category, and five items were in the “Uncertain” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed that two items ("Many changes have been made to make services and/or resources accessible to minority students," and "An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority groups") both received the highest rating on the response scale (mean = 4.35). Using the interpretive scale, these items were in the category of “Uncertain.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “This high school goes out of its way to make minority group members feel at home and accepted” (mean = 4.17). This item was also classified in the “Uncertain” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test was “Few attempts have been made to alter services and/ or resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspective of minority students” (mean = 3.48). Using the reverse interpretive scale, the descriptor that was attached to this response level was “Mildly Agree.” Overall, five items were in the “Uncertain” category and one item was in the “Mildly Agree” category.

A summary of the pre-test and post-test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Climate for Racism” Sub-scale for the Non- Participants in the control group is presented in
Table 8. When interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher also referred to the interpretive scales outlined earlier when describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Strongly Disagree,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Disagree,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Mildly Disagree,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Uncertain,” 4.51. - 5.49 = “Mildly Agree,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Agree,” and 6.50 – 7.00 = “Strongly Agree.” Additionally, since two of the items in this sub-scale were reverse coded items, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use with these items that was reflective of the response provided by study participants. This reverse interpretive scale included the following values and descriptors: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Strongly Agree,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Agree,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Mildly Agree,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Uncertain,” 4.51 – 5.49 = “Mildly Disagree,” 5.50 – 6.49 = “Disagree,” 6.50 – 7.00 = “Strongly Disagree.”

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale, was “Minority groups have less voice than whites about decisions which affect functioning in this high school” (mean = 4.39). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Uncertain.” Even though this was a reverse coded item, the descriptor that would be attached to this response level would remain “Uncertain” on the interpretive scale. The second highest rating was for two items. One of the items was “There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups” (mean = 4.28). This item was classified in the “Uncertain” response category. The other item was "Few attempts have been made to alter services and/or resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of minority groups" (mean = 4.28). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was also classified in the "Uncertain" response category. The item which received the lowest
rating among the subjects in the control group at the pretest was “An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority groups” (mean = 3.78). This item was also described as “Uncertain” on the interpretive scales. Overall, all six items were in the “Uncertain” category.

Table 8
Climate for Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Few attempts have been made to alter services/ and/ or resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of minority groups.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.28/1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority groups.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.78/1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This high school goes out of its way to make minority group members feel at home and accepted.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.78/1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Many changes have been made to make services and/or resources accessible to minority students.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.22/1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minority groups have less voice than whites about decisions, which affect functioning in this high school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.39/1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.28/2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>m/SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.12/.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.26/.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 2 = “Disagree,” 3 = “Mildly Disagree,” 4 = “Uncertain,” 5 = “Mildly Agree,” 6 = “Agree,” and 7 = “Strongly Agree.”


At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Few attempts have been made to alter services and/ or resources to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of minority groups” (mean = 5.07). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Mildly Disagree.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority students” (mean = 4.43). This item was classified in the “Uncertain” response category. Two items received the
lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the post-test. One item was “There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups” (mean = 3.93). This item was described as “Uncertain” on the interpretive scale. The other item was "Minority groups have less voice than whites about decisions which affect functioning in this high school" (mean = 3.93). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was also classified in the "Uncertain" response category. Overall, five items were in the “Uncertain” category, and one item was in the “Mildly Disagree” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items in the “Climate for Racism” sub-scale, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Climate for Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the six items included in the sub-scale with the calculations completed after the two reverse scaled items had been re-coded. The overall “Climate for Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from 4.06 to 4.83 with a mean value of 4.57 (SD = 1.80). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 3.48 to 4.35 with a mean value of 4.01 (SD = .64).

When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores ranged from 3.78 to 4.39 with a mean of 4.12 (SD = .86). The overall post-test score for the control group was 4.26 (SD = .94) with values ranging from 3.93 to 5.07.

These overall “Climate for Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the second hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Climate for Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Climate for Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from -2.17 to 3.17 with a mean difference score of -.26 (SD = 1.37). When the difference score was examined for
the control group, the mean difference score was -.03 (SD = 1.16) with values ranging from -2.33 to 2.00.

These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Climate for Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score ($t_{34} = -.52, p = .61$) (see Table 9). Therefore, Hypothesis two was not confirmed by the data in this study.

Table 9
Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Climate for Racism by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated (Experimental)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>- .52</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate (Control)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Hypothesis Three

The third study hypothesis was that "the mean differences between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” This hypothesis looked at whether subject participation in the Undoing Racism program would be associated with changes in their critical assessment of the
effectiveness of various strategies to counter-act institutional racism in American society at large.

The IRS’s Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale consists of 11 items describing strategies to reduce racism. Examples of these strategies include “Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices,” “Demonstrate against racist practices,” “and “Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear.” Student subjects were asked to assess the effectiveness of each of these strategies along a four-point scale ranging from “Poor” to “Excellent.”

Two of the items in this sub-scale (“Inform minority groups of the problem and help encourage them to change,” and “Make it possible for minorities to withdraw and develop their own clubs, extracurricular school activities, and other organizations rather than rely on predominantly white organizations”), were reverse coded items. While a higher response on the other nine items included in this sub-scale is indicative of a more positive perception of the effectiveness of strategies to counter-act institutional racism, for these two items a lower response is indicative of a more positive perception of the effectiveness of strategies to counter-act institutional racism. Therefore, the coding was reversed for responses to these two items prior to summarizing the data.

Prior to interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher established an interpretive scale for describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.00 – 1.50 = “Poor,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Fair,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Good,” and 3.51 – 4.50 = “Excellent.” Additionally, since two of the items in this sub-scale were reverse coded items, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use with this item that was reflective of the response provided by study participants. This reverse interpretive scale included the following
values and descriptors: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Excellent,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Good,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Fair,” and 3.51 – 4.50 = “Poor.” A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Participants in the experimental group is presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide setting in which minority and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.06/.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuade white/black friends on an individual level that racism hurts them as much as it does minorities.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.75/.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inform minority groups of the problem and help encourage them to change.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.28/.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Utilize the courts to alter unfair racist practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.75/1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have minorities at administrative and faculty levels so that they can monitor and change racist policies that may exist at your school.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.53/.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make it possible for minorities to withdraw and develop their own clubs, extracurricular school activities, and other organizations rather than rely on predominantly white organizations.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.64/1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integrate neighborhoods by having minorities and non-minorities living alongside one another.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.44/1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.03a/1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.72/.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Demonstrate against racist practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.50/.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.42/1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Scale Scores

36 | 2.65/41 | 24 | 2.44/42

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Poor,” 2 = “Fair,” 3 = “Good,” 4 = “Excellent.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for directly coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Poor,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Fair,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Good,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Excellent.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for reverse coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Excellent,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Good,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Fair,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Poor.”

When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale, was “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another” (mean = 3.06). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Good.” The second highest rating was for the item “Persuade
white/black friends on an individual level that racism hurts them as much as it does minorities.” (mean = 2.75). This item was classified in the “Good” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the pre-test was “Inform minority group members of the problem and help encourage them to change” (mean = 2.28). Using the reverse interpretive scale, this item was classified as “Good” on the interpretive scale. Overall, three items were in the “Fair” category, and eight items were in the “Good” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another” (mean = 2.83). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Good.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Persuade white/black friends on an individual level that racism hurts them as much as it does minorities” (mean = 2.71). This item was also classified in the “Good” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test was “Integrate neighborhoods by having minorities and non-minorities living alongside one another” (mean = 2.25). This item was described as “Fair” on the interpretive scale. Overall, eight items were in the “Fair” category, and three items were in the “Good” category.

A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for the control group is presented in Table 11.
Table 11
Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.24/1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have minorities at administrative and faculty levels so that they can monitor and change racist policies that may exist at your school.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.43/1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make it possible for minorities to withdraw and develop their own clubs, extracurricular school activities, and other organizations rather than rely on predominantly white organizations.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.52/1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.24/.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.57/1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate against racist practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.24/1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.24/.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Scale Scores</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.45/.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Poor,” 2 = “Fair,” 3 = “Good,” 4 = “Excellent.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for directly coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Poor,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Fair,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Good,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Excellent.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for reverse coded items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Excellent,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Good,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Fair,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Poor.”

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the items which received the highest rating on the response scale, were “Make it possible for minorities to withdraw and develop their own clubs, extracurricular school activities, and other organizations rather than rely on predominantly white organizations,” and “Inform minority groups of the problem and help encourage them to change (mean = 2.86). Using the reverse interpretive scale, the descriptor that would be attached to this response level would be “Fair.” The second highest rating was for the item “Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices” (mean = 2.57). This
The item was also classified in the “Good” response category. The item, which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the pretest, was “Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory” (mean = 2.24). This item was described as “Fair” on the interpretive scales. Overall, 8 items were in the “Fair” category, and 3 items were in the “Good” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another” (mean = 2.87). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Good.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Have minorities at administrative and faculty levels so that they can monitor and change racist policies that may exist at your school” (mean = 2.80). This item was classified in the “Good” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the post-test was “Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory” (mean = 2.27). This item was described as “Fair” on the interpretive scale. Overall, seven items were in the “Fair” category, and four items were in the “Good” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items in the “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the eleven items included in the sub-scale with the calculations completed after the two reverse scaled items had been re-coded. The overall “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from
2.28 to 3.06 with a mean value of 2.65 (SD = .41). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 2.25 to 2.83 with a mean value of 2.44 (SD = .42).

When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores ranged from 2.24 to 2.86 with a mean of 2.45 (SD = .50). The overall mean post-test score for the control group was 2.53 (SD = .46) with values ranging from 2.27 to 2.87.

These overall “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the third hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from -1.36 to .73 with a mean difference score of -.19 (SD = .49). When the difference score was examined for the control group, the mean difference score was -.042 (SD = .72) with values ranging from -1.36 to 1.27. These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score (t = -.74, p = .46) (see Table 12). Therefore, Hypothesis three was not confirmed by the data in this study.
Table 12
Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>- .74</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Experimental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Hypothesis Four

The fourth study hypothesis was that “The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” To accomplish this objective, the researcher tested whether student participation in the Undoing Racism program would be associated with changes in their critical assessment of the ongoing efforts by school administrators to reduce institutional racism.

The IRS’s Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale is comprised of twenty pairs of terms. Students in the study were asked to rate the level of importance of the efforts of administrators and faculty to reduce racism in their school by responding to a series of 20 pairs of terms on a semantic differential scale. The terms of the scale were pairs of words that represented opposite ends of a conceptual continuum.

For example, active and passive was one of the pairs of terms. Also uninformative and informative were included on the list of pairs of terms. Students were asked to mark on a seven point scale the degree to which being on one end of that continuum was important in reducing institutional racism in their school. Using the pair of terms active – passive, the subjects were
asked to mark the space (of the seven provided) that was closest to active if they felt that this
trait/behavior was very important in efforts to reduce racism. This rating would be subsequently
assigned a value of “1.” If they felt that the trait/behavior was quite important, they were to
mark the second space (value = “2”). Similarly, if they felt that the trait/behavior was slightly
important, they were instructed to mark the third space (value = “3”); and if they felt that the
trait/behavior was neutral, they were instructed to mark the middle space corresponding to a
value of “4.” Using the same descriptors but with the unimportant concept, the students also had
the option of indicating that the trait/behavior was slightly unimportant (value = “5”), quite
unimportant (value = “6”), or very unimportant (value = “7”).

Of the 20 pairs of terms provided to the respondents in the study, 12 were worded such
that subjects were assessing the importance of the positive term (for example, active versus
passive) and 8 were worded such that subjects were assessing the importance of the negative
term (for example resistance versus cooperation). To facilitate the interpretation of the study
results, and the calculation of the overall scale score needed to test the fourth hypothesis of the
study, the researcher reversed the coding on the 8 items for which the respondents were assessing
the importance of the negative item in each of the pair of terms. Additionally, the researcher
established an interpretive scale for use in reporting the findings of the study. This scale of
interpretation was as follows: 1.00 – 1.50 = “Very Important,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Quite Important,”
Unimportant,” 5.51 - 6.50 = “Quite Unimportant,” 6.51 – 7.00 = “Very Unimportant.” A
summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the
“Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Participants
in the experimental group is presented in Table 13.
Table 13
Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Eagerness – Reluctancea</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.12/1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  Voluntary - Involuntarya</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.14/1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Movement - Inertia or at a Standstill, No Progress</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.25/1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public - Privatea</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.03/1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.  Active - Passive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.53/1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Willingly - Grudgingly or Not Willingly</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.03/1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Flexible – Rigid</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.08/2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Precise - Ambiguous or Unclear</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.83/1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Democratic - Autocratic or Not Democratic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.14/1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Realistic - Idealistic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.92/1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Informatively - Uninformativea</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.00/1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Strong – Weak</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.36/1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Energetic - No Energy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.11/1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  Practical - Impracticala</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.56/1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperation – Resistancea</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.44/1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open - Closeda</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.19/1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Accurate - Inaccurate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.47/1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Positive - Negative</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.34/1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Natural - Contriveda</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.43/1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Constructive - Destructive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.08/1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Scale Score | 36 | 4.20/.80 | 23 | 4.19/62 |

Note. Response scale utilized was 7 = “Very Important,” 6 = “Quite Important,” 5 = “Slightly Important,” 4 = “Neutral,” 3 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 2 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 1 = “Very Unimportant.”


Note. The paired items are presented such that all positive terms are presented first. Therefore, all items are coded in the same direction.

When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating (nearest the value of one) on the response scale, was “Precise – Ambiguous or Unclear” (mean = 3.83). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Neutral.” The second highest rating was for the item “Idealistic - Realistic” (mean = 3.92). This item was also classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) among the subjects in the experimental group at the pre-test was “Practical - Impractical,” (mean = 4.56). This item was described as “Slightly Unimportant” on the interpretive scale.
Overall, eighteen items were in the “Neutral” category, and two items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed the item which received the highest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test was “Eagerness - Reluctance” (mean = 3.65). This item was described as “Neutral” on the interpretive scale. The item which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) on the response scale was “Constructive - Destructive” (mean = 4.77). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly Unimportant.” The second lowest rating at post-test was for the item “Natural - Contrived” (mean = 4.43). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. Overall, nineteen items were in the “Neutral” category, and one item was in the “Slightly Unimportant” category. A summary of pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” for Non-Participants in the control group is presented in Table 14.

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the items which received the highest rating among the subjects in the control group at the pretest, was “Realistic - Idealistic” (mean = 3.52). This item was described as “Neutral” on the interpretive scales. The item which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) on the response scale, was “Open - Closed,” (mean = 4.81).

Using the interpretive scale, these items were in the category of “Slightly Unimportant.” The second lowest rating was for the item “Voluntary - Involuntary” (mean = 4.62). This item was also classified in the “Slightly Unimportant” response category. Overall, sixteen items were in the “Neutral” category, and four items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category.
Table 14
Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of the Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eagerness - Reluctance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00/2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democratic - Autocratic or Not Democratic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.00/1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Realistic - Idealistic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.52/2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Practical - Impractical</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.05/1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Natural - Contrived</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.24/1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Accurate - Inaccurate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.95/1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Constructive - Destructive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.95/1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Active - Passive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.48/2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Flexible - Rigid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.33/1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperation - Resistance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.29/1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Voluntary - Involuntary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.62/1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Movement - Inertia or at a Standstill, No Progress</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.76/1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Informative - Uninformative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.57/1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Positive - Negative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.90/1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Energetic - No Energy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.24/2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Precise - Ambiguous or Unclear</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.90/1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public - Private</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.62/1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Willingly - Grudgingly or Not Willingly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.24/1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open - Closed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.81/1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale Score</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.16/.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 7 = “Very Important,” 6 = “Quite Important,” 5 = “Slightly Important,” 4 = “Neutral,” 3 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 2 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 1 = “Very Unimportant.”


Note. The paired items are presented such that all positive terms are presented first. Therefore, all items are coded in the same direction.

a a reverse scaled item.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item which received the highest rating among the subjects in the control group at the post-test was “Eagerness - Reluctance” (mean = 4.33). This item was described as “Neutral” on the interpretive scale. Since this was a reverse coded item, the descriptor that would be attached to this response level was also “Slightly Unimportant” on the interpretive scale.

The item which received the lowest rating on the response scale was “Open - Closed” (mean = 5.50). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly Unimportant.” The second lowest rating at post-test was for the item “Willingly – Grudgingly or
Not Willingly” (mean = 5.29). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. Overall, five items were in the “Neutral” category, and fifteen items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the twenty items included in the sub-scale with the calculations completed after the twelve reverse scaled items had been re-coded. The overall “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from 3.83 to 4.56 with a mean value of 4.20 (SD = .80). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 3.83 to 4.77 with a mean value of 4.19 (SD = .62). When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores ranged from 3.52 to 4.81 with a mean of 4.16 (SD = .99). The overall mean post-test score for the control group was 4.82 (SD = 1.13) with values ranging from 4.14 to 5.50.

These overall “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the fourth hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from – 2.95 to 1.12 with a mean difference score of .07 (SD = .83). When the difference score was examined for the control group, the mean difference score was .53 (SD = 1.11) with values ranging from – 1.54 to 2.07.
These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score ($t_{36} = -1.47, p = .15$) (see Table 15). Therefore, Hypothesis four was not confirmed by the data in this study.

Table 15
Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Experimental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Hypothesis Five

The fifth study hypothesis was that “The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” To accomplish this objective, the researcher tested whether student participation in the Undoing Racism program would be associated with changes in their critical assessment of their own, personal efforts to reduce institutional racism.
The IRS’s Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale is comprised of twenty pairs of terms. Students in the study were asked to rate the level of importance of their own personal efforts to reduce racism in their school by responding to a series of 20 pairs of terms on a semantic differential scale. The terms of the scale were pairs of words that represented opposite ends of a conceptual continuum. For example, active and passive was one of the pairs of terms. Also uninformative and informative were included on the list of pairs of terms. Students were asked to mark on a seven point scale the degree to which being on one end of that continuum was important in reducing institutional racism in their school. Using the pair of terms active – passive, the subjects were asked to mark the space (of the seven provided) that was closest to active if they felt that this trait/behavior was very important in efforts to reduce racism. This rating would be subsequently assigned a value of “1.” If they felt that the trait/behavior was quite important, they were to mark the second space (value = “2”). Similarly, if they felt that the trait/behavior was slightly important, they were to mark the third space (value = “3”); and if they felt that the trait/behavior was neutral, they were instructed to mark the middle space corresponding to a value of “4.” Using the same descriptors but with the unimportant concept, the students also had the option of indicating that the trait/behavior was either slightly unimportant (value = “5”), quite unimportant (value = “6”), or very unimportant (value = “7”).

Of the 20 pairs of terms provided to the respondents in the study, 12 were worded such that subjects were assessing the importance of the positive term (for example, active versus passive) and 8 were worded such that subjects were assessing the importance of the negative term (for example resistance versus cooperation). To facilitate the interpretation of the study results, and the calculation of the overall scale score needed to test the fourth hypothesis of the study, the researcher reversed the coding on the 8 items for which the respondents were assessing
the importance of the negative item in each of the pair of terms. Additionally, the researcher established an interpretive scale for use in reporting the findings of the study. This scale of interpretation was as follows: 1.00 – 1.50 = “Very Important,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Quite Important,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Slightly Important,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.50 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 5.51 - 6.50 = “Quite Unimportant,” 6.51 – 7.00 = “Very Unimportant.” A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Participants in the experimental group is presented in Table 16.

Table 16
Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public - Private</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.19/1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eagerness - Reluctance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.74/1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Accurate – Inaccurate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.57/1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open - Closed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.44/1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Precise - Ambiguous or Unclear</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.64/1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Active - Passive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.19/1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Practical - Impractical</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.61/1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Energetic – No Energy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.59/1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Movement - Inertia or at a Standstill, No Progress</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.03/1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democratic - Autocratic or Not Democratic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.47/1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Voluntary - Involuntary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.67/1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Informativa - Uninformativa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.86/1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Willingly - Grudgingly or Not Willingly</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.86/1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Realistic - Idealistic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.03/1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Positive - Negative</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.69/1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Constructive - Destructive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.11/1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Strong - Weak</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.25/1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Natural - Contrived</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.58/1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperation - Resistance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.54/1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Flexible - Rigid</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.92/1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Scale Score | 36 | 4.79/0.99 | 23 | 4.53/0.74 |

Note. Response scale utilized was 7 = “Very Important,” 6 = “Quite Important,” 5 = “Slightly Important,” 4 = “Neutral,” 3 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 2 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 1 = “Very Unimportant.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Very Important,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Quite Important,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Slightly Important,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.50 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 5.51 – 6.50 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 6.51 – 7.00 = “Very Unimportant.” The paired items are presented such that all positive terms are presented first. Therefore, all items are coded in the same direction. a a reverse scaled item.
When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating (nearest the value of one) on the response scale was “Public - Private” (mean = 4.19). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of "Neutral." The second highest rating was for the item “Open - Closed.” (mean = 4.44). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category. The item which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) among the subjects in the experimental group at the pre-test was “Energetic – No Energy” (mean = 5.59). This item was described as “Quite Unimportant” on the interpretive scales. Overall, five items was in the “Neutral” category, and fourteen items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category, and one item was in the "Quite Unimportant" category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed the item which received the highest rating (nearest the value of one) among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test was “Private - Public” (mean = 4.09). This item was described as “Neutral” on the interpretive scale. The items which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) on the response scale was “Flexible - Rigid” (mean = 4.96). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly Unimportant.” The second lowest rating at post-test was for the item “Resistance - Cooperation” (mean = 4.87). This item was classified in the “Slightly Unimportant” response category. Overall, nine items were in the “Neutral” category, and eleven items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category.

A summary of pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Non-Participants in control group is presented in Table 17.
### Table 17
Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of the Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Willingly - Grudgingly or Not Willingly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Movement - Inertia or at a Standstill, No Progress</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Precise - Ambiguous or Unclear</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Eagerness - Reluctance(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Active – Passive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Energetic - No Energy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Accurate - Inaccurate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cooperation – Resistance(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Informative - Uninformative(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Strong - Weak</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Public - Private(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Natural - Contrived(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Flexible - Rigid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Democratic - Autocratic or Not Democratic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Practical - Impractical(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Voluntary - Involuntary(a)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Realistic - Idealistic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Constructive - Destructive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Positive - Negative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Scale Score**: 21, 4.49/1.22, 15, 4.37/0.96

**Note**: Response scale utilized was 7 = “Very Important,” 6 = “Quite Important,” 5 = “Slightly Important,” 4 = “Neutral,” 3 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 2 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 1 = “Very Unimportant.”

**Note**: Researcher established interpretive scale for items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Very Important,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Quite Important,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Slightly Important,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Neutral,” 4.51 – 5.50 = “Slightly Unimportant,” 5.51 – 6.50 = “Quite Unimportant,” and 6.51 – 7.00 = “Very Unimportant.”

**Note**: The paired items are presented such that all positive terms are presented first. Therefore, all items are coded in the same direction. \(a\) a reverse scaled item.

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the items which received the highest rating (nearest the value of one) on the response scale, was “Public - Private, (mean = 3.19). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly Important.” The second highest rating was for the item “Open - Closed” (mean = 3.71). This item was classified in the “Neutral” response category.

The item which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) among the subjects in the control group at the pre-test was “Active - Passive” (mean = 5.28). This item was described as “Slightly Unimportant” on the interpretive scales. Overall, twelve items were in the “Slightly
Unimportant” category, seven items were in the “Neutral” category, and one item was in the “Slightly Important” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item which received the highest rating (nearest the value of one) among the subjects in the control group at the post-test was “Willingly - Grudgingly or Not Willingly” (mean = 3.57). This item was described as “Neutral” on the interpretive scale. The items which received the lowest rating (nearest the value of seven) on the response scale was “Positive - Negative” (mean = 5.14). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Slightly Unimportant.” The second lowest rating at post-test was for the item “Constructive - Destructive” (mean = 4.93). This item was also classified in the “Slightly Unimportant” response category. Overall, fifteen items were in the “Neutral” category, and five items were in the “Slightly Unimportant” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items in the “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the twenty items included in the sub-scale with the calculations completed after the twelve reverse scaled items had been re-coded. The overall “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from 4.19 to 5.59 with a mean value of 4.79 (SD = .99). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 4.09 to 4.96 with a mean value of 4.53 (SD = .74). When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores
ranged from 3.19 to 5.28 with a mean of 4.49 (SD = 1.22). The overall mean post-test score for the control group was 4.37 (SD = .96) with values ranging from 3.57 to 5.14.

These overall “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the fifth hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from 4.79 to 4.53 with a mean difference score of -.34 (SD = 1.32). When the difference score was examined for the control group, the mean difference score was -.08 (SD = 1.02) with values ranging from 4.48 to 4.37.

These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Personal Efforts to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score (t\textsubscript{36} = -.67, p = .51) (see Table 18). Therefore, Hypothesis five was not confirmed by the data in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18</th>
<th>Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated (Experimental)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate (Control)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Hypothesis Six

The sixth study hypothesis was that “The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Use of Strategies to reduce institutional racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.” To accomplish this objective, the researcher tested whether subject participation in the Undoing Racism program would be associated with changes in self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism.

The IRS’s Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale corresponds to seven items from the Effectiveness of Strategies sub-scale. It asked student subjects to indicate the extent of their use of such strategies as “Demonstrate against racist practices,” “Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear,” and the like, along a five-point continuum ranging from “never” to “very frequently.” This sub-scale provided a measure of self-reported behavior in response to institutional racism. Item numbers #5, #7, #8, and #9 are not listed in this sub-scale as they were part of the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale only and not part of the Personal Use of Strategies Sub-scale.

Prior to interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher established an interpretive scale for describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Never,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Seldom,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Occasionally,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Frequently,” 4.51 - 5.00 = “Very Frequently.” A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Participants in the experimental group is presented in Table 19.
Table 19
Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuade white/ black friends on a personal level that racism hurts them just as much as it does minorities.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.08/1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.19/.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.75/.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.97/1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate against racist practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.78/.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.44/.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.72/.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale Scores</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.85/.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Never,” 2 = “Seldom,” 3 = “Occasionally,” 4 = “Frequently,” 5 = “Very Frequently.”

Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Never,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Seldom,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Occasionally,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Frequently,” 4.51 – 5.00 = “Very Frequently.”

Note. There were no reverse coded items in Table 19.

When the subjects in the experimental group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another” (mean = 2.19). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Seldom.” The second highest rating was for the item “Persuade white/ black friends on an individual level that racism hurts them as much as it does minorities” (mean = 2.08). This item was also classified in the “Seldom” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the pre-test was “Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices” (mean = 1.44). This item was described as “Never” on the interpretive scales. Overall, one item was in the “Never” category and six items were in the “Seldom” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the experimental group showed the
item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Persuade white/ black friends on a personal level that racism hurts them just as much as it does minorities” (mean = 2.42). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Seldom.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another” (mean = 2.38). This item was also classified in the “Seldom” response category. The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the experimental group at the post-test was “Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.” (mean = 1.58). This item was described as “Seldom” on the interpretive scale. Overall, all seven items were in the “Seldom” category.

A summary of the pre-test and post test descriptive data for the individual items in the “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” Sub-scale for Non-Participants in the control group is presented in Table 20. When interpreting the responses to the items in this sub-scale, the researcher also referred to the interpretive scale outlined earlier when describing the mean subject responses. Values established for this scale included: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Never,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Seldom,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Occasionally,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Frequently,” and 4.51 – 5.00 = “Very Frequently.”

When the subjects in the control group responded to the items in this sub-scale prior to the “Undoing Racism Program,” the item which received the highest rating on the response scale, was “Provide setting in which minority and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.” (mean = 2.05). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Seldom.” The second highest rating was for the item “Demonstrate against racist practices” (mean = 1.90). This item was also classified in the “Seldom” response category.
Table 20
Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism Sub-scale Item Scores of Non-Participants in the Undoing Racism Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Control Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m/SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide setting in which minority and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.05/1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuade white/black friends on a personal level that racism hurts them just as much as it does minorities.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.62/.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.70/.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.48/.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.81/.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate against racist practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.90/.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.71/.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Scale Scores</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.76/.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response scale utilized was 1 = “Never,” 2 = “Seldom,” 3 = “Occasionally,” 4 = “Frequently,” 5 = “Very Frequently.”
Note. Researcher established interpretive scale for items was: 1.0 – 1.50 = “Never,” 1.51 – 2.50 = “Seldom,” 2.51 – 3.50 = “Occasionally,” 3.51 – 4.50 = “Frequently,” 4.51 – 5.00 = “Very Frequently.”
Note. There were no reverse coded items in Table 20.

The item which received the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the pretest, was “Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices” (mean = 1.48). This item was described as “Never” on the interpretive scales. Overall, one item was in the “Never” category and the remaining six items were in the “Seldom” category.

At the three-month follow-up post-test after the “Undoing Racism” educational intervention was completed, responses from the subjects in the control group showed the item which received the highest rating on the response scale was “Provide setting in which minorities and whites can participate in common school activities to get to know one another.” (mean = 2.93). Using the interpretive scale, this item was in the category of “Occasionally.” The second highest rating at post-test was for the item “Persuade white/black friends on a personal level that racism hurts them just as much as it does minorities.” (mean = 2.33). This item was classified in the “Seldom” response category. Items receiving the lowest rating among the subjects in the control group at the post-test were “Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to
alter or change racist practices” (mean = 1.60), and "Demonstrate against racist practices" (mean = 160). These items were described as “Seldom” on the interpretive scale. Overall, one item was in the “Occasionally” category, and six items were in the “Seldom” category.

In addition to examination of the individual items in the “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale, the researcher also computed overall mean scores for the “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale. This overall score was defined as the mean of the seven items included in the sub-scale. The overall “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” pre-test (baseline) scores for the experimental group ranged from 1.44 to 2.19 with a mean value of 1.85 (SD = .68). In comparison, the overall post-test sub-scale scores for the experimental group ranged from 1.58 to 2.42 with a mean value of 1.98 (SD = .65).

When the overall scores were examined for the control group, the pre-test (baseline) scores ranged from 1.48 to 2.05 with a mean of 1.76 (SD = .57). The overall mean post-test score for the control group was 2.02 (SD = .65) with values ranging from 1.60 to 2.93.

These overall “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” sub-scale scores were utilized to calculate a difference score to test the sixth hypothesis in the study. The difference score was defined as the overall post-test “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” score minus the overall pre-test (baseline) “Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism” score. The difference scores for the experimental group ranged from -1.71 to 1.57 with a mean difference score of .16 (SD = .80). When the difference score was examined for the control group, the mean difference score was .32 (SD = .70) with values ranging from -.71 to 1.71. These difference scores were then compared statistically using an independent t-test to test the hypothesis that “The mean difference between the baseline (pre-
test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program (the experimental group) on the Personal Use of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale will be greater than the mean difference between the baseline (pre-test) scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale. The results of this comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups on this difference score \(t_{37} = -.65, p = .52\) (see Table 21). Therefore, Hypothesis six was not confirmed by the data in this study.

Table 21
Comparison of the Mean (Average Change Score) of Personal Use of Strategies by Student Participation in the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated (Experimental)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate (Control)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Analysis of Qualitative Data

A semi-structured interview protocol was finalized that encompassed a total of 26 questions with attendant prompts and conducted by way of an individual group format. Group interviews were not deemed appropriate due to the possibility of answer/response contamination oftentimes exerted by one participant upon another participant; or the sharing of attitude to which it is oftentimes referred. Additionally, anonymity of individual student responses was supported and respected. The protocol outlined in Appendix D covered the five broad topical domains studied.

All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed, and a content analysis of the interview data was conducted. The purpose of the content analysis was to search for recurrent phrases and themes, for differences in the responses of subjects in the experimental and control groups and
for “outlier” responses that deviated from “majority” or “consensus” views. This qualitative data collection was conducted at the 3-month, post-test follow up after the final survey questionnaire had been completed. Subject recruitment for this component of the study was non-probabilistic.

The primary investigator initially recruited 12 subjects from the experimental group and 12 subjects from the control group to participate in interview sessions. Individuals were self selected (volunteers) for participation in the qualitative component of the study. Therefore, generalizability was not an anticipated outcome of this component of the study. The originally planned number of interviews in each of the two groups (12) was to ensure that the researcher reached the saturation point in the qualitative data collection process. This is the point after which no new information is identified in subsequent interviews. In examining the transcripts of the interviews, the researcher determined that the saturation point for the experimental group was reached in interview number 6 and for the control group it was reached in interview number 5.

Ultimately, three subjects from the experimental group and five subjects from the control group did not report to the interview session held in the school library as scheduled, and were excluded from the final data analysis. Exclusion of these eight participants was not felt to have skewed the results in any one particular direction or another as all participants, treatment and control, were selected equally on the basis of pre-determined selection criteria. The eight absent participants were, therefore, not unlike the remaining participants with respect to the selection criteria.

An important goal of these interviews was to “integrate substance and method” by engaging the students to share and speak about real-life experiences. These interviews were conducted over a 2-week period after school hours, taking 30 minutes to 1 hour to complete.
Knowing that the goal of qualitative research is to uncover patterns that exist and emerge after close observation and interview discussions the first step is to present the participant responses in an organized manner. To this end, it was determined that direct participant responses would best fit in an appendix. For a complete transcription of all interviews the reader is directed to Appendix D. What is being presented here is a summary of the themes that emerged from the responses to questions in each domain.

**Topical Domain One**

The first topical domain involved questions about the role of institutional racism in situations that student subjects had observed at their school, for instance, the under-representation of African American students in "high ability" classes.

1. **Do you think African American students are underrepresented in “high ability” classes? By that I mean, for example, in the Honors classes?**

   **Experimental Group Response.** The data from the Domain One, Question 1 participant interview question has been presented in collective form. Of all Black and White students interviewed two White students agreed with the question that Black students were under-represented; two White students disagreed with the statement; five Black students agreed that Black students are not fairly represented in the Honors program; one Black student reported that Black students do not want to be included; and one White student did not say one way or another.

   What the researcher was able to garner from the first interview question of Domain One was that there was a definite division between Black students and White students with respect to Honors course inclusion. The Black students definitely felt that they were not invited to join these classes nor did they feel they were welcome. On the other hand, White students felt that
Black students were not barred from participation in the Honors program, rather that they themselves were not interested in the Honors program. This was evidenced by one White student’s statement that “It’s [Black student Honors’ program inclusion] not really brought up until it happens.” What this implied was that unless the issue was brought forward no one- Black or White- really paid much attention to it.

Control Group Responses. Of the students interviewed, one Black student agreed that black students were underrepresented in the Honors program but felt that things were changing; one White student believed that Black students were not well represented; and one White student felt that Black students do not work hard enough to be included in the Honors program.

Although control group responses were limited in number it was interesting to learn that these were not similar to experimental group responses, in that one White Student felt that Black students were under-represented while one Black student thought that things were changing.

2. How do you feel about administrative and faculty efforts in your high school to reduce institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. In response to how the students felt about administrative and faculty efforts in their high school to reduce racism, a summary of these results is as follows: One White student was not sure if faculty and administrative efforts to reduce racism were effective; and three White students and one Black student responded that the efforts were not substantial or effective.

With respect to the extent to which teachers and administrative staff in the school actively promote efforts to reduce racism the results of the interview were significant in terms of those students who responded vs. those participants who did not. Overwhelmingly, the White student participants felt that the administrative and teaching staff did little to promote racial tolerance.
On the other hand the Black student participants offered little personal opinion. Whether or not the imbalance between White and Black student participation was a result of the Black students not knowing whether or not the teaching and administrative staff promoted racial tolerance or were reluctant to offer an opinion is not clear. Interesting as well, was one Black student’s response that “…and it’s like the one African American administrator never really makes any major decisions.” Such a statement was indicative of an issue not related to this investigation but probably should have been, namely, racial divergence of the administrative and teaching staff.

Control Group Responses. With respect to whether or not the administrative and teaching staff was proactive in promoting racial tolerance in the school, the control group participants responded as follows: Two White students responded affirmatively and one Black student was basically in agreement by stating that “They are trying to improve the situation.”

Although only three student participants responded to this question, thus rendering a response generalization as being somewhat ineffective, it was interesting to note that both the White student participants and the Black student participants were affirmative in their response, namely, that the administration and teaching staff were both proactive in promoting an affirmative approach to racial tolerance. What was interesting as well, was the fact that both the experimental and control groups were similar in their responses to this interview question.

3. **Do you think there are much higher suspension rates or flunkout rates of minority students than white students?** If so, why do you think this is so?

Experimental Group Responses. Of the five students who responded (three White and two Black), there existed a general consensus that more Black students are suspended from school than White students. In addition, one Black student went as far as to report that “I know
that a lot of African American students do complain more about the teachers in how they are getting written up for just no specific reason.”

**Control Group Responses.** Control group responses to this particular Domain One question are as follows: Two White students reported that more Black students are suspended than White students; however, one White student reported that an equal division between Black and White students existed along while one White student did not feel that Black students were more frequently suspended. In contrast to the experimental group, the control group's overall opinion was that Black students were no more likely to be suspended than White students.

4. **Do you think black or minority students have less voice than white students about decisions affecting students here at school?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** Of those students who participated in the experimental group the general consensus with respect to this question was equal in terms of who has a greater voice in decision-making processes affecting students – White students or Black students. General consensus was that White students carry the majority vote.

**Control Group Responses.** Of those interviewed one Black student and one White student agreed that Black students have less involvement in decision making processes affecting students. At the same time one White student felt the decision making process was equal while another White student thought the process was equal. These results were, in the main, similar to the results gathered from the experimental group.

5. **Do you think an important goal of this school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority students? (Yes/no). Why or why not?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** The general response for all students interviewed was that the Undoing Racism Educational Program was not really important to the faculty and
administrative staff and that the whole school was not really all that involved nor are the faculty
and administrative staff really interested in making things work.

Control Group Responses. What was interesting to learn from this particular question
was that neither Black nor White students were particularly interested in revealing anything other
than everyone agreeing that it is important to learn how to get along. As to how getting along
was to be accomplished the respondents offered no possible solution.

6. This next question is aimed directly at getting your perspective. What is it like to be
a student at this high school in terms of being black or white? Is there a difference?

Experimental Group Responses. For this particular interview question it was interesting
to note that all the White student respondents felt that being in a racially mixed academic
environment was not advantageous to them and they would prefer not being in a racially mixed
academic environment. The singular most important reason was the White students felt that the
Black students were excessively disruptive and generally started fights. On the other hand, one
Black student who responded to the interview question summarized their feeling by stating,
“Black kids are expected to cause trouble as well as come to class and do nothing.” An
additional theme found in the responses to this question is the notable fact that White female
students are fearful of Black students.

Control Group Responses. In direct contrast to those respondents in the experimental
group, those participating in the control group felt that problems did not exist between Black
students and White students. In fact one White student responded to the interview question by
stating, “To be honest, I like going here better because it is more of diversity. I like it better"
while another White student reported ”Not really.” It doesn't really matter if my friends are
black or white.”
7. Have you experienced or heard about situations, here at school, personally, or that you have seen, that you might consider examples of institutional racism? (This question was followed up with conversational probes consisting of a detail-oriented question, for example: When did that happen? How did that come about? What? Where?)

Experimental Group Responses. Due to the very explicit responses to this particular question, the research investigator thought it appropriate to include those responses in their entirety for both the experimental group and control group. The reason for doing so was because this was one of the few questions that actually contained heated verbal delivery. Significant words or phrases have been purposely set in bold type for accentuation purposes (to highlight the emotions expressed in the responses). What was interesting to note here was the intensity of the racial comments, both Black and White, was stereotypical of the environment in general. That is, both Black and White participants, even though having participated in the ARE intervention program, continued to hold stereotypic views about Black students in general. Fault, however, should not be placed on the ARE intervention program for failing to erase these stereotypical views rather on society in general who has promoted such views throughout these participants’ lives.

One white female student reported, “Not really, I mean, I think people look at it- racism because they get in a situation that is brought up and some people see what it is and it’s really not racism. They just take it way out of proportion and things do spread.” One white male student reported simply, “Not really, no difference.”

Another white male student replied, “I hear them but for the most part they are mostly jokes. People just make jokes about it. For example, like for me, I have been on the basketball team and I was the only white guy on the team and you know a lot of times they'd be like, ‘Oh,
you're white and can't play on this team. It's only a black sport down here. You need to quit.’

After a while, I realized that they were just joking and all and having a good time. For me, personally, I can take the joke you know cause when they told me the coach was right there when they were saying it. You know, for me, I'll maybe start dishing out a little bit of jokes here and there, but for some people I could understand that they might not be able to take the joke and it could lead to worse things."

One black male student reported, “Oh yeah, like with that thing with the Student Council President from last year. Like it was like homecoming and like we put decorations out- like each class does like a little section of the school, you know decorate it, like for homecoming and stuff. And like they had a black guy- like two black guys and two white girls came and- they came together in the same car, same everything- and they vandalized like everybody else, like the freshman and sophomore and junior’s like decorations so they can, I guess, so they can win.”

He went on to report, “Then they [the administration] found out and the two white girls got like behavior class- that’s like an hour and a half after school. And these guys [the two black male students] got recommended for expulsion. And they had to stay out of school for almost two weeks and like they couldn’t make up their work, so they basically, like the guy- one guy had to come back this year to make up some of his credits because he couldn’t graduate. Yes sir, I think it was a direct result of institutional racism.”

Another white male student reported, "We have a group of us called the ‘country boys.’ That's what we really are. We're the students that live out on the farms. It's mostly racist people that live out on farms because they haven't had a chance to grow up making friends with many blacks so they kind of feel pushed away."
One black female student reported, “One of my teachers, the way he teaches, he tends to pick more of the Caucasian students to do like assignments in class or to talk on-line. **He never picks any African American students.** It’s just that they tend to get picked more to do things for him and he doesn’t really remember any of our needs. He knows all of their needs. If you are going to make a difference, don’t make it that obvious.”

**Control Group Responses.** One black female student replied, "Yes, I think it was sometime this year, maybe in the beginning. I don't know if it was this year or the end of the school year. I want to say this year. **A white dude and a black dude were fighting. The black dude was the one who ended up being punished, not the white dude.**"

A white female student replied, "Not at this school but at my previous school there was a lot of racism. Like if the people were black they might not let you in their group because of your color. But over here, everybody just hangs out with everybody. At my old school, they would act differently toward people that were black and people that were white. The financial thing was a big thing too. If you didn't have money, they didn't want you in their group. **A lot of the black people didn't have money so they got excluded.**" Another student replied, "Um, maybe like with jokes. I think a white guy told it. I mean, people need their jokes. Even black people need their jokes about like other races."

A white male student replied, "I've seen some fights that were sometimes based on that. Like in my sophomore year. **Two kids started talking one said something racial and that's what made the other guy mad and that's what started it.**"  

From both the experimental group and the control group what was eminently apparent was that participants in both groups had experienced similar situations with respect to
institutional racism. In fact, both groups reported very similar situations wherein institutional racism had occurred.

8. **Do you think there is a good understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups here at your school? Why/ Why not?**

   **Experimental Group Responses.** Responses to this particular interview question presented very different results in that the question itself was peer related and did not involve any segment of faculty or administration. For the experimental group both White and Black student participants reported that both races appear to function together with not too much racial tension. In fact, one student even reported that “A lot of people understand each other…” What was interesting to note as well is that each respective race was aware that inter-racial association was very acceptable and most of the time both races got along in the school, although both races usually participated with their own race respectively.

   **Control Group Responses.** For the control group, as for the experimental group, most of the respondents did not feel that race was an issue. However, one White student did state that racism was “becoming” an issue; however, further prompting by the interviewer did not elicit additional information.

9. **Do you think enough time and energy is spent at the school talking about issues concerning racism?**

   **Experimental Group Responses.** In unison, this particular question delivered a negative response from both Black and White student respondents. Both groups were in agreement that discussing racism has not been a focal point within the school and that the subject was only slightly touched upon.
Control Group Responses. Control group responses were very similar in content to experimental group responses in that very little effort has been put forth to discuss racial issues with the students. One student did, however, make a very interesting comment, namely, “…the school would be a lot better if we would just sit down and talk about it.” Although there were significant differences between Black student and White student responses in previous questions with respect to racism in the school, responses from both groups on this question were basically in agreement that the faculty and administrative staff have done little to cultivate racial tolerance.

Topical Domain Two

The second topical domain involved an inquiry about student subject perceptions of institutional racism in their community such as in residential concentrations along racial lines.

1. In terms of the city as a whole, or in terms of the community where you live, do you see whites and blacks always having certain sections or pockets of the city where one ethnic group is going to live/congregate? Why or why not do you think this is so?

Experimental Group Responses. Overwhelmingly, the Black and White respondents participating in the experimental group felt that neighborhoods are most often an association of like races and, as such, much more comfortable. In addition, the White respondents generally felt that the Black neighborhoods were much more caught-up in problems such as crime and drugs. In fact, the majority of White student respondents felt they would not be comfortable living in an almost- or all- Black neighborhood. The White respondents fell short, however, in expressing the specific reason for not wanting to live in an all Black community environment – regardless of the socio-economic standard of the neighborhood.

In turn, the Black student participants voiced the opinion that they would not like to live in an all White neighborhood as well. To all respondents the respective neighborhoods were simply
the “white section” and the “Black section.” Out of all the respondents, only two felt that living in a “mixed” neighborhood was a problem to any great extent. What was the singularly most important result with respect to the responses to the question was that no one respondent, White or Black, offered a great deal of information or opinion as to whether community neighborhoods should be more integrated or less integrated. Overall, the responses to this particular question were somewhat vague, even when prompted to offer more information. Further, the general consensus among students is that community neighborhoods are based on “likeness” rather than diversity, as community members are much more comfortable with the concept of “sameness.”

Control Group Responses. What was found to be interesting with the control group responses was in terms of socio-economic status. Most all control group respondents divided the community into Black and White areas based on economic status; i.e., Whites as upper class and Blacks as lower class wherein class was defined as having more or less money. This particular phenomenon was not reported or discussed by the experimental group respondents. Although not a subject of this thesis one cannot wonder whether or not Black and White students not wanting to reside in a mixed neighborhood is a valid result of negative experience or a consequence of what is commonly called “self-imposed segregation.” However, this particular topic is best left for future research endeavors seeking to determine whether or not segregation is, indeed, self-imposed.

2. Do you think having integrated neighborhoods or whites and blacks living along side one another is an important way to lessen or end racism/ institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. Participant responses to this question were somewhat opposite from the responses for the preceding question. Respondents of the former question generally felt that they would not like to live in a different race composition neighborhood, yet
the same experimental group participants felt that the best way to end racism was to have mixed-race neighborhoods. In fact, one White student seemed to sum up the sentiments of all participants when he said “…it [racially mixed neighborhoods] shows we are progressing and not having racism anymore.” Why such a discrepancy exists in the resulting information retrieved from the two questions will be discussed in the following chapter.

**Control Group Responses.** For those students who participated in the control group the information from this question was a replication of the responses obtained from the experimental group. Again, one Black student from this group expressed the collective opinion of the group with respect to inter-racial neighborhoods as a means to decrease racism by stating “They can learn to get along with one another.”

3. **Do you think, in terms of the city/community as a whole, that minority groups have less of a voice than whites about decisions, which affect our everyday lives?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** The general consensus for the entire group was one of agreement that minorities seemingly have less of a voice in community affairs than Whites. However, one single dissenting vote is particularly noteworthy in that one Black student felt that if Blacks and Black communities wanted to see changes for the better in their communities then “… it is up to them if they want to have any kind of life.” In addition, the majority of the respondents felt that Whites were more interested in community improvement than were Black residents.

**Control Group Responses.** For the control group the responses did not point to a central theme with respect to the question presented and, as a result, the information gathered did not result in any sort of common demographic.
Topical Domain Three

The third topical domain involved questions concerning the impact of interpersonal and institutional racism on the lives of interviewees.

1. **Do you think everyone is affected by racism/ institutional racism?**

   **Experimental Group Responses.** For the most part the White student participants felt that everyone faces racism, but at times one is not aware that it happened. On the other hand the Black respondents felt that they face racism on a daily basis – in school and in the community and are always aware of the situation. In fact, two Black students felt that racism takes place within their own communities and is delivered by those who work in the area and are not Black – especially the police. However, all the experimental group respondents were of the same feeling that everyone is affected by racism. One particular Black student summed up the interview by stating “Yeah, whites, blacks, everyone.”

   **Control Group Responses.** As was true for the experimental group respondents, the control group participants in general felt that everyone faces racism at some time or another. What was important to record from this particular interview segment, one member of the control group, unlike any one in the experimental group, said that racism has very deep roots going all the way back to slavery and that we [white students] should not be held accountable for that which took place centuries ago. An additional insightful theme brought forth by a control group member (White) was based on family rearing practices; and one that is extremely important in understanding race relations, namely, “…you grew up with parents that were racist then that is probably how you’re ‘gonna’ turn out to be and raise your kids that way.” To this statement a Black student replied simply “Yeah.” These comments underscore the importance of understanding race relations.
2. **How do you think you have been affected by racism/ institutional racism?**

*Experimental Group Responses.* Although there was an array of responses to this particular interview question the overwhelming theme, for both Black and White students, was one of “Yes I have been affected by racism.” The interesting point was, however, the manner in which the participants were affected. For the Whites the majority of respondents related the racism issue to their parents and not directly to themselves. That is to say, the White students did not generally feel they were the target of racial remarks, rather, that their parents were all too often non-accepting of the Black friends their children might have. What was very interesting during this particular segment of the interview was the fact that the White students confirmed that the Black students are the ones who are most often affected by racism; and, that the reason was most often their parents who were not in favor of Black-White student associations or friendships. For the Black participants the effect of racism was rather eloquently described by one student saying “It’s just like the assumptions. It’s like when you’re born, I guess, when you’re born black, you have to almost prove yourself to society before you can do anything so it’s like you have to go the extra step. You know you’re not expected to do much.” For the White student respondents the sentiments were not the same as no one felt that they had to prove themselves to Black students, other than one student who felt he had to so on the basketball court. However, this might well have been an internalized emotion of what he thought Black students expected of him on the basketball court.

*Control Group Responses.* Unlike the experimental group the control group participants, both Black and White, felt that they were not the subject of racism and that color did not matter with respect to forming friendships. Further, these respondents generally agreed that it is the whole person that strengthens a friendship – not their color.
3. What do you think about kids at school, or that you know here in [name of town], that date people from a race different from their own? What comes to your mind when you see inter-racial couples out together?

**Experimental Group Responses.** Responses to this question were generally split 50/50. That is to say, both the 50% of the White participants and 50% of the Black student participants acknowledged that inter-racial dating is acceptable and 50% of the White participants and 50% of the Black student participants acknowledged that inter-racial dating was unacceptable. However, the more interesting comment elicited was from a White student who expressed the opinion that inter-racial dating was religiously unacceptable. Unfortunately, further probing by the interviewer did not result in additional information.

**Control Group Responses.** In contrast to the experimental group participants the control group offered a greater variety of opinions. The feelings about inter-racial dating ranged from one of being totally acceptable, to not a problem, to no one’s business, to hurting children if marriage resulted, to who cares. What this information revealed was a much more tolerant attitude toward inter-racial dating by the control group vs. the experimental group.

4. Have you ever found yourself in a difficult situation with a friend that later as you thought about or reflected on the situation, may have had something to do with race?

**Experimental Group Responses.** With the exception of two respondents, one White and one Black, the remaining participants overwhelmingly agreed that they had never found themselves in a situation that had anything to do with race. The two dissenters, however, were very strong in their response to being in a situation that they felt was racially charged wherein one incident occurred in a sports situation and one in a social setting.
Control Group Responses. None of the respondents provided any responses for the control group with respect to this question.

5. How do you see yourself or how do you feel about your own personal efforts to reduce institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. Without exception the participants in the experimental group, both Black and White, felt that they had attempted to reduce racism though racial awareness through both words and actions. For example, one White student expressed the feeling that children should be taught racial tolerance at an early age and another student, (Black) expressed the opinion that hopefully the “program” would help to instill racial tolerance in racial acceptance situations. Another student was quite insightful with respect to assisting in racial tolerance practice by stating, “We must all try to get along.” This was basically the sentiment expressed by all participants.

Control Group Responses. Two central themes emerged from the interview with the control group in terms of reducing racism from a personal perspective, namely all people must try to get along and that “treat others as you would like to be treated.” What was interesting as well was the fact that no one participant in the control group expressed an opinion in terms of one race having more tolerance than another. This factor is extremely important when attempting to implement any intervention program aimed at reducing racism.

Topical Domain Four

The fourth topical domain involved soliciting student subject opinions about the impact and effects of court-ordered racial desegregation in the [name of Parish] Parish school district.

1. What is your opinion, or what do you think, or feel about the court-ordered racial desegregation here in the [name of town] Parish school district?
Experimental Group Responses. The central theme throughout both the Black and White participants was not totally unexpected in that the majority of respondents really did not have knowledge about desegregation efforts in the school district. There was one student, however (Black) that offered the following opinion that was extremely perceptive: “Like, you know, we’re gonna have problems with it, you know soon, you know, in the near future but you have to think about what’s gonna help us out like 20 years, 25 years from now and then to get this desegregation thing over in the schools.”

Control Group Responses. The response to this interview question presented to the control group was best described by one Black student’s comment: “I ain’t up to date with it” along with another student’s comment [White], “I don’t really think it matters.”

The significance of students, Black and White, being uninformed about desegregation in the school district will be discussed in the following chapter.

2. **What do you think the impact has been [desegregation]?**

Experimental Group Responses. Although participants in the experimental group offered opinions about desegregation none of the comments appeared to reflect personal situations involving desegregation. Most of what was offered was instances wherein friends were transferred to different schools but information as to how these friends felt was not available. Interesting as well was a comment made by a Black student wherein the impact had more to do with parents than it did with the students.

Control Group Responses. Only one respondent replied to this question from the control group. A black female student replied, “I think it’s a positive effect.” The remaining participants did not respond.

3. **Do you think it’s [desegregation] had an effect (positive or negative) on**
people?

**Experimental Group Responses.** Responses to this particular interview question ranged from desegregation breaking up the community, to having a positive effect, to a negative action, to being a “reality check.” In summary, as many Black respondents had negative comments as White students and as many White students had positive comments as Black students.

**Control Group Responses.** All participants, Black and White, with the exception of one Black student felt that desegregation would have a negative effect on people. Their reasons were the same as those for the experimental group participants; i.e., community break-up and a negative action.

4. **Have you seen or heard about situations where this personally affected a friend or others?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** Out of all responses from the participants only one student (Black) had experienced a situation wherein the effects of desegregation were felt by others. Those involved, however, were cousins and not the respondent, so the information received is on a second level of interpretation.

**Control Group Responses.** Of all the respondents interviewed it was interesting to note that not one student, Black or White, had experienced any situation wherein desegregation affected them individually or affected a friend. Similar responses were also recorded for the experimental group.

5. **Do you think it’s helped pull the community together, or apart?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** The majority of the interview responses from those interviewed in the experimental group were of the opinion that, although it might well take time, desegregation would benefit everyone. What was interesting to note was that the responses went
beyond a yes or no answer as the students, Black and White, described how desegregation is helping their community – both with parents and friends.

Control Group Responses. For the control group the recorded responses were not as descriptive as they were for the experimental group. Although the majority of the control group participants were positive in their response, their positivism was simply stated as a yes or no.

6. Do you think whether a school is 100% black or white is anybody’s business? Should the government or the courts get involved?

Experimental Group Responses. Although the responses to this particular interview question were mixed, all responses were given in great detail and with little prompting from the interviewer. The responses ranged from yes the government should get involved to no they should not. Reasons given ranged from providing a racially balanced academic environment to having better teachers. An additional theme reported by the responses wherein the general consensus was one of not having all White or all Black schools. The primary reason given was that doing so promotes segregation and one group fairs better than another. The conclusion drawn was the “mixed” schools offer a better opportunity to learn for both races. There was one dissenting vote, however, wherein a White student offered the opinion that a person should be able to attend the school of choice and if it was to be an all White or all Black school then that was acceptable.

Control Group Responses. As was reported for the experimental group the control group responses were similar in that most participants believed that the government should not get involved in community education issues. Further, the participants were generally of the opinion that a person, White of Black, should be able to attend the school of choice. What was rather interesting was that one Black student reported that it would be nice to have more White students
at the student’s school and one White student reported that it would be nice to have more Blacks
at the predominately White school.

7. **As you may know, the court ordered desegregation… has been both controversial and worrisome to many people. What do you think about it?**

   **Experimental Group Responses.** One black female replied “Not really.” A black male student replied simply “Um-hum. Yes sir.” A white male student replied, “Helped pull it together.” Based on these comments all that can be said it that there was a mixed outcome without reason as to why.

   **Control Group Responses.** A white female student replied “Right. We didn’t have to be pushed to move. I don’t think it’s right.” A black male student replied simply “Yeah.” A black female student replied simply “Uh-Huh.” As with the experimental group, the responses from the control group were rather vague and without description.

**Topical Domain Five**

The fifth topical domain sought to elicit feedback from the experimental group about their experience and evaluation of the Undoing Racism Educational Program. Helping high school students understand and deal effectively with race issues is not an easy task and the very subject matter has been approached from a wide variety of perspectives. The literature is replete with content information with respect to the effectiveness of various programs; however, and despite the type of program being augmented, students of all races are primarily concerned with three major issues; namely safety from bullies, the administration’s preferential treatment of one group over another, and the lack of institutional (teacher and administration) response to small problems before they escalate into violence. In an attempt to better understand the student’s perspective, the fifth domain of this study attempted to ascertain the extent to which a pre-
selected program (ARE) influenced the perceptions and assessments of self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism within an educational environment that had recently undergone compulsory, court-ordered desegregation. One of the more crucial aspects of the program, namely, the students’ own evaluation of the program itself, were reserved until the end of the program and are summarized below.

1. **Over the past several days you have been involved in a really intensive two-day training program. What do you think? How did it go? How would you rate your experience of the Undoing Racism program?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** For those students who participated in the Undoing Racism educational program, an overall agreement that the program “it opened my eyes” and “it was a good experience” and “it taught me certain ways of thinking about things” and “I learned a lot” was the general consensus. Seemingly, common themes or threads in the self-reporting aspect to the study for the participating students when answering how they would rate the experience of participating in the program was that the program proved not only to be insightful and interesting, but also provided an environment to improve one’s ability to communicate with one another better, to learn more about institutional racism, and that the program was educational for all. Responses from the experimental group participants also focused on the need for the school’s administrative and teaching staff to “hear our voice.” These students reported the training taught them to begin to think critically about their White or Black classmates as well as learning to view each other differently and from a more positive perspective. At the same time, several of the students voiced several criticisms with respect to the program. One such criticism was that the training did not provide a “solution” to racism. Another criticism was that the training was too “one-sided.” Overall the information supported the argument that high school
students were capable and willing to discuss racial issues in an open and honest way across racial and ethnic boundaries.

**Control Group Responses.** Students in the control group did not, of course, participate in the Undoing Racism Educational Program and as such no comments were made with respect to the question presented to the experimental group.

In keeping with the need to garner information with respect to the participants’ involvement in the program, the second question presented was more open-ended than the first question within Domain 5. More specifically, the second question was phrased as follows:

2. **This next question is purposefully vague so that you may respond in any way that makes sense to you. What differences do you think this program will make to students who went through it?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** In general terms all student responses were in general agreement that participating in the program would not only increase one’s racial tolerance but the impact would be felt much more strongly on the student participants than on the administration. In addition, the general consensus was that the program provided an “opening” for students to discuss racial differences and racial equality much more openly in the classroom. Many students also voiced the opinion that programs such as the one in which they participated would help to elevate their awareness of racism and its impact on society. Additionally, several students made reference to numerous positive changes the school administration was planning for the next school year. For example, the disciplinary committee was to be re-structured to include students sitting on this committee who had, in fact, attended the Undoing Racism Educational Program training.
Undoubtedly racism in the public education arena exists; however, irrespective of its sources, racism is racism. Wherein ignorance is no excuse and insecurity is not a justification, racism in all its negative forms must be uncompromisingly condemned. The singular most important question remaining is “What role can schools play in combating racism?”

**Control Group Responses.** Students in the control group did not, of course, participate in the Undoing Racism Educational Program and as such no comments were made with respect to the question presented to the experimental group.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the possible influence of participation in an anti-racist educational (ARE) program upon the perceptions of, critical assessments of, and self-reported behaviors toward institutional racism in a sample of 11th-grade students enrolled in a public school district that had recently undergone compulsory, court-ordered desegregation. This quasi-experimental study measured hypothesized differences between the scores of a group of high school students on a quantitative data-gathering measurement instrument prior to their participation in an Undoing Racism curriculum, with their scores on that same instrument re-administered three months after their completion of that course. These numeric values were then compared to the degree of pre-intervention/ post-intervention changes in the experimental study group with changes in scores on two concurrently administered rounds of the study instrument obtained from a peer control group who did not participate in the Undoing Racism program.

Following the second phase of testing, the qualitative component of the study involved the researcher conducting interviews with sub-sets of study participants drawn from both the experimental and control groups. The interview consisted of questions with respect to judicially mandated racial desegregation in the school district. Results generated through these procedures yielded study findings about the efficacy of Undoing Racism as an intervention for changing student sensitivity to, appraisals of, and actions toward institutional racism in their school, their community, and American society at large.
The research question governing inquiry in this study was: Will exposure to an anti-racism educational program in the form of the Undoing Racism curriculum change the perceptions of, assessments of, and behaviors of high school students toward institutional racism? Presented below is a re-cap of the study hypotheses for the purpose of the reader being able to focus on the study’s intent along with accompanying results.

This study formally tested six research hypotheses set up to test for mean differences between participants in the ARE intervention experimental group and participants in the non-ARE control group. Consistent with the express purpose of the Undoing Racism intervention and the research findings concerning Anti-Racist Education (ARE) reported to date in the literature, the study’s hypotheses were as follows:

Study Hypothesis #1: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Examples of Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #2: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Climate for Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #3: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Effectiveness of Strategies to Reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.
Study Hypothesis #4: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Administrative Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #5: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

Study Hypothesis #6: The mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the participants in the Undoing Racism program on the Personal Use of Strategies to reduce Institutional Racism sub-scale would be greater than the mean difference between the baseline scores and the post-intervention scores of the non-participants on that sub-scale.

B. Overview of Methods and Research Design

The methods of this study involved a quasi-experimental investigation that was implemented through original fieldwork conducted by the researcher at a high school within a public school district in Southern Louisiana. The final research site was chosen on the basis of cooperation from school district and school building administrative decision-makers in permitting the implementation of the Undoing Racism workshop and the researcher's planned efforts to measure the program’s effects. This study included both quantitative and qualitative measurement data-gathering and analysis components. The former entailed the administration of the Barbarin Institutional Racism Scale (IRS) to an initial sample of approximately 80 11th grade students prior to initiation of an Undoing Racism program. From this initial sample, forty students were selected to take part in the anti-racism curriculum during the spring of 2004 and
served as the study's experimental group. The remaining forty students comprised a control group who did not participate in the Undoing Racism curriculum.

After the completion of the spring, 2004 curriculum, that is, approximately 12 to 14 weeks following an intensive two-day workshop, the IRS was re-administered to the entire sample. It was anticipated that the responses of the experimental group on the six sub-scales of the IRS would exhibit significant changes upon re-test when compared to their pre-intervention scores. What was also anticipated was that the responses from the control group on the six sub-scales of the IRS would not exhibit significant changes upon re-test when compared to their scores on the initial administration of that instrument.

With the conclusion of the Undoing Racism curriculum at the end of the spring, 2004 curriculum, the researcher conducted interviews with 16 students, half drawn from the study's experimental group and half drawn from its control group. These discussions were guided by a semi-structured interview protocol tapping into student perceptions of, assessments of, and self-reported actions toward institutional racism within the school system. The interviews also sought confirmation of the study's quantitative research findings by asking about any changes that interviewees perceived in their stance toward institutional racism. Lastly, feedback concerning participant experience in the Undoing Racism program was solicited from the 9 interviewees drawn from the experimental study group.

C. Major Findings from the Study

A summary of the major findings of this study describes the student participants’ overall characteristics as well as their perceptions regarding institutional racism. The completed sample included 57 participants from a large public high school located in a small city in Southern Louisiana. The majority of the experimental group (76.5%) and the control group (61.9%)
participants were Caucasian. Most of the experimental group was male (52.8%), while most of the control group was female (57.1%). Most of the experimental group (52.8%) was sixteen years of age. In contrast, most of the control group (57.1%) was seventeen years of age.

A summary of the quantitative findings of this study revealed that essentially, in terms of the above stated hypotheses, none were confirmed statistically; none of the changes in attitudes and perceptions of students who attended the Undoing Racism Program were significantly different from those students who did not attend the Undoing Racism training. The subjects in this study were uncertain as to what the administrative and faculty efforts were regarding institutional racism.

However, a summary of the qualitative findings of this study revealed through student interviews that racism was a major issue for the High School where this study was conducted. These interviews also documented student concerns and observations about institutional racism in the larger community where they lived. The students reported that certain areas of the community continue to be referred to as “black” and “white.”

Both the experimental and control group students’ general consensus was that everyone was affected by racism. Several students described their parent’s behavior and attitudes as racist. These students had mixed views regarding inter-racial dating, many deferring judgment, saying it was up to the particular students or individuals involved. Also, most of the students interviewed expressed varied opinions regarding the court-ordered desegregation taking place in their community.

Many students spoke of wanting “this desegregation thing” to be over with. At the same time, several students believed that the drastic steps towards integration of schools taking place were a good thing because “that’s how you teach children to mix.” Students who participated in
the Undoing Racism educational program agreed that “it opened my eyes,” “it was a good experience,” “it taught me certain ways of thinking about things,” and “I learned a lot.” These were common themes throughout the interviews.

Additionally, several students made reference to numerous positive changes the school administration was planning for the next school year. The disciplinary committee was to be re-structured to include students sitting on this committee who had, in fact, attended the Undoing Racism Educational Program training.

Several students who had participated in the Undoing Racism Education Program also voiced several criticisms. One such criticism was that the training did not provide a “solution” to racism. Another criticism was that the training was too “one-sided.”

D. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions and recommendations were drawn by the research investigator.

1. There was racial diversity among the study participants.

This conclusion is based on the finding from the study that 70.9 percent of the participants were Caucasian and 27.3% were African American. It would be reasonable to consider this group of students as representative of the general population of both the geographic area in which the school is located and the state of Louisiana as a whole. According to the United States Census Bureau, in the year 2000, the total population of Lafayette Parish stood at 187,000, the majority of whom (114,000) resided within the central city of Lafayette itself. At that time about 76 percent of Lafayette Parish’s residents were classified as Caucasian, while 23 percent were categorized as African American.

2. The “Undoing Racism Educational Program” was not effective in changing
the perceptions of, assessments of, and behaviors of students toward institutional racism.

This conclusion is based on the finding that no significant difference was found in the changes between pre and post-test scores for the experimental and control groups in any of the six sub-scales of the IRS.

While this conclusion may seem discouraging initially, there are some possible reasons that the program may not have produced an immediate quantifiable effect and yet be positive in its outcome. For example, if the students who participated in the program were unaccustomed to addressing the issues involved in the program openly, the initial effect of the educational activity may have caused considerable discomfort and/or uncertainty among the participants. In this case, a delayed post-test might have provided a more accurate measure of the effect of participating in the program.

Additionally, the possibility exists that the issues being openly addressed in this program may actually have had a negative short-term psychological impact on the participants. For example, African American students may have been angered by some of their experiences that had previously not been recognized as institutional racism. Similarly, Caucasian students may have become very uncomfortable with the circumstances, especially if they realized that some of their previous actions were actually consistent with racist attitudes.

Since one of the major aspects of the “Undoing Racism” curriculum is teaching individuals to identify racism (especially institutional racism), participation in the program may have created awareness among the participants of the existence of institutional racism of which they were previously unaware. This awareness may have created varying levels of discomfort and/or anger among both White and Black program participants. However, this awareness could produce long term positive outcomes because change can not be accomplished until an
awareness of the need for change exists. This possibility seems to be supported by findings from the qualitative analysis of the study as is evidenced in the subsequent conclusions.

3. There was a definite division between Black and White student study participants with respect to Honors course inclusion, as well as a lack of Black student representation in the Honors program at the high school.

   This conclusion is based on the following findings from the experimental group participants when asked if African American students were underrepresented in "high ability" classes. Black students felt that they were not invited to join these classes nor did they feel they were welcome. On the other hand, White students felt that Black students were not barred from participation in the Honors program, rather that they themselves were not interested in the Honors program.

   The above referenced conclusion is also based on findings from control group's respondent's answers that centered on the same concept, namely, Black student lack of representation in the Honors program. Although control group responses were limited in number it was interesting to learn that these were not similar to experimental group responses in that one White student felt that Black students were under-represented while one Black student thought that things were changing.

4. Administrative and teaching staff in the high school have done little to promote racial tolerance.

   This conclusion is based on findings from both experimental and control group participants as to how they felt about administrative and faculty efforts in their school to reduce institutional racism. Overwhelmingly, the White student participants felt that the administrative and teaching staff did little to promote racial tolerance. On the other hand, the Black student
participants offered little personal opinion. Whether or not the imbalance between White and Black student participation was a result of the Black students not knowing whether or not the teaching and administrative staff promoted racial tolerance or were reluctant to offer an opinion is not clear. One Black student's response was interesting. "It's like the one African American administrator never really makes any major decisions." Such a statement was indicative of an issue not related to this investigation but which should clearly be a focus of future research, namely, racial divergence of the administrative and teaching staff.

5. The "Undoing Racism Educational Program" was effective in creating a dialogue about institutional racism among the students and in developing their ability and willingness to identify racism.

This conclusion is based upon the qualitative findings for both the Black and White students in the experimental group. The overwhelming theme was one of "Yes, I have been affected by racism." Interesting, also, was the manner in which the participants were affected. For the Whites the majority of respondents related the racism issue to their parents and not directly to themselves. That is to say, the White students did not generally feel they were the ones who made racially denigrating remarks, but rather, that their parents were all too often non-accepting of the Black friends their children might have. What was very interesting was the fact that the White students agreed that the Black students are the ones who are most affected by racism: and, that the reason was most often their parents (of the White students) who were not in favor of Black-White student associations or friendships.

For the Black participants the effect of racism was rather eloquently described by one student saying "It's just like the assumptions. It's like when you’re born, I guess, when you’re born black, you have to almost prove yourself to society before you can do anything so it's like
you have to go the extra step. You know you're not expected to do much." The sentiments of the White student respondents reflected a lack of a need to prove themselves to Black students, with the exception of one student who felt he had to do so on the basketball court. However, this might well have been an internalized emotion of what he thought Black students expected of him on the basketball court.

Although there were significant differences between Black student and White student responses with respect to racism in the school, both groups were basically in agreement that the faculty and administrative staff have done little to cultivate racial tolerance. Whether the issue was one of Honors class participation or suspension, both the experimental and control group respondents, White and Black, felt that the faculty and administration singled out the Black students more often than the White students. At the same time both groups felt that racism does exist and that the faculty and administration has done little to promote racial harmony.

6. Student participants attending the Undoing Racism Educational Program felt positive about their own personal efforts to reduce institutional racism.

This conclusion was based on the qualitative finding that without exception, the participants in the experimental group, both Black and White, felt that they had attempted to reduce racism through racial awareness through both words and actions. For example, one White student expressed the feeling that children should be taught racial tolerance at an early age and another student (Black) expressed the opinion that hopefully the "program" would help to instill racial tolerance in racial acceptance situations. Another student was quite insightful with respect to assisting in racial tolerance by stating, "We must all try to get along." Although these comments were the opinions of participants and cannot be readily supportive by quantitative or qualitative data they remain, however, the sentiment expressed by all participants.
7. Student consensus was that ultimately, over time, desegregation will benefit everyone.

This conclusion is based on findings from both experimental and control group participants that the court-ordered desegregation efforts would ultimately pull the community together. What was interesting to note is that the experimental group responses, unlike those of the control group, went beyond a yes or no answer as the students, Black and White, described how desegregation is helping their community - both with parents and friends.

E. Implications

Despite all of the attention and focus on multi-cultural education (MCE) over the last thirty years, public school systems may still be utilizing educators in classrooms who do not know how to effectively address racial prejudices in their student populations. Gone is the day where a white teacher teaches a white student. Teachers nowadays must teach students from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds. Teachers may become experts in their respective fields of curriculum, but they still retain their whiteness or blackness. Within the still developing belief systems of young, secondary education students, such prejudicial attitudes must be addressed.

According to the trainers who conducted The People’s Institute’s Undoing Racism Educational program held at this public high school, “We tried to made clear to the junior high school students who participated that a history of racism has kept replicating itself systemically and is interconnected with every institution in America.” Whether or not this assertion was actually successful or not is difficult to ascertain knowing that racism remains an integral part of the Parish’s educational system – spoken or unspoken. The Undoing Racism training is based on the following premise: as a collection of individuals, once individuals, clearly know what’s been done, we can begin to undo. This training attempted to offer the students a type of analysis of
the racism they see and hear about in their community. Whereas training about racism tends to
focus on individuals, the Undoing Racism approach stressed that the problem was more
systemic, political, and institutional. Until an individual concerned about racism and its negative
effects begins to see this, all the diversity training in the world never really gets to the systemic
core of the problem.

Several explanations may be plausible for the high morbidity of student turnout at post-
test. The lack of student participation at the three month post-test could have been part of a
similar problem cited by Morelli and Spencer (2000) when they encountered a low response rate
(under 50 percent) in their survey. They found that “teachers and administrators were unwilling
to use ARE because they had insufficient knowledge of its objectives and methods and feared
negative community reaction” (173). Further qualitative investigation would be necessary to
determine whether or not the same unwillingness existed among the staff and administration of
the schools wherein the present research investigation took place. Although the teachers,
administrators, counselors, and social workers Morelli and Spencer surveyed reported
uncertainty about the difficulties they would encounter if they attempted to use ARE in school
communities that are resistant to change, knowing whether the same uncertainties existed in the
present situation was best left to future research endeavors.

At a minimum, students who were part of the current study were talking about issues
related to racism. They were willing to talk about specific issues related to institutional racism
they had observed at this high school. This dialogue seems to be a necessary requisite before
students can begin to resolve problems or heal issues related to race.
F. Recommendations for Practice

Based on the above stated conclusions and findings, wherein it was found that the ant-racism initiative was found to be ineffective, the researcher recommends that further practice efforts be initiated and focused on continuing to provide anti-racism training at the secondary education level. The reason for this particular recommendation is to determine whether or not other similar ant-racism programs are also being proven to be ineffective. Considering the amount of state and federal funds spent on anti-racism programs in the public education sector all programs require further evaluation and scrutiny to determine their efficacy. Although the door is open to discussing and resolving problems related to race and institutional racism within the public high school setting there is a need for in-service training that focuses on how administrators and faculty can work with students to more effectively resolve inter-racial conflict and controversies that will inevitably arise within a high school such as the one in this study; and these programs must be looked at and evaluated very closely.

Additionally, administrative efforts to reduce racism can be enhanced by teaching ant-racist principles directly in the classroom. While a number of students reported these efforts were inadequate, many of these same students did not take the necessary actions and/ or personal efforts to reduce such institutional racism. Why is it that these students were not more actively involved in taking personal efforts to reduce such racism? One possible explanation may have been fear of alienation from their peers (if the student was white) or fear of retribution from the administration (if the student was black).

Garcia and Van Soest’s (1997) study cited earlier also identified “the fear of alienating friends and families” as a major barrier to the implementation of plans to confront prejudice for a
group of 43 Master of Social Work students who were interviewed after receiving anti-racist education during a required course on diversity and racial oppression.

G. Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the above conclusions and these findings, the researcher recommends that further research be conducted that investigates similar perceptions from teachers and other administrative personnel. Such investigations would possibly add credible evidence as to whether other programs proved to be as ineffective. A study investigating the influence of an anti-racist educational program on the attitudes and prejudices among these professionals could prove beneficial as well. Recommendations for further research could also include the identification of additional measurement scales to more accurately assess the Undoing Racism Educational Program. One strategy could include increasing the sample size of study participants. This could benefit the study by ensuring adequate power is available to conduct a statistical analysis that can detect differences that exist. Another recommendation for further research would be a follow-up similar replicated study that allowed for a longer period of time between pre- and post-testing to determine the relative permanency of attitudinal changes. Such a strategy could include a 2 year longitudinal study of student participants beginning in the 9th or 10th grade. Utilizing a delayed post-test may be necessary to more adequately assess for attitudinal change in students’ perceptions as they relate to racial prejudice and institutional racism. In addition, an extended period might possibly give the participants a better opportunity to reach the goals specified in an anti-racism training initiative. One must always consider the fact that racism does not happen overnight. Knowing that racist attitudes are developed at a very early age level, an additional recommendation for further research would be that programs be designed for lower grade level(s).
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APPENDIX A. BARBARIN’S INSTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE
# Institutional Racism Scale (IRS)--11th grade version

## Instructions
Please answer each question describing as accurately as possible yourself, your attitudes, and your perceptions. Feel free to add any additional information in the margin which might clarify your response. Please bubble in only one answer.

1=Not at all 2=Slightly 3=Somewhat 4=Neutral 5=A good index 6=Very sensitive
7=Most sensitive

## Examples of Racism

To what extent do you consider the following an indication of institutional racism?

1. Someone who has been working at a company longer than others as a major criteria or need for promotion
2. Much higher suspension rates or flunk-out rates of minority students than white students
3. Formation of separate minority businesses, causes, or organizations
4. Minority populations having minimal knowledge about organizational events and opportunities
5. Use of standardized reading tests to advance to higher grade levels in high school
6. Employee selection based on written tests
7. Allowing whites to attend historically Black colleges
8. Higher automobile insurance rates for inner city areas

## Involvement in Reduction of Racism Effectiveness and Use of Strategies

Below is a list of methods which have potential for lessening or ending institutional racism. Indicate how much or how little you believe the strategy to be effective and whether or not you have used it in the past.

1. Voting for students at in-school elections who are willing to alter or change racist practices.

* **Effectiveness of Strategy**
  - Poor
  - Fair
  - Good
  - Excellent

* **Have You Used This Strategy Before?**
  - Never
  - Seldom
  - Occasionally
  - Frequently

2. Actively try to effect changes of any school regulations at your school that may appear discriminatory.

* **Effectiveness of Strategy**
  - Poor
  - Fair
  - Good
  - Excellent

* **Have You Used This Strategy Before?**
  - Never
  - Seldom
  - Occasionally
  - Frequently

3. Provide settings in which minorities and whites can participate in common social activities to get to know one another.

* **Effectiveness of Strategy**
  - Poor
  - Fair
  - Good
  - Excellent

* **Have You Used This Strategy Before?**
  - Never
  - Seldom
  - Occasionally
  - Frequently
4. Persuade white/black friends on an individual level that racism hurts them as much as it does minorities.
   Effectiveness of Strategy
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent
   Have You Used This Strategy Before?
   □ Never □ Seldom □ Occasionally □ Frequently □ Very Frequently

5. Inform minority groups of the problem and help encourage them to change.
   Effectiveness of Strategy
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent
   Have You Used This Strategy Before?
   □ Never □ Seldom □ Occasionally □ Frequently □ Very Frequently

6. Demonstrate against racist practices.
   Effectiveness of Strategy
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent
   Have You Used This Strategy Before?
   □ Never □ Seldom □ Occasionally □ Frequently □ Very Frequently

7. Integrate neighborhoods by having minorities and non-minorities living alongside one another.
   Effectiveness of Strategy
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent
   Have You Used This Strategy Before?
   □ Never □ Seldom □ Occasionally □ Frequently □ Very Frequently

8. Have minorities at administrative and faculty levels so that they can monitor and change racist policies that may exist at your school.
   Effectiveness of Strategy
   □ Poor □ Fair □ Good □ Excellent
   Have You Used This Strategy Before?
   □ Never □ Seldom □ Occasionally □ Frequently □ Very Frequently
9. Make it possible for minorities to withdraw and develop their own clubs, extracurricular school activities, and other organizations rather than rely on predominantly white organizations.

Effectiveness of Strategy
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Have You Used This Strategy Before?
- Never
- Seldom
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Very Frequently

10. Utilize the courts to alter unfair practices.

Effectiveness of Strategy
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Have You Used This Strategy Before?
- Never
- Seldom
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Very Frequently

11. Provide education about the obvious and subtle ways that racism can appear.

Effectiveness of Strategy
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

Have You Used This Strategy Before?
- Never
- Seldom
- Occasionally
- Frequently
- Very Frequently

Below are statements about the behavior and policy which may or may not apply to your high school or organizations within your high school. For each item indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree regarding the accuracy of that statement as it pertains to your high school. Indicate your perception or opinion of your school environment by filling in the the appropriate number.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Mildly Disagree 4=Uncertain 5=Mildly Agree 6=Agree 7=Strongly Agree

1. There is a very sensitive understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Many changes have been made to make services and/or resources accessible to minority persons........................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Few attempts have been made to accommodate and include the cultural perspectives of minority groups........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Minority groups have less voice than whites about decisions which affect functioning in this high school.................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. This high school goes out of its way to make minority group members feel at home and accepted........................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. An important goal of this high school is to promote cooperation between minority and nonminority groups.................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Part II A

The purpose of this questionnaire is to look at both personal and administrative (including faculty) efforts to reduce institutional racism. As shown below, a series of descriptive scales or word pairs is used. In answering the questionnaire, please make your judgments on the basis of how things seem to you; all answers will be confidential. Here is how to use the scales:

If you think that such efforts are very closely related to one end of the scale, you should fill in the bubbles as follows:

Important □□□□□□□□ Unimportant

If you think that reduction of institutional racism is quite closely related to one end of the scale (but not extremely), you should fill in the bubbles as follows:

Important □□□□□□□□ Unimportant

If such efforts seem only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but is really neutral), then you should fill in the bubbles as follows:

Important □□□□□□□□ Unimportant

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale (in the middle of both sides of the scale, and equally associated with the concept) or if the scale is completely irrelevant, then you should fill in the bubbles as follows:

Important □□□□□□□□ Unimportant

Work at fairly high speed through this task. It is your first impression and immediate "feelings" about the items that are wanted. Make each item a separate and independent judgement.

Personal Efforts to Reduce Racism

Please fill out this scale marking the way you feel about your own efforts to reduce institutional racism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>active</th>
<th>democratic</th>
<th>constructive</th>
<th>resistance</th>
<th>impractical</th>
<th>involuntary</th>
<th>reluctance</th>
<th>accurate</th>
<th>positive</th>
<th>energetic</th>
<th>strong</th>
<th>private</th>
<th>closed</th>
<th>willingly</th>
<th>uninformative</th>
<th>contrived</th>
<th>realistic</th>
<th>movement</th>
<th>flexible</th>
<th>precise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Part II B
Administrative and Faculty Efforts to Reduce Racism
Please fill out this scale marking the way you feel about administrative and faculty efforts in your high school to reduce institutional racism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>active</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>autocratic or not democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>constructive</td>
<td>destructive</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructive</td>
<td>resistance</td>
<td>practical</td>
<td>voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resistance</td>
<td>involuntary</td>
<td>eagerness</td>
<td>energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involuntary</td>
<td>reluctance</td>
<td>inaccurate</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance</td>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>no energy</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>grudgingly or not willingly</td>
<td>informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>inertia or at a standstill, no progress</td>
<td>rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>ambiguous or unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. PERMISSION TO USE ISTITUTIONAL RACISM SCALE
Memo

From: Oscar Barbarin <barbarin@jrnalnc.edu> on 10/24/2002 02:47 PM AST.
Sent by: Oscar Barbarin <barbarin@jrnalnc.edu>
To: Joseph E Wilson <jwilson@jrnalnc.edu>
Cc: 

Subject: Re: Institutional Racism Scale

Joseph, you have my permission to use my scale. I only ask that you send me a summary of the findings related to the scale for my archival records.

Oscar Barbarin

Joseph E Wilson wrote:

> Dr. Barbarin/To Whom It May Concern,
> I am writing to obtain written permission to use the Institutional Racism Scale (Barbarin, 1999) as part of the pre-and post test measurements of student perceptions surrounding institutional racism. I am a Ph.D. student in social work at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. An UNDOING RACISM intervention will be provided to an experimental group of public school high school juniors in Lafayette, Louisiana. I plan to implement this study in Spring 2003.
> Sincerely,
> Joseph Wilson

--
Oscar A. Barbarin, Ph.D.
L. Richardson and Emily Preyer Bicentennial Distinguished Professor for Strengthening Families
University of North Carolina School of Social Work
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3550
Voice: 919 962 6405
Fax: 919 843 8627

Fellow, Frank Porter Graham Child Development
300 NationsBank Building
Chapel Hill, NC 27599 8040
Voice: 919 843 3469

http://mail29.jrnalnc.edu/mail/25gj/wilson3/as5dhf/c5877bddc1577985256415001263el56380v... 1236/2002
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APPENDIX C. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD MATERIALS
IRB #: 2139
LSU Proposal #: 178-8692
LSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) for
HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECT PROTECTION
Office: 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
FAX: 5792

APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT

Unless they are qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/projects using living humans as subjects, or samples or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

Instructions: Complete this form. If exemption seems likely, submit it. If not, submit regular IRB application. Help is available from Dr. Robert Mathews, 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu or any screening committee member.

Principal Investigator Joseph Wilson
(LSW) Student? YES

Ph: 225-352-6324 E-mail: jwils@lsu.edu Dept/Unit-Social Work

If Student, name supervising professor Dr. Mohan Ph: 578-5875 E-mail: mohan.b@worldnet.att.net

Mailing Address: LSU School of Social Work, Hugy F. Long Field House, Baton Rouge, LA Ph: 225 578-5875

Project Title: Assessing the Effects of Multicultural and Antiracist Education in Achieving Prejudice Reduction among Secondary Education Students.

Agency expected to fund project: National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI)

Subject pool: Lafayette Parish Public School High school Juniors

Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: Children 0-18 the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other. Persons with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project, scope or design is later changed I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the LSU IRB.

Stud exempted by Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall 225-578-8692
Robert C. Mathews, Chair
Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted.

PI Signature: Joseph Wilson, LCSW Date 1/14/03 (no per signatures)

Screening Committee Action: Exempted ___ Not Exempted ___

Reviewer: Mathews Signature: [Signature] Date: 1/14/03
To: All Principal Investigators

From: Robert C. Whitney, Chairman
Institutional Review Board

Date: December 11, 2002

Re: Use of Approved Consent Form

In order to comply with recent federal guidelines, we are now requiring that PIs use only printed copies of their IRB consent documents in their research. The change applies only to research approved after the date of this memo. Projects exempted or approved prior to this date do not require the change until their annual review by the IRB.
Human Subjects Consent Form
Re: IRB # 12159 - "Investigating the Influence of Anti-Racist Education in Achieving Prejudice Reduction among Secondary Education Students."

Project Title: Investigating the Influence of Anti-Racist Education in Achieving Prejudice Reduction among Secondary Education Students

Performance Site: One of the six high schools within the Lafayette Parish public school system determined by non-probabilistic means in consultation with district and building administrative decision-makers. The preference will be for the facility that most closely matches the racial composition of the district as a whole.

Investigator(s): The following investigator is available for questions:

M-F. 8:30a.m. - 4:30p.m.
Joseph Wilson, LCSW
Ph.D. Candidate
LSU Graduate School of Social Work
(225) 578-5875

Purpose of the Study: To assess the effects of an antiracist curriculum on reducing racial prejudice among high school students. To gather student perceptions of self, school, and community climate surrounding desegregation, school choice, and racism.

Inclusion Criteria: All juniors from the chosen Lafayette Parish public high school who comprise the experimental and control groups.
Exclusion Criteria: All remaining juniors from the chosen Lafayette Parish public high school research site not selected to participate in the study.

Description of the Study: The Underscoring Racism training is designed to provide high school students with a basic understanding of racism that will help them to build relationships cross culturally. This is a nationally recognized process that has trained young people all over the United States from New York City to Seattle, Minnesota to New Mexico and in Louisiana. These trainings have also been implemented as “Freedom Schools” in summer programs for youth in New Orleans, Louisiana, Berkeley, California, and Seattle, Washington. The Freedom Schools are shaped after the Freedom Schools during the 60’s Civil Rights Movement. Students will receive three consecutive days of 8 hour training. A student will receive this training while sitting and interacting in a large and comfortable classroom setting with approximately 40 other junior high school students from Lafayette parish. Reading materials will be provided which the student will be allowed to keep. Students will be presented lecture material, and at times throughout the training, be asked to break up into small groups of 4-5 students to allow for more interaction with peers to take place. Students will be given assignments to complete while in these small group settings to help them integrate the material. Students will be asked to complete 2 questionnaires before and immediately after the training, and again 3 months later. These questionnaires are designed to gather information about students’ understanding of prejudice and discrimination. Lunch will be provided to students on each of the three days of training as well as snacks during designated break periods throughout each day of training. Students will return to their own homes after each day of training and transportation to and from the training will be provided on an as needed basis.

Benefits: The Antiracist curriculum intervention is designed to educate students on the history of racial prejudice and racism and to teach students how to look for and assess
unconscious and conscious racial biases in their own behavior.

Risks: There are no known risks. Due to the sensitive nature of the subject matter (racial prejudice and racism), debriefing sessions will be held throughout the length of the study to provide students with an opportunity to process any concerns, or questions they may have.

Right to Refuse: Participation is voluntary, and study participants, along with their guardian(s) will become part of this study only if they agree in writing by signing this consent form. This Human Subjects Consent Form follows the LSU Human Subjects guideline. At any time, the student subject may withdraw from this study without penalty of loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.

Privacy: All pre- and post-test questionnaires which were completed by a student subject for this study may be reviewed by investigators. The investigator may conduct informal interviews with the student subject to get clarification and further explanations about their answers. Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included for publication. The investigator will offer to make a report available to the student subjects and their guardians either in written or oral form. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

Financial Information: There is no cost for participation in the study, nor is there any compensation to the subjects and their guardians for participation in the Undoing Racism program.
This study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature(s):

__________________________ Date: ____________
Student

__________________________ Date: ____________
Guardian
APPENDIX D. FINAL QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW GUIDE
Final Qualitative Interview Guide

Each student was asked a total of 20-30 questions with attendant prompts. Five broad topical domains were covered during each interview. First, questions about the role of institutional racism in situations that student subjects have observed at their school, for instance, the under-representation of African American students in “high ability” classes, were asked:

1. Do you think African American students are underrepresented in “high ability” classes?
2. How do you feel about administrative and faculty efforts in your high school to reduce institutional racism?
3. Do you think there are much higher suspension rates or flunkout rates of minority students than white students? If so, why do you think this is so?
4. Do you think black or minority students have less voice than white students about decisions affecting students here at school?
5. Do you think an important goal of this school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority students? (Yes/no). Why or why not?
6. This next question is aimed directly at getting your perspective. What is it like to be a student at this high school in terms of being black or white? Is there a difference?
7. Have you experienced or heard about situations, here at school, personally, or that you have seen that you might consider examples of institutional racism? (Follow up with conversational probes consisting of a detail-oriented question, for example: When did that happen? How did that come about? What? Where?)
8. Do you think there is a good understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups here at your school? Why/ Why not?
9. Do you think enough time and energy is spent at the school talking about issues concerning racism?

Second, inquiries about student subject perceptions of institutional racism in their community were asked:

1. In terms of the city as a whole, or in terms of the community where you live, do you see whites and blacks always having certain sections or pockets of the city where one ethnic group is going to live/ congregate? Why or why not do you think this is so?

2. Do you think having integrated neighborhoods or whites and blacks’ living along side one another is an important way to lessen or end racism/ institutional racism?

3. Do you think, in terms of the city/community as a whole, that minority groups have less of a voice than whites about decisions, which affect our everyday lives?

Third, questions concerning the impact of interpersonal and institutional racism on the lives of interviewees were asked:

1. Do you think everyone is affected by racism/ institutional racism?

2. How do you think you have been affected by racism/ institutional racism?

3. What do you think about kids at school, or that you know here in Lafayette, that date people from a race different from there own? What comes to your mind when you see inter-racial couples out together?

4. Have you ever found yourself in a difficult situation with a friend that later as you though about or reflected on the situation, may have had something to do with race?

5. How do you see yourself or how do you feel about your own personal efforts to reduce institutional racism?
Support and recognition responses were offered to the student participants about half way through the interview. Examples of comments used by this researcher included, "We're about half way through the interview now. It's going very well. I really appreciated your comments; they are just the kind of thing we’re trying to get at. From my point of view, it’s going very well. How’s it going for you?"

Fourth, the interview solicited subject opinions about the impact and effects of court-ordered racial desegregation in the Lafayette Parish school district:

1. What is your opinion, or what do you think, or feel about the court-ordered racial desegregation here in the Lafayette Parish school district?
2. What do you think the impact has been?
3. Do you think it’s had an effect (positive or negative) on people?
4. Have you seen or hear about situations where this personally affected a friend or others?
5. Do you think it’s helped pull the community together, or apart?
6. Do you think whether a school is 100% black or white is anybody’s business? Should the government or the courts get involved?
7. As you may know, the court ordered desegregation… has been both controversial and worrisome to many people. What do you think about it?

Lastly, feedback was sought from the experimental group about their experience in/evaluation of the Undoing Racism program:

1. Over the past several days you have been involved in a really intensive two-day training program. What do you think? How did it go? How would you rate your experience of the Undoing Racism program?
2. This next question is purposefully vague so that you may respond in any way that makes sense to you. What differences do you think this program will make to students who went through it?
APPENDIX E. TRANSCRIPTION OF QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS
The following is the Appendix inclusion of all student interviews conducted by the research investigator at the three month follow-up.

**Topical Domain One**

The first topical domain involved questions about the role of institutional racism in situations that student subjects had observed at their school, for instance, the under-representation of African American students in "high ability" classes.

1. **Do you think African American students are underrepresented in “high ability” classes? By that I mean for example, in the Honors classes?**

   **Experimental Group Responses.** One white male student replied simply “No” to this question. Another white male student replied, "Yeah, there are less black people." One black male reported that only 6 or seven other African Americans are enrolled in Honors Classes. He reported that it's a lot more whites than blacks in the Honors classes. He reports that they (Administration and faculty) have recommended other black students to go to Honors but that some just don't want to go. He reported that "most kids just want to hang around with your friends." But my Mom talked me into it (Honors class). He reports "Yeah, there's higher suspension rates among the blacks, we get suspended a lot more." I don't know why, it's just a fact. Also, this summer there's going to be some classes about State government held at LSU in Baton Rouge. There are twelve kids going altogether. There are six white girls and six white boys going. We (the blacks) only have three black boys scheduled to go as alternates.”

   Another white male student reported, "No, not like we don't let them in here or something. I really don't think so." Another black male reported that "the most black kids you probably ever have (in Honors class) out of maybe 25-30 kids is maybe 5-7 African-Americans at the most. But most African American student just didn't want it. Like with the mock state government
seminars at LSU this summer, where students get to go and learn how to run the government. They (the teachers who vote to send the students), nominated three African Americans and not one of them made it there.”

He went on to report “The teachers didn't even nominate one African American boy who's a 4.0 student and he's in all kinds of clubs, he's even in Debate and he didn't even get nominated! Another African American girl I know has taken all kinds of AP and senior classes as a junior, and she still has like a 3.8 and she’s going to UL next semester because she’s gonna have too many credits for high school… and she didn’t even get nominated.” Yes, they noticed it. They were kind of upset that they didn’t even get nominated.”

One black female reported, “It appears that all of my friends are black and most of them are not in the Honors classes. Overall, I would say most of the Honors students are the Caucasian students.” One white female student reported, “Technically, they [the black students] are [underrepresented], because it’s only like maybe five black people in the whole Honors program at our school. But also, if you think about it, you have to ask to be put in Honors because I had to ask. If you don’t show interest in wanting to be in Honors, you won’t be put in it. Your teacher will not say, “You belong in Honors.” You have to ask unless you are an A= student. But yeah, basically, if they would ask, there are a lot of people who could do it.” Another white female student reported, “Not really. It’s not really brought up until it happens. Not many people really start to care about it.”

**Control Group Responses.** One black female student replied, "Yes, but I think they're trying to make it better." A white female student replied, "That they're not represented? No, No." Another student replied, "No. Maybe some people don't work hard enough to be in honors. I am in Honors class." A white male student replied, "Um, not really."
2. How do you feel about administrative and faculty efforts in your high school to reduce institutional racism?

**Experimental Group Responses.** In response to how the student’s felt about administrative and faculty efforts in their high school to reduce racism, one white male replied simply that he wasn’t sure. One black female student reported, “In the lunch room for example, most of the teachers will break up a big group of African American students who are getting loud because they don’t want a fight to break out. But if it’s Caucasian students, the teachers won’t do anything because, okay, they are just talking. It’s like, if it’s a group of black students it’s more okay, it’s like, let’s go break the little ---- from fighting.”

She goes on to report, “All of the administrators are Caucasian but one, and it’s like the one African American administrator never really makes any major decisions. For example, I had an experience trying to drop a class and when I went to the counselor, they told me that I had to go to Ms. (a white principle) and she told me no, but one of my Caucasian friends had just informed me that she had told her “yes” that she could drop a class. Some teachers do, I think try to make a difference, but for the most part, a lot of them don’t, you can tell which ones. I think it’s their personality, some of them think, “she’s an African American student and she’s not going to go anywhere. She’s not going to do anything. She’s not going to behave in my class.”

One white female reported, “Basically, I think, not really. Everybody is treated equally, some black students though think it’s about racism, because they get more severe punishment that you do, but other than that, everybody is basically treated the same. Another white female student reported, “I don’t think it’s a big issue over here but I don’t think they go out of their
way to do it [reduce institutional racism]. Another white male student reported, "I would say most teachers don't do too much or don't do anything."

**Control Group Responses.** One black female student reported, "I think they're trying to make it better." A white female student replied, "They do a lot of stuff to integrate the black people and white people together. They do a lot of stuff to help it. Like, um, school dances and football games and stuff like that." One white male student replied, "They try because they try to keep it more as diverse as they can."

3. **Do you think there are much higher suspension rates or flunkout rates of minority students than white students? If so, why do you think this is so?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** One white male student reported simply “Yes, I see it.” Another white male student reported, "I guess you hear about it more from, you hear about it more about the black people. You don't hear about too many white people." Another white male student replied, "Yeah, I think there is. I don't know, I just observe that through the years at this school, there have been more blacks than white that have dropped out.

One white female student reports, “Yeah, it’s true. There is more, but to day any reason, I mean, if you don’t believe it you can maybe not have as much support at home. But you can’t really go into saying “why” because everybody goes through the same class, same grades, everything’s done equally, just a different race.” One black male reported, “Yes, I really couldn’t tell you but it’s just like, around here, like black students just seem to get in a lot more trouble. I’m not saying they didn’t do anything; they just get in trouble. It’s the students’ fault though.”

Another black male replied, “Oh yeah, but I’m not sure why. It’s just a fact. its little things like tar dies, like we’re always outside class talking and we’re tardy and they just write us up and
we get suspended.” One black female reported, “Yes, I would say yes, a lot of people I know are African American students and do get suspended more and do get in trouble more with the teachers. I know that a lot of African American students do complain more about the teachers in how they are getting written up for just no specific reason.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied, "I don't think it's high. I don't think more blacks are suspended or more blacks drop out than whites." A white female student replied, "Yes, at our school I think we have a higher, a higher, um, like more black than whites." Another student replied, "Yes I do. Maybe they weren't raised the right way or brought up the right way or something like that." A white male student replied simply, "No."

4. Do you think black or minority students have less voice than white students about decisions affecting students here at school?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student reported, “Yes and no. Some of them speak up about it and others just come and go about their business. I mean, we all- I don’t think that there’s anybody here that hates black people.” One white male student reported, Not at all." One black female replied, “Um, yes, I do, because like if a group is chosen to represent the school, it’s more the Caucasian students than African American students that are chosen, I don’t know why, they say it is random or just I don’t think it is.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied simply, "Yes I do." A white female student replied, "No, actually our student body president and our vice president are both black and the student council is much more mixed with blacks." Another student replied, "It's about the same." A white male student replied simply, "Yeah."

5. Do you think an important goal of this school is to promote cooperation between minority and non-minority students? (Yes/no). Why or why not?
Experimental Group Responses. One black student reports, “Like I don’t know, it always seems to work out like that the senior class officers are all white or in the student council is all black, or the student council is all white and the senior class is all black.” In regards to cooperation between between the races, it’s like this program [the Undoing Racism Educational Program] is like the first thing like at this school that I remember. They don’t really talk about it [cooperation between the races], not from like it’s a whole school together talking about it.”

One black female student reports, “I really don’t think they [the administration] care, to be honest. I just don’t think that that’s a major goal they have to try to get everyone together. I think they are more worried about who and what they look like.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied simply, "I don't know." A white female student replied, "I don't think that has been much of a problem here." Another student replied, I guess so to show the other students." One white male student replied, "Yeah I do. Maybe it's not as important like the grades but everyone just needs to learn how to get along with each other to where we are not like that when we do get out of high school- to where we can get along when we are in the work place.

6. This next question is aimed directly at getting your perspective. What is it like to be a student at this high school in terms of being black or white? Is there a difference?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student reported, No, I don’t mind coming to school with Blacks or Mexicans or Whites. That is not a big issue for me.” One white male student simply replied, "In some ways." Another white male student replied, "Oh, yeah, I can recall that there have been many times that one majority or minority would feel racist against the other and it would create a conflict ending up in a fight.
Another white female student reported, “It sucks. There is a difference [in terms of being black or white], but I say it that way because everyone is treated the same as far as the administration, but the way people as treated by their classmates is a whole lot worse because we [the white girls] will be pushed out of the way by a black person. It is basically fear, that you don’t just do nothing about it because you are scared they will hurt you. The blacks cutting in line at lunch is a really big practice, but basically, they will cut in front of us at line and if we said something, it would be like “Oh, I’m going to get whatever on you. Just basically leave them alone and they basically run over you.”

This white female student went on to also recount the incident described earlier by other students when two white females and two black males vandalized the school. “They both did everything equal, everything the same. The majority [whites girls] only got DC (disciplinary committee), and the minorities [black boys] got suspended. They were all A students; they were all in the student council. They all had the same GPA’s. Everything was exactly the same except for their race.”

One black male student reported “Yeah you know there’s a black student union because I guess we- a lot of black people do get in trouble over here. It’s like you expect it. You [a black student] have to prove to him [the teacher] that your willing to do work, you know, it’s always like an assumption that your gonna come in class and do nothing.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied, "I don't see any differences. Actually, we come here for the same thing. It's just for education." A white female student replied, “Before I went here, I went to another high school where there were more whites. To be honest, I like going here better because it is more of diversity. I like it better." Another student
replied, "They're no problem." One white male student replied, "Not really. It doesn't really matter if my friends are black or white."

7. Have you experienced or heard about situations, here at school, personally, or that you have seen, that you might consider examples of institutional racism? (Follow up with conversational probes consisting of a detail-oriented question, for example: When did that happen? How did that come about? What? Where?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student reported, “Not really, I mean, I think people look at it- racism because they get in a situation that is brought up and some people see what it is and it’s really not racism. They just take it way out of proportion and things do spread.” One white male student reported simply, “Not really, no difference.”

Another white male student replied, “I hear them but for the most part they are mostly jokes. People just make jokes about it. For example, like for me, I have been on the basketball team and I was the only white guy on the team and you know a lot of times they'd be like, "Oh, you're white and can't play on this team. It's only a black sport down here. You need to quit. After a while, I realized that they were just joking and all and having a good time. For me, personally, I can take the joke you know because when they told me the coach was right there when they were saying it. You know, for me, I'll maybe start dishing out a little bit of jokes here and there, but for some people I could understand that they might not be able to take the joke and it could lead to worse things.”

One black male student reported, “Oh yeah, like with that thing with the Student Council President from last year. Like it was like homecoming and like we put decorations out- like each class does like a little section of the school, you know decorate it, like for homecoming and stuff. And like they had a black guy- like two black guys and two white girls came and- they came
together in the same car, same everything- and they vandalized like everybody else, like the freshman and sophomore and junior’s like decorations so they can, I guess, so they can win.”

He went on to report, “Then they [the administration] found out and the two white girls got like behavior class- that’s like an hour and a half after school. And these guys [the two black male students] got recommended for expulsion.” “And they had to stay out of school for almost two weeks and like they couldn’t make up their work, so they basically, like the guy- one guy had to come back this year to make up some of his credits because he couldn’t graduate. Yes sir, I think it was a direct result of institutional racism.”

Another white male student reported, "We have a group of us called the "country boys." That's what we really are. We're the students that live out on the farms. It's mostly racist people that live out on farms because they haven't had a chance to grow up making friends with many blacks so they kind of feel pushed away."

One black female student reported, “One of my teachers, the way he teaches, he tends to pick more of the Caucasian students to do like assignments in class or to talk on-line. He never picks any African American students. It’s just that they tend to get picked more to do things for him and he doesn’t really remember any of our needs. He knows all of their needs. If you are going to make a difference, don’t make it that obvious.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied, "Yes, I think it was sometime this year, maybe in the beginning. I don't know if it was this year or the end of the school year. I want to say this year. A white dude and a black dude were fighting. The black dude was the one who ended up being punished, not the white dude."

A white female student replied, Not at this school but at my previous school there was a lot of racism. Like if the people were black they might not let you in their group because of your
color. But over here, everybody just hangs out with everybody. At my old school, they would act differently toward people that were black and people that were white. The financial thing was a big think too. If you didn't have money, they didn't want you in their group. A lot of the black people didn't have money so they got excluded." Another student replied, "Um, maybe like with jokes. I think a white guy told it. I mean, people need their jokes. Even black people need their jokes about like other races."

A white male student replied, "I've seen some fights that were sometimes based on that. Like in my sophomore year. Two kids started talking one said something racial and that's what made the other guy mad and that's what started it."

8. Do you think there is a good understanding and acceptance of differences among ethnic or racial groups here at your school? Why/Why not?

Experimental Group Responses. One white male student replied simply, Yeah.” Another white male student replied, "I don't know. Our school is a small school so pretty much we are all used to one another. We went through middle school together so we have all been with each other for a long time. One black male reported, “It’s like very few people mingle with other races in this school. We hang around in small groups, maybe like 5 to 10 people in a group, and like you basically- like blacks talk to blacks and whites talk with whites. Like I’m in Honors classes- like I’m one of the few other people that do talk to whites a lot, like on an everyday basis.”

One white female reported, “A lot of people understand each other but then there’s some people who think they do but don’t. Like whenever we first started the class [the Undoing Racism Educational Program] and black people like started opening up. White people never say it that way about anything because they never really said anything or it was kind of like,
whatever. It (racism) was like a different subject that nobody wanted to get into.” Another white female student replied, "I think we all understand not to say the "N" word around people. I think we understand those points of views.”

One black female reports, “Between the students, yes, I think that the students pretty much understand each other. I think pretty much everyone, all your students, pretty much get along.” A white female student reported, “It depends. Some people do. Like, I’ll hang around with white and black, but then there are people that are like, “Don’t go over there because that’s the black group, or that’s the black tree, or the fruit tree.”

Control Group Responses. One black female replied, simply, "Some people do, and some people don't." A white female replied, "I think so. I mean everybody just hangs out with everybody. It's not a really big thing about your color over here." Another student replied simply, "Yeah, they get along more." A white male student replied, "Yeah, now more than there used to be.

9. Do you think enough time and energy is spent at the school talking about issues concerning racism?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student reported, “No, its [institutional racism] hardly ever brought up. It may be brought up in like in other groups or clicks or whatever, you know, but as far as like a whole school, I don’t think so.” One white male student replied, “No, I don’t know anything about it.” One white female student reports, “The only time we talked about racism is in American History class like for a whole hour. This was based on the training; because of the training [Undoing Racism Educational Program] you did here at the school. We talked about the stuff we had learned, how people got the name racist, that there really was no race. Other than that, we [the school, the students] almost never talk
about it. The only other time I can recall talking about it [racism] is maybe the black issue month.” Another white female student replied, "No, I don't think it is a big part of school. I think we had like little discussions in class, but not something really big."

**Control Group Responses.** A white female student replied, "We don't really talk about it but I don't really think we need to. There are not really fights between people just because one person is racist." Another student replied, "No, No, they put forth no effort to talk about it." A white male student replied simply, "Not really, because people still have problems with it. But you know, that seminar that ya' all put on… One of my friends was in it. He said it just helped because you sit there and talk it without other people getting mad at you or anything and you have a chance to say what you have to say and you can hear the other side of it too. In fact, a few of my friends were in it and whenever they came back after the third day they came and we were all just sitting there talking about it. It's like everybody said the school would be a lot better if we would just sit down and talk about it.

**Topical Domain Two**

The second topical domain involved inquiries about student subject perceptions of institutional racism in their community, for instance, in residential concentrations along racial lines.

1. **In terms of the city as a whole, or in terms of the community where you live, do you see whites and blacks always having certain sections or pockets of the city where one ethnic group is going to live/ congregate? Why or why not do you think this is so?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** One black female reported simply “Yeah.” I don’t know about everyone living by each other. Like where I stay, our community is just white. It’s just whites in the front, and when you get to the middle, it starts to mix, then when you get all the
way to the back, it’s just blacks. When I just moved there, it was maybe- it was just three black families living in the neighborhood. [Now] everything has changed.”

One white female student replied “Um, well I can say in my neighborhood, there are not a whole lot of black people but I know Kevin Faulk lives in the back of my neighborhood, but all the people around me are white. I know there are certain sections that are called the “black section” and the “white section” of the community. A white male student replied “Sometimes, but not that often. Just from what I’ve seen I am able to go threw a city I already know which parts are the bad neighborhood and stuff which happen to do like drug dealing and stuff. You kind of get an understanding for what kind of people live in there, but, it’s not really that bad in Carencro between the [unclear] of the district.”

One black male student replied, “Yes, sir, like in Lafayette, it’s like you have the north side of town, and that’s basically where all the black people live. And on the south side of town is basically where all the white people live. You do have the middle section that’s like mixed in-between, like the downtown area. Around the downtown area on the north side. Like they have a Southside section like they have like Section 8 housing up in there. You guys talked about it [in the Undoing Racism training] like tracking, no steering, that’s what you called it. I do believe that’s a major issue too in the community of Lafayette.” Another black female replied, “I really don’t know because personally I live in a pretty mixed neighborhood. Most everyone in my neighborhood is Caucasian. I live in the country. Most all of my family lives in neighborhoods where it is pretty nice Caucasian neighborhoods.”

A white female student replied, “Un-hum. I just think people feel safer or more together around their people, their race of preference. In our neighborhood, we have no black people at all. It’s a solid white neighborhood. When you go around the North side of town, around the
railroad track, by University and all that, there are no white people there because it’s all black people. We basically [live] separated. The railroad tracks separate the Lafayette black and white sections.” Another white female student replied “It’s kind of like [unclear]; you know everybody knows everybody so and it’s pretty much mixed.”

One white male student replied simply “Yeah. I don’t know anything about it.” Another white male replied “Actually, where I live there are actually no blacks where I live. It’s just the road that I live on the highway on Gloria Switch way down past the four-way stop. On Gloria Switch, I live way down there where there’s a couple of farms and stuff. On this road, I don’t think we have blacks.”

Control Group Responses. A black female student replied simply “Um, I see.” Another black female student replied “No. Like where I live, we have some white people.” A white female student replied, “They usually are like [unclear]. They have a section that’s you know, that upper class and lower class and sometimes it tends to be the upper class more white and the lower class is more black. Then they have the parts that are [unclear]. Just the way things work out I guess. Not higher class but like, just because they have a higher income.” Another black female student replied “Somewhat. Um, it’s just where they want to live on the other side of town." Another black female replied “No. They have their neighborhoods you know.”

A black male student replied simply “No, I don’t know.” A white male student replied, “Where I live right now, um, in Carencro, it’s kind of a mix. It’s not really all white and all black. It’s just… I don’t really know. It’s just that’s where they want to live and like when we moved there, it was mainly white people and now it’s mixed up. It’s just whenever the area gets bigger, people just move around.”
2. Do you think having integrated neighborhoods or whites and blacks’ living along side one another is an important way to lessen or end racism/ institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female replied, “Yeah because you see- you get to know that person. [Unclear] mixed; you can see how it really is instead of going on stereotypes.” A white female student replied “Well, yeah because you can interact with them more and see how they live and that’s not that different than how you live.” A white male student replied “I believe so because like I said earlier, it lets them work together and it doesn’t rally become a color issue while it’s with them.”

One black male student replied, “Yes sir. It’s like you can’t deliberately go out and like make people move to places, but they have people deliberately trying to make people move away from places. That’s what’s hurting our community and that’s why we have these problems in schools.” Another black female student replied “Yes, because I see them getting along more with their neighbors and just more things.” A white female student replied “I think that we really need to show people to trust people because not by what color they are but by the person that they are. Maybe if you get to know somebody better, you wouldn’t think that just because they are black, they are going to rob us or something.”

One white male student replied simply “Yeah.” Another white female student replied “Yes and no. I mean some people, that’s just their way of life and they are never going to change no matter how many times [unclear]. [However, I think] most people are open and up to new ideas.” Another white male student replied, “Yes. It shows that people can all live together and be happy and not causing any problems and it shows we are progressing and not having racism anymore.”
Control Group Responses. A black female student replied “Yes, because I feel you know, when that could give you a chance to get along with the next race, you know. You know, we could get some [unclear] know each other’s differences. You know we might get along better. It could bring the community [closer]. Another black female student replied simply “I think yeah.” A white female student replied, “I think that’s a good thing.” A black male student replied simply “Uh-hum.”

A white male student replied “[Yeah] because you don’t feel like “I don’t live next to them so I don’t have to put up with them” and when you do see them, you be like uncomfortable around them.” Another black female student replied, “Yes sir. They can learn to get along with one another.” Another black female student replied simply “Yeah.”

3. Do you think, in terms of the city/community as a whole, that minority groups have less of a voice than whites about decisions, which affect our everyday lives?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female replied simply “Yeah, sometimes. Cause, like sometimes you might have like a town meeting, where it’s usually posted just in the white areas. Whites are probably thinking like blacks ain’t gonna care about that meeting, but some show up to talk, but sometimes they’re not heard. And the whites have majority, so it’s just vote with the whites.” A white female student replied simply “Um, not really.”

A white male student replied with “sometimes” and “Just stuff getting on your nerves how they’re always talking about how they believe in [unclear] and they are not getting their opinions heard.” One black male student replied, “Yes sir. You want me to give you an example? Like in our community, like they vote on an issue. They have all kinds of like elections on how to improve our city and stuff. Like they just started putting up sound walls on like major streets on the Southside of town. But they have like the interstate, like on the north
side of town, that’s almost inside of people’s houses, like you live right off the Interstate and like where’s the sound wall for them? You know, like they’re building a sound wall on Ambassador Cafrey. They’re building sound walls around these communities on the Southside, but they have like all kinds of communities on the north side that should also have sound walls.”

Another black female student replied “No, because it is up to them if they want to have any kind of life. It’s not right there in school under people that have to tell them what to do. Pretty much freedom [unclear].” A white female replied “Not really. Because a lot of the stuff that is going on now lately, like the building of the stores and sidewalks and other stuff that is happening in their areas too. They are getting equal treatment.”

One white male replied simply, “Yeah, some people [unclear].” Another white female replied, “I think it’s a lesson [unclear]. I don’t think that people having gone, I mean that’s what white’s [unclear]. They were [the] first to complain about anything that’s gone wrong but you never stand up or say anything about it till it’s pretty much [unclear].” Another white male student replied simply “I have no idea.”

Control Group Responses. A black female student replied simply “No and Un-huh.” Another black female replied simply “Yes.” A white female student replied “Not really because our school board is made up of blacks and whites. Stuff like that. I mean they have a big board.” A black male student replied simply “It’s about the same.” A white male student replied “Like it all depends if they get out and do the things that everybody else does like [unclear] giving people anything but if they can get out and do [unclear] then they have the same voice as I do.” Another black female student replied simply “[unclear]. Another black female student replied simply “No.”
Topical Domain Three

The third topical domain involved questions concerning the impact of interpersonal and institutional racism on the lives of interviewees.

1. Do you think everyone is affected by racism/institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student replied “Everyone is, even though you might not know it, you are.” Another white female replied ‘Not everyone, I mean, I know there’s people that are but…” One white male student replied simply “For the most part.” Another white male student replied “A good percentage with like [unclear].” Another white male student replied simply “Yes.”

One black male replied “Yeah, that’s true, because everybody experiences that sometimes. Most everybody experiences it and you just learn from the situation. Yeah, cause one day I got stopped by the police. Some of my friends came to the door, just about to come inside, so like right when I walked outside some cop passed and he just turned around, then he got down and he was like, take your hands out of your pocket! Do you have id with you?

This student went on to say “And I was like, what’s going on? [Then he] frisked me. He said there were two black males in uniform. And so it happened that day, like people were just looking for a guy who had on blue and blue and one had one blue and khaki. Well, I had on red and blue, and my friend had on blue and khaki. So, they thought [unclear]. They said, “Well, we were looking for dark males- just males. I was like, he had on a school uniform, but come to find out it was like these people they were following, and it was like one white and one black. I had been in my own house, it like happened during the day. I just walked outside and he just turned around, parked in the yard, and said, “Get your hands out of your pockets.” Yeah, I just walked out of my house, and he kept asking me where were you, where were you? But explain it
but like, I think a lot of people are affected by racism and it’s a big part of the world. It’s been here for a long time and it’s probably gonna stay here for a while.” Another black male student replied “Yeah to a certain extent.” A black female student replied “Yeah, whites, blacks, everyone.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied simply, “Un huh.” Another black female student replied, “In some way, I think so. Everybody should [unclear].” Another black female student replied “Sure, not all of them. At some level, yes. I can’t really say because I’m the kind of person who gets along with everybody. I can’t say I can’t stand this person because they’re a different race. I might not like them for other reasons but it’s not because of, you know, race. Because if I feel you’re a good person I’m not going to associate with you.” Another black female student replied simply “No sir.”

A white female student replied ‘To some extent, I think everybody is affected because, I mean, if you grew up with parents that were racist then that is probably how your gonna turn out to be and raise your kids that way.” A black male student replied simply “Yeah.”

A white male student replied “It’s not like everybody brings up like how slavery happened and it’s just like we didn’t do it but our ancestors did and we’re still affected by it cause they don’t… Some of them don’t like us because it was our ancestors that did it. So it’s basically… like it’s not the same cause we didn’t go through what they went through but it’s still [unclear]. It’s still negative because we have to deal with them that don’t like us from…”

2. How do you think you have been affected by racism/ institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. A white female student reported, “My mother is kind of racist but she had black friends and everything. It’s just a certain type of black people she’s racist about and it’s those, the ones that like I don’t know go banging up people, I don’t know.
Whatever. But it’s not like all black people. It’s just like a certain type and I am sure they have that about us, like white people. When you say banging people up, do you mean hurting them?

“Yeah.” Another white female student replied “I think that’s just life in general, because like, I don’t have [unclear], I have black friends in this school. I don’t bring home black friends to my parents because they don’t really accept them or something. We have had [unclear]. I cannot sit down and think that we have ever had a black person at our house.” Another white female replied, “I don’t really notice it at all.”

A white male student replied, “Well, my father and a couple of my uncles, my dad is in church point. Also, when their little country group and I guess he needed to intermingle with blacks and whatever. But when I was younger, I felt that I could [unclear] and from his perception. But when I got into high school, I became friends with a lot of blacks. Then my dad too started getting the perception that where he was accustomed to it and he wasn’t that bad, but my uncles, they lived out in Sulphur and stuff like my dad, I guess they were brought up that way. But sometimes, I mean, I don’t see how it’s that bad, but my dad has gotten better since I have come to high school and showed him a lot of my friends.” Another white male student replied simply “No.”

Another white male student replied ‘Really the only one to see when I play on the basketball team with me being the only white person getting around all the black people, and when I was older going to baseball where there’s no black people, like there’s a different attitude that is shown upon me and I guess, even though they did tell me they were joking. I guess you could still say it was kind of racism because they were kinda mad because I have been the only white player in the past couple of years that has ever played on the team. I guess they are probably not used to someone like me. I guess really, even though they said they were joking
and most likely were, I know that deep down they kind of felt like “Why is he on the team?” It’s not his sport.” He needs to go play soccer. They were joking. You know, as I was saying, you know, I really do think they were joking but it’s like deep down they were probably still like wondering like “We really don’t want this kid on the team” or something like that. Joking can be a subtle form of institutional racism. Hiding it, I guess.”

Another black male student replied, “It’s just like the assumptions. It’s like when your born, I guess, when your born black, you have to almost prove yourself to society before you can do anything so it’s like you have to go the extra step. You know you’re not expected to do much.”

A black female student replied, “Basically, the only thing that I can see that I have been affected by would be how we at school just being exposed to it, because it never really was an issue in my family. It was never an issue to me until I started public school and that where I started. It never really was an issue for me because I always was the only African American student and no one really treated me differently. It was always the same.”

Control Group Responses. A black female replied “Um, I get really sick because I’m the kind of person. I never lie to anybody. I don’t think there’s no reason I can say I can’t stand this person because [unclear]. I might not like you for other reasons but it’s not because of your race because if I [unclear]. If I feel I like you, if you’re a good person, I’m gonna associate with you.” Another black female student replied simply ‘I haven’t.” A white female student replied ‘I was always taught, you know, that color doesn’t matter because that’s just the way that we were all grown up because to me, I don’t think that color matters.”

A black male student replied ‘I haven’t. I don’t remember nothing.” A white male student replied “Just like with friends or whatever. Some of them think I like… I don’t like
other people because they’re a different color or a different race. I have plenty of friends that are not my color or race. So it doesn’t… it doesn’t bother me at all.”

3. What do you think about kids at school, or that you know here in Lafayette, that date people from a race different from their own? What comes to your mind when you see inter-racial couples out together?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female student replied “Like who date black people? Um, I really don’t see too much of that. Um, it’s kind of awkward to see it but it’s them, not me you know. I wouldn’t, I wouldn’t do that? Not that I have anything wrong with it. It just… If they’re friends or if they’re dating, I really don’t like think anything bad of it or anything. Yeah, I’m not gonna talk bad about them if that’s what they want to do, you know? Another white female student replied, “Personally, I don’t want to give you the wrong answer. I don’t think it’s right. It’s just like okay. I won’t say anything, personally. Religiously speaking, I don’t think they should. It’s okay. You learn to get along with them because everybody does it lately and it doesn’t really bother me as much any more but like before it was like “Oh, my God. She couldn’t get anybody in her own race?” Another white female student replied, “There’s about a handful here that they do that. It doesn’t bother me to look because it’s like… I don’t know. My dad’s [unclear] so I am always with black people so it’s like I am good friends with them so I don’t really think it’s wrong or anything.”

One black male replied, “That ain’t nothing. Everybody’s [unclear]. Oh, they must love each other. Your parents might not like it but they like… they love each other so you got to let em do what they gotta do. That’s what I say. I don’t see no problem with it.” A white male student replied, “What do I think about it? They seem strange at first, but I don’t really have anything against it. Just that it’s their preference.” Another white male student replied ‘I don’t
know anybody, really, that dates different. Honestly, it doesn’t bother me. If they like each other, it’s all-good. It’s not really a problem.”

Another black male student replied, “Like you see that too much but like, it’s not that big of deal. But like if a white girl dates a black guy, you know they’re like, some people think like, Oh, she’s trashy, or what not. So that’s why a lot of people like steer away from that kind of stuff.” Another white male student replied, “I know a couple of people. Nothing really.” And another black female student replied, “I don’t think anything is wrong with that personally because in my family, there are a lot of Caucasian people, different races. Nothing, I am used to it.”

Control Group Responses. A black female student replied “Um, no, I could speak on it because I saw people in my family beat down, really. Un-huh. It didn’t bother me. I mean, I might not do it but that’s on them. I mean one of my cousins did it and I didn’t like his girlfriend but it’s not because of her race. My uncle dated an out of race person and he made me mad because they broke up and that was my friend that was my [unclear]. It made me mad.” Another black female student replied simply “I wouldn’t care.” Another black female student replied simply ‘Uh, nothing.” And another black female student replied, “All date each other? That’s their business. Yep.”

A white female student replied ‘Even though I am not [unclear]. I’m not prejudiced or racist at all but that’s something I would never do that. Only because I think it hurts the children. I have a friend that is mixed and he doesn’t know where he belongs. I have a friend that’s mixed and his dad is white and his mom is black and he doesn’t really know… Do I date white people? Do I date black people? So I don’t know… I think it’s more accepted now. It’s not really that big. I sometimes don’t even notice. I think it’s more accepted than it used to be. I personally,
personally, I wouldn’t do it because of children.” A black male student replied, “Oh, I don’t mind that at all. Nothing. My sister is dating a white guy.” A white male student replied, “If that’s what they want to do, it doesn’t bother me.”

4. Have you ever found yourself in a difficult situation with a friend that later as you though about or reflected on the situation, may have had something to do with race?

Experimental Group Responses. One white female replied simply “No.” Another white female student replied “Not really. I mean, sometimes you can kind of [tell] when a white girl is with a black guy and some of the black girls look at you stupid because they aren’t used to seeing [unclear]. But they think that you are more than just friends. Yeah, and I don’t know that situation [unclear] that well with some people. Another white female replied “No, not that I can think of. Lately, we’ve noticed that when me and my friends try out for something, then another girl of a different race, I have a better chance of getting it than she does. Just anything in general, not just sports. Thinking about like going out for the college or scholarship, we have everything the same, and I have gotten my papers before she has.”

A black male replied “Oh, yeah. I went to a party with one of my white friends. And [unclear]white people, I just saw that I was the only black person. Everybody just stopped and looked at me. Yeah about like [unclear], and what I’m doing here. Everybody came, “Oh my God, you came all the way from Carencro? They were like Oh my God? It was like all of them was surprised that a black person came to a white person’s party. I was thinking like, where’s all the black people? My friend said, you know man black people don’t go to these parties. But I stayed anyway cause it was fun.”

One white male student replied “I have to think about it now.” Two other white male students replied simply “No.” Another black male student replied “No. In other words, like one
of my friends.” A black female replied “Not really with a friend but with my stepfather. I noticed like that, when I was in private school that he would make comments about things. I started to notice that maybe he could have been a little prejudice at a younger age. But as I got older, he seemed like he grew out of it maybe because I tried to expose him to different races and stuff. My stepfather is African American.”

5. How do you see yourself or how do you feel about your own personal efforts to reduce institutional racism?

Experimental Group Responses. A white female student replied “Personally, I think it’s [unclear] and since we’ve gone through the training because like, we judge people by who they are and not by their color. I will go around, bring all my friends, and hang around with people of all different races. I am trying to get everybody to mix. There is really no difference just because your skin is darker or lighter you shouldn’t be judged by that, just trying to get that across to some people.” Another white female replied, “I feel fine. You know, I mean, whenever I have kids, I am not gonna be racists about anything, you know [what] I mean. The black people are just the same as us just that they are a different color.’

A black male student replied “I try, I mean, sometimes, like, they make cracker jokes. It’s like we crack jokes, and it’s just funny, ain’t nobody take it to heart. It’s just… it’s cool. We [whites and blacks] both crack jokes. It’s like people I come to school with, we all crack jokes, and we’re cool with each other. I wouldn’t take it personal and I would say something back, but some do take it personal. Especially if I didn’t know them.”

A white female student replied, “Um, I don’t think I do too much but I know I have a lot of friends like black friends and everything but I think that’s all I do. I really don’t go out and
try to make friends like outside my classes and stuff. I have friends in my classes but we don’t go outside of school and do stuff. We just talk in class and everything.”

One white male student replied ‘I feel like I am doing a good job for the most part. I put the effort out there, at least to reduce it.” Another white male student replied, “I do try to stop it. I grew up in the military. My dad was in the military and just retired and so kinda growing up military and moving to different places and living in different areas and then adapting to all that, you kind of know that everybody has to get along because everyday you are going to meet somebody new probably that’s going to move in or you are going to move away and so you kind of have to learn that there’s not everybody going to be the same. You don’t get to chose where you get to live so you have to adjust to where you live and I think that’s why I became so adapting to accepting everybody and not as soon as I see them, saying, “I don’t want to be your friend because of the way you look or anything.” I am a little more open and so I accept more people and then I make my decision after I meet them and after I talk to them or whatever, you know. I consider myself a little more open.”

Another black male student replied “It’s like I haven’t done much, but it’s like that’s why I was hoping this program [unclear] when you all called us up. Like I wanted to learn like what to do. I want to do something but its like how do I do it? You know, like I don’t want to be like the only one doing it either.” A black female student replied ‘I try, if I see like one of my cousins and friends say something, I’ll be like, “Did you say that?” Anybody that makes comments, I will be like “Why do you feel that way?” and basically try to talk to them about it.”

Control Group Responses. A black female student replied ‘Um, you mean how could I make it better? I mean people could try to make it better by getting along instead of trying to talk [unclear]. We should give people a chance you know because we’re all equal. We are the
same people. We should [unclear] skin is a different color but I think we should give the next person a chance before we judge them. They might be somebody that you need.” Another black female student replied, “I don’t know. I don’t worry about it. No sir.” Another black female student replied, “I don’t bother no one, they don’t bother me. I think people can try to get along better. I think we should all give people a chance. I mean we’re all equal. Our skin is a different color, but we should all give people a chance. You might need that person some day.”

A white female student replied ‘Um, I think, um, I mean, I don’t… I’m not prejudiced. Like some of the names that people call black people. And if you are the opposite race then I don’t really pick my friends on color, I just pick them on how they are.” A black male student replied, “I think I’m [unclear]. I mean, if I would see somebody, [unclear]. A white male student replied “I just try to get along with everybody and like I don’t show like sides with anybody just because they’re white or just cause they’re black. I just think if you want to… if you treat me good then you’ll be treated the same way. That’s how I look at it.”

Topical Domain Four

The fourth topical domain involved soliciting student subject opinions about the impact and effects of court-ordered racial desegregation in the Lafayette Parish school district.

1. What is your opinion, or what do you think, or feel about the court-ordered racial desegregation here in the Lafayette Parish school district?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female student replied, “Basically, I really don’t know or heard about issues.” A black male replied “Like, one thing I don’t like is closing down historical schools, like in both African American and white communities, They’re closing down these schools and like busing these kids. If they would have did that like years ago, like one major thing, like to do it. They just try to get it over with. Like, you know, we’re gonna
have problems with it, you know soon, you know, in the near future but you have to think about what’s gonna help us out like 20 years, 25 years from now and then to get this desegregation thing over in the schools. This happened like in the late 1950’s. Like it needs to be…”

Another black male student replied “It just helps a lot of things like it really could help black people see what like white people, like I have a white person is racist and then I have a black person who hates white people. It’s like [unclear] get along [unclear]. Everybody went to school ever since we were small so, I mean everybody grew up with everybody and we know how everybody is. There ain’t nobody got a problem.”

A white male replied, “I don’t know how much that would affect it, because I have never really been put in that situation.” Another black female replied, “I like it. It helps you to get to know more people and see what they are going through sometimes in life you know that we don’t think they go through and just to meet different types of people.” Another white male student replied, “I got no idea because honestly, I just moved here at the beginning of the year. I moved here from Spokane, Washington. Another white male student replied simply “Not really.”

A white female student replied, “I don’t really listen to the news or anything.” Another white female student replied, “I have certain mixed feelings about that because if they had done that, I would have gone to Acadian High School, not here. Personally, I would have rather gone to Acadian but I think it’s because my friends were going there. When they separated us, it was just like, “I have to get started over here” but basically, I think I got a better grip on [unclear] than I would have over there. Gee, to be stuck around your friends. In another way, it is good because it gets people to me and you are not stuck around your ethnic background and your race the whole time. It gets you to mix and you get to know other people.”
Control Group Responses. A black female replied “Explain that to me again. Okay, so whites. ok, now I feel they… I mean it doesn’t matter. You can’t see like [unclear]. It doesn’t matter whether you feel you have too much black or too much white. It doesn’t matter because you [unclear]. Another black female replied, “I feel that it’s not right [unclear] all black school. I don’t think that’s fair.” Another black female student replied, “I ain’t up to date with it.” Another black female student replied, “Now can you explain that court order to me?” and then shook her head no she didn’t have anything to say about it after the researcher explained the court order to her.

A black male student replied “In a way, it’s good because we should integrate. Yeah. That’s how you teach your children to be friends with everybody. I think it’s better to mix.”

A white female student replied, “I don’t really like it because when I was in middle school, I was bused to Paul Breaux because they had to make it. Paul Breaux middle because they had to make it 50/50 blacks and whites. So I don’t really agree with any of the stuff that’s going on with Vermillion school. Vermillion elementary and they have to… All the kids from there have to be bused to other schools. I don’t really think it matters.”

A white male student replied, “I just think it’s good that they are trying to stop it and get people to be able to go to school with each other.”

2. What do you think the impact has been?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female student replied, “I think it’s had an effect on some people. I have noticed like people make comments, people I knew, made comments about the Caucasian parent being upset about it because they didn’t want their children’s school to be overrun with African Americans because they thought it would bring problems to the schools.”
A white male student replied, “Some of my friends had to go to a different school because of the segregation.” Another black female replied, “I know some of the black parents get [unclear] when white people go to a generally all black school or black people come to a generally all white school. Then there are some parents [who] get hot about the situation and others just the [opposite?]…

After the researcher explained the school desegregation court order to her, a white female student replied, “Probably a negative affect because they shut them down and everything.”

**Control Group Responses.** A black female student replied, “I think it’s a positive effect.”

3. **Do you think it’s had an effect (positive or negative) on people?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** One black male student replied “I think like in some situations, it does have a negative effect cause it’s like you live in a community and you have to go to school in another community, and that’s kinds hard on some kids.” Another black male student replied “I think, so far, like [unclear] it’s gonna have a positive effect cause if I like more people like it’s not just [unclear] other races but it’s negative on the older people because they don’t want that. They just like want them to be secluded in a different area.”

A white male student replied “I think it would be negative because you are going to one school and you get becoming friends with a lot of people and then they are shipping you to another school just because you are a certain color and they are trying to equal it out. Another white male student replied simply “No, not really.”

A white female student replied simply “No.” Another white female student replied, “I think a positive effect on me because when I went to Scott Middle and crossed over to Acadiana, I didn’t mix with anybody. I was one of those who was a very, very, stuck up little white person.
who didn’t talk to anybody but my own race or my friends. Over here now, it’s kind of like a reality check. There are just as many black people as white people, so I talk to everybody now.

Control Group Responses. A black female student replied, “Um, I think it had a negative effect. And the reason why I say this is because you know when you watch the news.” Another black female replied “Probably it’s the negative black people.” Another black female student replied, “Getting them together.” Another black female student replied, “Probably had a negative effect on people. I say this because when you watch the news, the school board… all they want to talk about is the race, there are too many blacks, there are too many whites, black students need to increase, white students need to increase… but it shouldn’t matter.

A black male student replied simply “Positive.” A white female student replied, “I think it’s going to have a negative effect.” A white male student replied “I think, at first, it might have been negative because nobody really got along and they couldn’t really deal with each other and now that everybody is starting to be friends and not really worry about it, it is getting a lot better.”

4. Have you seen or hear about situations where this personally affected a friend or others?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female student replied simply “No.” A black male student replied, “It’s like I don’t want to leave. I live in like the north side of Lafayette. I don’t want to leave Carencro so that’s why I come over here. I still come over here. I don’t want to have to deal with going to a new school or what not, cause I’ve grown up in this- and like if they would rezone or what not, I would have to move.” Another black male replied “No. Yeah. My little cousins, they went to two different schools and then when they passed that thing, they went to the same school and they were [unclear] because they got to be in the same class.
His best friend is white and he stay, they stay right next to each other and go to two different schools. So, it looks like {unclear}. Well, my momma told me that. That was {unclear}. That’s funny. You just stay right next to each other and you go to different school when they both public. So now they can just [ ] together in the same classroom.

A white male student replied simply “Not personally.” Another male student replied simply “No.” Another black female replied “Not really.” A white female student replied, “Yes, it brought me down, to realize that people are people. You can’t hurt their feeling just because of their race.”

**Control Group Responses.** A black female student replied simply “Um, no.” Another black female student replied, “Someone I knew went to a school [unclear]. And they [unclear].” Another black female student replied simply “No sir.” Another black female student replied, “Yeah, I think it helped to pull the community together. Do you think it’s anybody’s business? No, you shouldn’t have to go to school because you’re a certain race.”

A black male student replied simply “No, no sir.” A white female student replied “No, well, I do have a friend that I went to elementary school with that she lived on just the opposite side of the street of me and she had to go to a different middle school than I did and she was just on the opposite side of the street. So… her friends… we started talking after middle school so that kind of had a negative effect.” A white male student replied simply “Not really.”

5. **Do you think it’s helped pull the community together, or apart?**

**Experimental Group Responses.** One black female student replied “Maybe the adults who were or seemed to be in one mind set about it. But in some ways, I think that it has pulled the kids closer together.” Another black female replied, “It’s pretty much the same.”
A white female student replied, “Um, I am sure after a while it would have been bringing them together but not after a couple of years, you know? Another white female student replied “In some places, it has got people closer together because we are unsure {unclear}. It got us all together like one big family over there. Our parents go do stuff together, at [unclear]. It’s the chorus, singing of mixed girls both black and white, and it has gotten a lot of our parents together. So has swimming because a lot of the parents would get together and know like, “Yes, let’s do this, let’s do that. It has gotten people closer. In cases of people who really don’t want clicks to mix, it has gotten them further apart.”

A black male student replied, “It’s helped pull the community together. It’s not they {unclear}. They have a [unclear] races. You just, you try to change em in the front. Right when you pull up in my neighborhood, he’s always outside and he never waves to any blacks, but he will stop and talk to a white. And now he’s like he’s waving to black people. “Hey, how you all doing?” and all that stuff and it’s like…”

Control Group Responses. Two black female students replied simply “Together.” Another black female student replied simply “Apart.” A white female student also replied “Apart.” A black male student replied simply “Together.” A white male student replied “I think it’s important [unclear] and get along with everybody without having to worry whether they are black or white.”

6. Do you think whether a school is 100% black or white is anybody’s business? Should the government or the courts get involved?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female replied, “I think it really shouldn’t matter. If this school, if the area around that school is majority Black, majority white, or who
ever lives around this school should go to that school. It’s shouldn’t matter who it is or what race they are.”

A black male student replied “Yeah, in situations like that where it’s like- like schools like north side and stuff, like where it’s 70 % and 30 %, like seventy- something, I don’t know, it’s like you have- in situations like that, you have to like do something.” Another black male student replied, “Yeah, they should get involved cause need to have inter-racially mixed. You know, if you have inter-racially mixed, you just gonna have like an all white group to where white is like… they all have… everything they say goes. Well, you can have like two sides, two sides like of a board, like people that you can actually [unclear] that like [unclear] that one person might say something but the other might not like it to where they can come to a compromise to help both of “em.”

A white male student replied, “I think they should. Bit it all depends on, I mean. I think it will cause controversy, but I am sure they will have an educational purpose, that, from an educational point of view, kind of. You have one school that is doing really well and the teachers are great and you like school. I mean, don’t just shuffle the students to try to get teachers for another school instead of just saying, “Well, that’s a black school. They don’t have good teachers. If you [take the] effort [and] the time to teach the teachers you already have and make them better.”

Another white male student replied, “I don’t know. It might depend on the situation, I guess. In some situations, you might want to know. I don’t think whites should have their own school or that blacks should have their own school. We are trying to prevent racism but we’re still separating them apart and I don’t really think separating us is going to stop it. I really think making us come together and working it out is going to stop racism, instead of separating us.”
Another white male student replied, “I think so. I think it is good to have half and half. Most people communicate with each other and you know.

Another black female replied, “Yeah, I mean, I don’t think it should be blown out of proportion and make a big deal out of to but it is nice to come to school and not see all white people or all black people or any other type of race. It just mixes up things.”

A white female student replied, “Um, if they think it’s a problem, you know, go forward, but if there’s like nothing happening, I don’t know. Uh, probably inter-racial would be better like more races in there. Maybe not just all one-school black and one white. Maybe mix it up a little bit. Yeah. You know you can’t make people do what they [unclear]. You can’t make people white people go to a school if they don’t want to.

Another white female student replied, “No, I don’t think it is. I don’t think it’s any of their business. If that’s where they want their kid’s to go, they should get the choice of sending their kids but I don’t think they should have any say, just because it is black or white.”

Control Group Responses. One black female student replied “No. Yeah, you shouldn’t go to school where you have to go to the school cause you have certain grades or your school has more of this, no.” Another black female student replied “No. It’s white and black.” Another black female student replied simply “Not really.” A black male student replied “I think so because like somebody can come from a different town and see that [unclear].” Another black female student replied, “We could have some more whites come.”

A white female student replied “Not really. I don’t think it really matters. I mean, I like going here and I didn’t like Comeaux High that much and Comeaux was a predominately white school so maybe it might have some kind of effect but…”
A white male student replied “Um, it helped out, but if that’s not how it was then it didn’t really matter but I mean when they did do it, it really did help out because we started… everybody started to get along. It was like nobody really talked to each other because I mean we weren’t really around each other anyway. I think it’s… yeah, it has helped out a lot more than it has hurt now because we actually get along with each other these days.”

7. As you may know, the court ordered desegregation… has been both controversial and worrisome to many people. What do you think about it?

**Experimental Group Responses.** One black female replied “Not really.” A black male student replied simply “Um-hum. Yes sir.” A white male student replied, “Helped pull it together.”

**Control Group Responses.** A white female student replied “Right. We didn’t have to be pushed to move. I don’t think it’s right.” A black male student replied simply “Yeah.” A black female student replied simply “Uh-Hun.”

**Topical Domain Five**

The fifth topical domain sought to illicit feedback from the experimental group about their experience in and evaluation of the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

1. Over the past several days you have been involved in a really intensive two-day training program. What do you think? How did it go? How would you rate your experience of the Undoing Racism program?

**Experimental Group Responses.** One black female replied “I think it went pretty well and basically, it just opened my eyes a little more to what I already knew or things that I really felt and it helped me to express [unclear]. I think the school’s idea of letting some of the kids who went through the Undoing Racism Program sit in on the disciplinary committee next year will be
a good idea… because I think they should hear our voice in it and because to me they would be more on sided with the situation and they would say, “I don’t think this is right and I don’t think this is right because of this so let’s do this.” But if they hear our side of the reason for it, then maybe they can like, maybe make a better decision.”

Another black female replied, “It went pretty well. Like I liked the [unclear] that we talked about but like they really didn’t give us like a solution. That’s the only thing. They could have just told us like [unclear]. And how to start programs and start following up and stuff.”

A white male student replied “I though it was a good experience. It taught me certain ways of thinking about things. They put it, I think on the first day about thinking outside the box. It was a good point and really helped me think about certain things.” Another white male replied, “I enjoyed it, I learned a lot and I got a lot out of it. All in all, it was very good because to be honest when I was selected to be part of this, I thought it was going to be a fun, get out of class two days. I don’t have to worry about homework or anything and just kick back and relax. But when it first started, it actually brought me in to it and made me really want to sit down and pay attention to a couple of things and actually get something out of it.”

Another white male replied “Good. I think it can make a difference with a different race maybe even good for somebody else, maybe to communicate better.”

A white female student replied “I would rate it as a 7 or 8. It was just, it {unclear} oh, a 10. It was just different to hear how everybody felt about it. Like really, I thought about it and how like black people come and say what they felt about it cause normally stuff like that doesn’t really get that deep in class or doesn’t really get brought up that much.”

Another white female student replied “Um, well, I actually didn’t like it that much because it seemed to me very one-sided, like very towards the black people, like they were
backing up the black people but the white people were always wrong, but I thought it was very one-sided. I didn’t think I got too much out of it. I just wanted to leave after the first day cause I felt so down on my race, you know?

Another white female student replied, “It was just good. I liked it a lot. Like the first thing that [unclear] because you didn’t know what to expect. You were like, “Oh Lord, what am I going to do? What are we going to do here? But it ended up being like it was really fun and we learned a lot.”

A black male student replied, “Yeah, I learned a lot. I learned the side of the white people and learned the sides of us, even the one Mexican we had. It was fun being… everybody who was there was still cool with each other. We’d walk in the hall, “Look, that’s my white brothers.” My black brother [unclear], he still got it. Oh yeah, we had fun. It was helpful, fun, and educational at the same time.”

Control Group Responses. Students in the control group did not attend the Undoing Racism Educational Program.

2. This next question is purposefully vague so that you may respond in any way that makes sense to you. What differences do you think this program will make to students who went through it?

Experimental Group Responses. One black female replied “Hopefully, it will affect them in a positive way and make them realize that racism is real and that it does affect a lot of people.” Another black female replied “Like it may make slight differences on a personal level to each student, some students, but like not really having an impact on the school as much as people would like.”
A white male student replied “Just like me, it will also give them a different way of thinking about racism and helping reduce chances of being around it later in life. It also teaches our children for them to carry on.” Another white student replied, “It actually taught us that not only do, it shows that whites and blacks both want to go towards not being racist. Like maybe for a couple of people, like me a little bit, really all I see is really black people kind of trying to go towards not being racist and they are saying, “Come on, we don’t need to be racist and stuff.” White people are saying, “No, it’s just cool like it is, you know.” But coming to this little thing, kind of shows that when we talk to other people that it’s kind of like, “we’re all really trying to get towards not being racist and all that.”

A white female student replied, “I think it will make a big difference but I mean, it has been talked about in class a lot more. You know the teachers and students, both will start talking about something and we’ll just get into it and everybody says their things and stuff but it I think it’s going pretty well.” Another white female replied “Well, maybe not as much feeling as I had, but I noticed some of them felt almost the same way. Not so hurt. Like I had said before, I think it opened up our eyes to what everybody else sees as in what black people think and what white people think like. Almost some of the things we have the same views on but some it’s like a black and a white thing and… This student also commented that she thought the training was “too long and kind of got boring after a while.”

Another white female student replied “I think that it made a difference in some people because some of the people we had in there were kind of like I was before I came in here. A lot of them are not like that anymore. Once they learned the truth about the people and how to look at people for who they are and not what they look like, a lot of people have changed in how they… snobby or whatever.” This student went on to talk about how a group of students who
attended the Undoing Racism training were going to be part of the disciplinary committee at the high school next year. “We are going to sit down and really like make a basic rule of whether… how everybody should be treated not by who they are, what they look like. If me and a black girl and another white girl be the same consequences. Like vandalizing the school or something, that way everybody gets treated the same, not by who you are or what your grade level is. Some people get treated differently by what she makes. She makes 18.0 GPA and I make a 3.5 She would get worse treatment than I would because basically, I would be the better student, which I think the better student sometimes should get more discipline just because they are better. They think they are better than everybody else, so it will kind of bring them down. This student reported that they wanted to be part of the disciplinary committee because “We came through the racial thing and we learned a lot about race and how everybody should be treated.”

A black male student replied “It helped them see that, like they could go to a situation with a black person now and you can have some understanding of what the black person is probably thinking and the black person that went to it can probably have an understanding what the white person was thinking, instead of just going to a situation of [unclear], both sides. I mean the workshop, I had fun. I met the people I never knew that I know in the school right now.

Control Group Responses. Students in the control group did not attend the Undoing Racism Educational Program.
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