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ABSTRACT

This study examines the perceptions of 11th grade African American and Caucasian American students attending public Louisiana high schools. The students’ perceptions are explored in relation to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU’s) and Predominately White Institutions (PWI’s). Based on a review of current literature, four common areas emerged. The areas of consideration were perception of academic quality, peer relationships, socio-cultural fit, and faculty/student relationships.

The sample of students included 177 students enrolled in the Louisiana public school system in parishes where there were “pairings” of universities (HBCU and PWI). The four parishes where such pairings occurred were Caddo Parish, Orleans Parish, East Baton Rouge Parish, and Lincoln Parish.

Results of the study indicate that students are divided in their opinions of the universities along the lines of race. Students’ perceptions of the universities are rarely influenced by gender. The results of the study suggest that in order to further accomplish the goal of desegregation, universities have to address students’ perceptions early. Officials can little afford to ignore racial difference as it pertains to the college choice process.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Higher education is faced with demographic trends that bespeak a need for multi-cultural education and consideration of varied needs of its multi-ethnic population (Hodgkinson, 1989). George and Hodgkinson (1993) iterated that by the year 2000, America will be a nation in which one in every three of its citizens will be non-white. He further posited that society must have educated, employed citizens to perpetuate a decent lifestyle for all Americans. Harris (1988) similarly noted that in 1987, one-third of the kindergarten students in the United States were minority and that institutions of higher education will draw their college freshmen from this pool of students in the year 2000. Diversifying campuses will allow society to benefit from the talents and strengths of young people from all cultures. In addition, a more educated population portends less social ills and increases the productivity of a society (Edmonson, 1997; Stewart, Russell, & Wright, 1997).

Davis (1995) noted that there are many factors effecting college participation rates, some of which may be out of the control of a single higher education institution. The author posits, “...But colleges and universities need to ask this important question: ‘What are we doing to encourage or discourage minority participation--perhaps without even being aware of it?’ Educators and policymakers must be concerned about student attitudes and perceptions, and they must be knowledgeable about the academic and social factors that determine those attitudes and perceptions (p. 6).”
Perception of social and cultural environment has been shown to be important in the college selection process (Horvant, 1996; Martin, 1990; Hazzard, 1988). Davis (1995) iterated that a minority student’s decision to attend college and to remain there is influenced by their perceptions of the institution’s cultural and racial environment.

Darden and Hargett (1981) used enrollment data from the 1970’s and concluded that in states where there were duel systems of higher education, such as found in Louisiana, there was a significantly higher level of segregation of black students compared to those states without such systems. A later study by Darden, Bagaka’s and Kamel (1996) revealed that, in the 80’s, the pattern of racial segregation was consistent with the 70’s study and that states with higher education systems, such as Louisiana’s, remained the most racially segregated (Darden, Bagaska’s, & Marajh, 1992).

Louisiana has four “pairings” of universities in four parishes that can be considered as predominately white or historically black institutions. Those are as follows: (1) Southern University and Louisiana State University in East Baton Rouge Parish, (2) Southern University -New Orleans (SUNO) and the University of New Orleans (UNO) in Orleans Parish, (3) Louisiana State University - Shreveport (LSU-S) and Southern University-Shreveport (SU-S) in Caddo Parish, and (4) Grambling State University (GSU) and Louisiana Tech University (LA-Tech) in Lincoln Parish.

Despite ameliorative efforts by the state and federal courts and the universities, Louisiana’s student enrollment in its higher education institutions suggest high levels of defacto segregation among white and black students. Implemented in 1995, the Louisiana desegregation settlement plan has had marginal impact on ‘other race’
student enrollment at Louisiana’s schools of higher education (Darden, Bagaka’s & Kamel, 1996). Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of black and white students enrolled in the pairings of Louisiana universities for Fall 1994.

Table 1

**Student Enrollment by Race for Pairings of Louisiana Institutions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>1994-95 White No. (%)</th>
<th>1994-95 Black No. (%)</th>
<th>1997-98 White No. (%)</th>
<th>1997-98 Black No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State</td>
<td>18,756 (.78)</td>
<td>1,987 (.08)</td>
<td>21,567 (.77)</td>
<td>2,457 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>476 (.05)</td>
<td>9,187 (.93)</td>
<td>400 (.04)</td>
<td>9,235 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State</td>
<td>259 (.03)</td>
<td>7,227 (.95)</td>
<td>158 (.03)</td>
<td>5,571 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech</td>
<td>7,646 (.77)</td>
<td>1,310 (.13)</td>
<td>7,393 (.78)</td>
<td>1,248 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State-Shreveport</td>
<td>3,421 (.80)</td>
<td>812 (.19)</td>
<td>3,386 (.78)</td>
<td>689 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern-Shreveport</td>
<td>72 (.06)</td>
<td>1,197 (.93)</td>
<td>119 (.09)</td>
<td>1,212 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State-New Orleans</td>
<td>10,846 (.69)</td>
<td>2,214 (.15)</td>
<td>9,937 (.63)</td>
<td>2,863 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern-New Orleans</td>
<td>198 (.05)</td>
<td>3,982 (.92)</td>
<td>173 (.04)</td>
<td>3,748 (.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Figures from Louisiana State University Systems Office. Percentages are rounded to the nearest hundredth. Percentages do not equal 100% as only African American and Caucasian American students are figured into the equation.

Although these pairs of Louisiana universities are located within the same parish, they evidence considerable segregation in their respective African American and Caucasian American student populations. The historically black universities appear to have an under-representation of white students while African American students are
under-represented at the predominately white universities. Representativeness refers to
the presence of students on college campuses as compared to the population of college-
age (18-24 years old) persons in the general population.

Despite attempts at desegregation, there has not emerged a substantive movement
toward a truly integrated system of higher education in Louisiana. That is, there appears
to have been only modest gains in 'other-race' student enrollment despite efforts to
ameliorate defacto segregation in Louisiana's system of higher education. Further
complicating the problem, is the structure of the state's higher education system.
Louisiana's higher education system is historically structured in a way that may
facilitate racial polarization (Bronner, 1998; Darden, Bagaka's & Marijh, 1992). The
system includes predominately white institutions (PWI's) of higher education and
historically black colleges or universities (HBCU's). These schools are part of
Louisiana's historical reality of separation in the realm of higher education. In what was
at first a system of dejure segregation, Louisiana's system seems to be haunted by that
legacy in the form of defacto segregation.

A number of studies have focused on the various aspects of race relations on
college campuses (Edmonson, 1997; Davis, 1995; Feagin, 1992; Hazzard, 1988). Those
studies most often explore college student or staff perception of the variable of
investigation (e.g. racism, discrimination). There is a scarcity of studies that explore the
perceptions of attending other-race universities that are held by high school students
prior to enrolling into an institution of higher education (Rowley, 1995; Watson & Kuh,
1996). Rowley (1995) focused on the nature of African American beliefs about the
relationships between perceptions of discrimination and grades earned using 40 African American high school students and 120 African American college students. Watson and Kuh (1996) examined the relationships among involvement in campus activities, perceptions of the institutional environment, and educational gains at two predominately black and two predominately white private liberal arts institutions. Many studies have focused on black student perception of predominately white campuses. Few studies have examined white student perceptions of predominately black campuses (Nixon & Henry, 1992; Hazzard, 1988). This study, unlike the cited studies, will explore white high school student perceptions’ relative to historically black colleges and universities as well as black high school students’ perceptions relative to predominately white institutions.

The Louisiana desegregation plan dealt with governance, institutional equity, and student admission practices of the universities. While such efforts have involved access and opportunity, much less attention has been focused on psychological and social aspects of defacto segregation in higher education. Such barriers are formidable challenges to achieving racial balance in higher education (Horvant, 1996). Kane (1994) demonstrated that increased access and financial aid had but marginal impact on black student degree completion rates. The importance of such issues are, perhaps, reflected by the fact that only modest gains have been made in other-race student enrollment in Louisiana’s schools of higher education since the consent decree. Student perception of other-race institutions of higher education not only affects recruitment but retention of college students on other-race campuses (Walters, 1996). Despite efforts to ameliorate
political and financial barriers, defacto segregation is evident in Louisiana’s higher education system.

Among the barriers that are related to lack of student recruitment and retention are perceived relations among other-race peers, relations to professors and other staff, racial hostility and harassment on college campuses, and the perceived likelihood of matriculation (Balenger, Hoffman & Sedlacek, 1992; Cook, 1990; Richardson, 1990; Wells-Lawson, 1994). Predominately White Institutions of higher education and Historically Black Colleges and Universities are continuing to experience problems of negative perception as they affect recruitment, retention, and graduation of other-race students (Kane, 1994; Lang, 1992).

Student perception is an important reflection of an institution’s image in the community (Freeman, 1997). Perception of hostile racial climates on college campuses sometimes stem from a lack of adequate information in the community, media portrayal of relatively rare incidents, hyperbolic accounts of individual incidents, and historical racial geographic and social polarization. Because perception is such a powerful force, it then becomes a divisive force on college campuses and in the general community (Johnson-Durgans, 1994). Collison (1992) conducted a study and reported that regarding 15 to 20 year old Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans surveyed (n=1,170), 50 percent saw race relations as ‘generally bad’.

No studies were found that addressed the issue of perception related to race and the relative success or failure of a college’s diversity efforts. High school students may be assailed with distortions and misconceptions about a particular school type; they
may choose and attend a school based on misguided information, and therefore, any
encounters with racial difference will be screened through a nebulous and narrowed
lens. Students who shun negative assumptions and stereotypes and bravely venture into
the realm of an atmosphere where the dominant student population is of a different race
may encounter racial distortions and be met with indifference or hostility (Walters,
1996). In such cases, many students leave the college campus taking with them a
perceived confirmation of racist attitudes and thus may increase the polarization of the
college student population. Therefore, institutions of higher education have a need to
know the perceptions of high school students in order to address concerns related to
recruitment and retention of other-race students.

Statement of the Problem

A significant problem for Louisiana’s system of higher education has to do with
integration of African American and Caucasian American students in public institutions
of higher education. High school students’ perceptions can be a valuable tool for
ameliorating problems related to defacto segregation in higher education. Researchers
have not included the views of Louisiana high school students as they explore ways to
increase other-race student enrollment at institutions of higher education in Louisiana.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to examine Louisiana high school students’
perceptions regarding two types of universities in Louisiana. These universities are very
different culturally and in their ethnic composition (Smith, 1997). The study is intended
to gather information that may be helpful to Louisiana universities as they grapple with the dilemma of desegregation on their respective campuses.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of high school students in Louisiana regarding selected issues and characteristics of institutions of higher education which are classified as HBCU’s and PWI’s. Specific objectives developed to guide the researcher were:

1. Describe high school students in Louisiana on selected demographic and affective characteristics including the following:
   a. Race
   b. Gender
   c. Gender and Race
   d. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
   e. Racial make-up of high school attended
   f. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
   g. Student’s plans regarding college attendance
   h. Type of higher education institution students planned to attend
   i. Students’ report of close other-race friendships
   j. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
   k. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
   l. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
   m. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
   n. Perceptions of peer relationships at an HBCU
o. Perceptions of peer relationships at a PWI
p. Perceptions of peer relationships at an "other-race" college/university
q. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an HBCU
r. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on a PWI
s. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an "other-race"
college/university.

2 Compare white and black high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
h. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI
i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

3. Compare male and female high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s

e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU

f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI

g. Anticipated peer relationships at HBCU’s

h. Anticipated peer relationships at PWI’s

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

4. Describe interaction effects of race and gender on Louisiana high school students’ perceptions regarding the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s

b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s

c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s

d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s

e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU

f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI

g. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus of an HBCU

h. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus of a PWI

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

5. Determine if a relationship exists between the self perceived amount of other-race-contact and the following perceptions of other-race colleges/ universities:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at other-race colleges/ universities

b. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at other-race colleges/ universities

c. Anticipated peer relationships at an “other-race” college/ university
6. Determine if a model exists which explains a significant portion of the variance in the perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of "other-race" college/university from the following characteristics:

a. Race
b. Gender
c. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
d. Racial make-up of high school attended
e. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
f. Student's plans regarding college attendance
g. Students' report of close other-race friendships
h. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
i. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
j. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
k. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
l. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
m. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

Significance of the Study

This study has the potential to provide valuable information for recruitment personnel, university faculty, parents, and students as they select which institution of higher education to attend. That is, the study will challenge concerned individuals to
assess their own beliefs about other-race institutions and to seek accurate information as to their own course of action whether as a prospective student, faculty member, student advisor, parent, or other role. Exploring the issue of perception encourages introspection relative to race and the beliefs people hold about differences and human potential. College recruiters can direct resources toward further study of this obdurate issue and provide ameliorative strategies. Recruiters can also provide factual information so that college choice is based on intelligent observation rather than innuendo and misconception. Ending institutional racism and racial division depends upon careful intellectual observation such that higher education can facilitate. This descriptive study begins the process of exploring ways to do just that.

**Limitations of the Study**

The sampling technique used is called purposive sampling. It is a non-representative sample and relies on the judgement of the researcher that the sample represents the attitudes and views of a majority of the population (Ary, Jacobs & Razavich, 1996). In this study, students who live in the same parish as the pairs of universities were judged by the researcher as having similar views as their counterparts residing in each parish. Purposive sampling will most likely include those students who are most familiar with the pairing of universities in their own parish. Additionally, these students are less likely to be influenced by other public universities or similar regional idiosyncrasies. This conjecture is based on the research participants' proximity to the paired institutions in each parish. The representativeness of the sample relies strictly on
the judgement of the researcher. Therefore, care is urged in any attempts to generalize to others outside of the sample frame.

Other limitations of this study involves policy requirements for research in public high schools in Louisiana. In this case, the mandate is to obtain parental permission to survey students in the school system. The questionnaires may not gain the approval of parents who are predisposed to race prejudice, thereby possibly skewing the results in favor of those students whose families are relatively liberal in consideration of social issues. Also, in school districts where permission is not given, regional biases may be introduced simply because of people differences according to geographical location.

**Definition of Terms**

The definitions below are operational definitions for the purposes of this study. The definitions are not purported to be universal and should only be viewed as defined within the context of this study.

- **African American** - Used interchangeably with black, this designation refers to anyone who self identifies with the designation African American/ black.
- **Caucasian American** - Used interchangeably with white, this definition refers to those students who self identify with the designation Caucasian American/ white.
- **Defacto segregation** - The informal segregation of students not sanctioned by law (dejure) but recognized and practiced by custom. Also refers to self segregation of students on college campuses.
- **Other-race** - Refers to white and black groups in contrast to each other.
• Racially balanced school - A 60-40 ratio or the nearest racial balance that could be determined of black to white or white to black students in a particular school system. This balance approximates Louisiana’s black/white ratio in the population.

• H.B.C.U. - Historically Black College or University

• P.W.I. - Predominately White Institutions of higher education

• Mattering - Sense of fitting in or perceived importance of one’s culture within a particular type of institution (Freeman, 1997).

• Representativeness - Refers to the relative ratio of students regarding their own racial classification and their presence as a minority on majority-race campuses in higher education.

• Overculture - Coined by Colon (1991) refers to the dominance of Causian-American culture in American society.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to examine the nature and pervasiveness of the problem related to desegregation efforts in higher education, a historical review will be presented in this chapter. A review of literature specifically related to the objectives will also be presented in this chapter.

Segregation has been a recalcitrant issue for higher education in this country throughout much of the past. Peltason (1982) noted that racial desegregation has been a matter of periodic and continuing interest in American higher education for the better part of the past half-century; since the 1960's. Similarly, Wilson (1982) observed that

The desegregation process in higher education is impeded by a complex of historical issues and social barriers that defy simple solutions, decades of legally sanctioned, racially separated systems of public higher education, recalcitrant and obdurate state education authorities, long and arduous litigation and appeals, concerns of self interest among both black and white educators; fears for the maintenance of the identity of the historically black colleges in the context of desegregation; limited funds to truly 'equalize' black and white universities; and even disagreement as to definition of what constitutes a desegregated system of higher education (p. vii).

As African Americans have sought to overturn and overcome the legacy of segregation, questions of race and equity have assumed greater importance and urgency on virtually every college and university campus in the nation (Wilson, 1982). The overculture in the United States has, in the main, been characterized by separation and racial divisiveness. Institutions parallel the prevalent values, tenets, and structure of this overculture (Colon, 1991). Dejure segregation has been replaced by defacto segregation
as a result of lingering racial polarization and self segregation in higher education. The nation as a whole seems stymied by the relatively slow progress of integration despite efforts to the contrary (Southern Education Foundation, 1998).

College and university education has been in existence in the United States for over three and a half centuries (Smith, 1997). The oldest university in the nation is Harvard University which was established in 1636. The early universities were privately operated for white males. Colleges for white women began to be established in the 1700's and taught mostly art, music, literature, and homemaking skills. Organized attempts to provide education for blacks go back as far as the Civil War. At this time most of the black population was located in the southern or border regions where laws and strictly enforced social customs prohibited blacks from being taught to read and write (Browning & Williams, 1978).

The first institutions for blacks were established over 200 years after the opening of Harvard University. Those were Lincoln University in 1854 and Cheyney State University in 1852 in the state of Pennsylvania and Wilberforce University in 1857 in the state of Ohio. They were the first three institutions for blacks in the country (Smith, 1997).

The institutions of higher education remained virtually segregated until about a half century ago. Hacker (1992) noted that,

A half-century ago, virtually all black students who attended college enrolled in all-black institutions. In part, this was because most of them lived in Southern or border states, where higher education was strictly segregated. Even private colleges banned black undergraduates. And since schools elsewhere in
the country only accepted token numbers of black applicants, many Northern blacks traveled to segregated colleges in the South. Limited admissions continued into the postwar period. Amherst College, reputedly a 'liberal' institution, could display only two black faces among the 258 seniors at its 1951 graduation (p. 147).

A significant portion of the current problem relating to perceptual differences in institution type was given impetus during this period and sustained throughout the following decades of social and political policies of separation. The historical influences of a system that defined and defended the boundaries of race relations has hampered attempts by universities of both types to overcome the legacy of perceptual distortions and mutual exclusion. Historical perception of ability, attitude, and acceptance belies attempts to integrate higher education in a way that bespeaks ‘just universities’, not black or white universities (Browning & Williams, 1978).

**Desegregation and Higher Education**

In 1890, congress passed the Second Morrill Act which designated 15 public state universities (and Tuskegee Institute) as land-grant colleges for blacks (Smith, 1997). The Second Morrill Act of 1890 required that all land-grant funds be equitably divided in states that maintained separate schools for races (Neyland, 1990). The Second Morrill Act of 1890 extended to the southern states the opportunity to found colleges based upon the industrial model for blacks as well as whites (Browning & Williams, 1978). The act passed 28 years after the first Morill Act which created land-grant institutions for whites (Smith, 1997). This further entrenched the duel education system in America which had been the product of racial separation policies and practice.
In 1896, the system of separation was further reinforced by the Supreme Court's landmark “separate but equal” decision in the Plessy vs. Ferguson case. The Plessy suit was brought to eliminate racial segregation in transportation but the decision would define the parameters of racial etiquette and the governance of the education of blacks and whites for the next 54 years (Smith, 1997).

Smith (1997) related that during this period, segregation and its concomitant social and political influences on racial perceptions in the United States flourished. Further, the duel education was not a complementary or continuous body of learning but rather gave differing amounts of shrift to funding and educational quality of the two school systems. Smith (1997) further commented on this aphorism:

During this 54 year period, the historically black colleges and universities hardly aroused a ripple of protest among whites. Their fund-raising activities ranging from the Tuskeegee Quintet to the Fisk Jubilee Singers, and appeals to the largesse of the likes of the Rosenwald fund and the Carnegie Foundation were tolerated and patronized. Their operating budgets, resources and facilities ranged from pathetic to meager to modest. Their salaries were abysmally low and the Southern Association of Colleges and schools declined to have them as full accredited members but did grant the more prosperous black colleges and universities an “affiliate” status” (p. 92).

Similarly, there was little concern for admission standards and academic standards at black colleges. Because of the social and political views of race in America, perceptions of intellectual subordination and social inferiority of blacks influenced the policies toward black colleges. Smith (1997) further commented:

Whites expressed virtually no concern about admission requirements and ‘academic standards’ of these historically black institutions because their student populations were almost
exclusively black, as were their presidents and a great majority of their faculties and staffs. Although, undoubtedly, many whites thought the education being delivered to the black students was vastly inferior to the education the whites students were receiving, they probably felt that it did not really matter because blacks were an inferior race and were being taught separately in their 'designated' colleges and universities. The higher education of blacks in their colleges and universities apparently presented no threat of contamination of the institutions that whites attended (p. 92).

Kujovich (1994) expressed similar convictions as Smith relative to the historical perception of blacks in higher education and the dual education system. He related that the curricula of black colleges and universities have long been limited by financial constraints and by narrow definitions that focused on manual and vocational instruction. The author further elucidated that the emphasis was driven by an assumption of black inferiority.

The attack on the nation’s separate but equal policy was launched by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in the mid-1930's. It was during this time that the organization began using black attorneys to battle the court system. Charles Houston, former vice dean of Howard University Law School and Thurgood Marshall, a bright and aggressive young lawyer from Baltimore won several cases that gave impetus to further desegregation activity in higher education (Smith, 1997). In 1935, Houston and Marshall were able to gain court-ordered law school admissions for Donald Murray to the University of Maryland Law School and admission to the University of Missouri Law School for Lloyd Gaines through suits that had been filed on the students’ behalf.
One of the more far reaching decisions in higher education came in 1950. In a lawsuit filed by the NAACP (*Sweat v Painter*), the court ruled that the state of Texas must admit Heman Sweat to the University of Texas Law School in Austin, or build a law school for him. The state of Texas opened a law school for Sweat at Texas Southern University in Houston to which Sweat declined to enroll arguing that a new law school established for one black person was unequal to the prestigious long-established law school in Austin. This was the first time that the United States Supreme Court ruled that even when tangible things are equal at black and white schools, intangible forces would still make the schools unequal (Smith, 1997).

The Heman Sweat case set the tone for future court decisions as to whether racial segregation itself made it impossible to have separate but equal schools. The most famous court decision to consider this question was the case of *Brown v Board of Education* in 1954. The United States Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools were inherently unequal and that in the field of public education, segregation has no place (Smith, 1997).

Although many blacks accepted the *Brown* decision and interpreted it as the beginning of further acceptance of blacks and their institutions, some remained more cautious. They warned that services designed specifically for black students would disappear and existing patterns of discrimination would be perpetuated under the guise of equality (Browning & Williams, 1978). Despite these doubts, there were immediate benefits for black colleges. Those benefits came in the form of money for physical improvements and to increase the schools' enrollments.
Desegregation efforts in other social arenas also effected integration in higher education. After the protests and demonstrations during the 60's, many blacks' concept of desegregation changed. Blacks all over the nation decided that they wanted to be included in the decision-making processes and that desegregation meant more than assimilation. Other blacks who were humiliated and rejected in their attempts to desegregate public universities began to press for continuation of the policy to separate black colleges from white systems of higher education (Browning & Williams, 1978).

Higher Education After the Brown Decision

Though Brown proved to be a landmark decision in higher education, it did not end challenges to desegregation attempts. The court, however, maintained its favorable stance toward the advocates of desegregation. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided impetus for a series of court orders in public school systems. Further, The Civil Rights Act of 1964 removed the responsibility for implementing school desegregation from the courts and passed it on to the Commissioner of Education of the, then, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Title IV of this same act prohibited any schools that receive federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race in hiring, promotion, and admissions policies (Browning & Williams, 1978).

In 1969, the Office of Civil Rights required 10 states to submit plans for achieving racial equality in public colleges and universities. Those states were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Federal officers had completed an investigation in these states with results that deemed these states as having duel systems of education.
However, by June 1974, only 8 of the 10 states had acceptable plans for desegregation. Mississippi’s plan was rejected and Louisiana refused to comply (Browning & Williams, 1978).

According to Darden, Bagaska’s and Marijh (1992), the legal battle over desegregation in Louisiana began in 1974 when the U.S. Department of justice sued the state for violating the Civil Rights Act by maintaining a racially segregated higher education system.

**Public Higher Education in Louisiana**

Only after the Civil War was the right to an education “bestowed” upon African American citizens. During the Reconstruction era, sentiments against tax supported education ran high (Marshall, 1956). An impetus for education of blacks in Louisiana was a Constitutional Convention called by Governor Michael Banks in 1864. During the convention, it was agreed that there would be free public education for all children. Further establishing the concept of education for blacks in Louisiana was the establishment of schools by Governor Banks and the Freedmen’s Bureau (Marshall, 1956). The Freedmen’s Bureau has been credited with launching the beginnings of the black college in America (Parker, as cited in Marshall, 1956). According to Marshall (1956) the Freedman’s Bureau was active in establishing institutions of higher education in Louisiana during the reconstruction era. Three institutions of higher education for blacks were established by the Bureau or with its protection and assistance (Marshall, 1956).
Higher education in Louisiana remained segregated and was influenced by national court challenges as was other states’ institutions of higher education. However, challenges to Louisiana universities have their own peculiar history. For example, as early as 1945, black students applied for admission to Louisiana State University but were rejected on grounds that it was not the policy of the university to admit “Negro” students (Marshall, 1956).

The first lawsuit filed in court on behalf of a black Louisiana plaintiff seeking to enroll in a segregated university was the case of Viola M. Johnson who was attempting to gain entrance into Louisiana State University’s School of Medicine. Unlike other suits during this era, these challenges began in state court rather than in federal court. The Johnson suit, along with a suit which had been filed on behalf of Charles Hatfield, a black plaintiff seeking to enroll in the Louisiana State University Law School, was dismissed because, the court opined, it was Southern University’s mandatory duty to establish schools of law and medicine. Both cases were appealed to the State Supreme Court but were allowed to die on the calendar. In July of 1950, Louisiana State University received 12 applications from black students wishing to enroll in either the law school, the graduate school, or the undergraduate program. The twelve students were all denied admission based on the lower court ruling and, as a result, inspired a chain of lawsuits (Marshall, 1956).

The first successful challenge to the separate but equal laws was filed by Roy Wilson. In 1950, the Supreme Court ruled that Wilson, an African American, must be granted admission to the law school of the university. Wilson, however, subsequently
withdrew his application. In June 1951, Lubril Payne filed suit in the Baton Rouge division of the Federal District Court. Payne asked the court to restrain Louisiana State University from denying his admission and those similarly situated to both graduate and undergraduate divisions of the university. The issues were restricted to the graduate school. Payne received a favorable judgement thereby allowing he and other blacks to attend Louisiana State University’s graduate school.

The first successful challenge to the undergraduate division of Louisiana State University was in 1953. A. P. Tureaud, Jr. contended that he could not receive a combined arts and sciences and law curriculum at Southern University such as that offered at Louisiana State University. Tureaud received a favorable judgement in his case in September, 1953. Tureaud registered as a freshman at Louisiana State University in that year with a notation to his registration record that said he was being admitted under court order and that it was subject to further orders of the court (Marshall, 1956). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision in October of that year. The following day the university canceled Tureaud’s registration and returned his fees. A hearing on re-instatement was scheduled in Federal District Court but was discontinued at Tureaud’s request (Marshall, 1956).

**Desegregation in Louisiana Higher Education**

Despite ameliorative efforts by the state and federal courts and the universities, Louisiana’s student enrollment in its higher education institutions suggest high levels of defacto segregation among Caucasian American and African American students (Darden, Bagaka’s & Kamel, 1996; Southern Education Foundation, 1998). Darden and
Hargett (1981) used enrollment data from the 1970's and concluded that in states where there were such systems, there was a significantly higher level of segregation of black students compared to those states without such systems.

Darden, Bagaka’s, and Kamel (1996) conducted an evaluative study to measure the impact of desegregation efforts among states with highly segregated institutions of higher education. Among the conclusions was that Louisiana was one of six (6) states with the most highly segregated student population in the United States. Louisiana’s institutions were listed as second only to those of the District of Columbia in contributing to segregation. In order to arrive at this conclusion, Darden, Bagaska’s, and Marajh (1996) used an index of dissimilarity. The researchers considered proportions of white and black students at these universities and developed an overall index for each state and the District of Columbia. The researchers explained further,

“This index, which is one-half the sum of the absolute difference between the two proportions, ranges from ‘0’ indicating total desegregation to ‘100’ indicating total segregation. The index measures the ‘unevenness’ of the distribution of black versus white undergraduate students enrolled in public institutions of higher learning. The logic behind this index is that, in the case where ‘evenness’ occurs, the two proportions should be equal and the index will be zero. The extent to which the two proportions differ is thus a measure of dissimilarity or segregation” (Darden, Bagaka’s & Kamel, 1996, p. 59).

A major concern for Louisiana’s system of higher education is achieving racial balance in the state’s educational system. Darden, Bagaka’s, and Kamel (1996) used the black student representation ratio to describe black student representation in the nation’s institutions of higher learning. The black representation ratio was defined as the percentage of blacks enrolled in colleges in a given year (fall semester) divided by
the black percentage of the state’s 18- to 24-year old general population in that same year. A ratio of 1.00 indicates equality in black student representation: less than 1:00 indicates that black students were under-represented. Greater than 1:00 was said to represent black student over-representation. The researchers, Darden, Bagaka’s, and Kamel (1996), contended that using the state’s 18- to 24-year old population represents potential students and is more credible than using the enrolled student population. The justification was that if the student population was used, an institution with a few black students may appear to have a larger black representation ratio simply by being located in a state that is highly under-represented in black under-graduate students.

Darden, Bagaka’s and Kamel (1996) found Louisiana to be one of the six most segregated states in the nation. The authors commented,

The state of Louisiana had an index of 51.9 in 1982 and 60.7 in 1992. For both 1982 and 1992, Southern University-Baton Rouge, Grambling State University, and Southern University- New Orleans were disproportionately black. About 40 percent of all black undergraduate students who were enrolled in these three institutions, compared with 0.3 percent of all white undergraduate students who were enrolled in these same institutions in 1982. Louisiana State University, on the other hand, was disproportionately white for both 1982 and 1992 (p. 61).

Table 2 lists the states, according to Darden, Bagaka’s, and Kamel’s study, that had the highest rates of segregation for the year 1982/83.
Table 2

Top Six (6) Most Segregated States in Higher Education for 1982/83 and 1992/93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Years 1982/83</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Years 1992/93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index 0 to 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Index 0 to 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>85.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>60.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>58.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>56.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>54.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Rating taken from Darden, Bagaka’s and Kamel (1996).

*The index is one-half the sum of the absolute difference between the proportions of white and black students at each university ranging from ‘0’ indicating total desegregation to ‘100’ indicating total segregation.

Darden, Bagaka’s and Kamel (1996) also demonstrated the rate of segregation in Louisiana’s major institutions of higher learning during the academic year 1982/83 and 1992/93. Using a computed index of dissimilarity, which is a measure of segregation, a ratio of black and white undergraduate student enrollment was determined for each institution in the state. The contribution to Louisiana’s dissimilarity index is represented in the last column (see Table 3).
Table 3.

**Index of Dissimilarity by Institution in Louisiana, 1982-83**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>White proportion</th>
<th>Black proportion</th>
<th>Contribution to segregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern University-Baton Rouge</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University-New Orleans</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The proportions in the table are based on a formula developed by Darden and Tabachnek (1980). If the formula exceeds 1.00, the university is considered to be overly segregated (i.e., not desegregated). If it is less than one, it is considered to be desegregated (Darden, Bagaa's, & Marijh, 1992).

Table 4.

**Index of Dissimilarity by Institution in Louisiana, 1992-93**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>White proportion</th>
<th>Black proportion</th>
<th>Contribution to segregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern University-Baton Rouge</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University-New Orleans</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The proportions in the table are based on a formula developed by Darden and Tabachnek (1980). If the proportion exceeds 1.00, the university is considered to be overly segregated (i.e., not desegregated). If it is less than 1.00, it is considered to be desegregated (Darden, Bagaa's, & Marijh, 1992).
According to Darden, Bagaska’s and Marijh (1992), the legal battle over desegregation in Louisiana began in 1974 when the U.S. Department of justice sued the state for violating the Civil Rights Act by maintaining a racially segregated higher education system. Louisiana signed a consent decree in 1981 to settle the case. The conditions of the agreement required Louisiana to spend millions of dollars on improving its Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU’s). However, by the time the consent decree expired in 1997, Louisiana had not fulfilled all of the requirements of the decree. In 1988, Judge Charles Schwartz ordered a series of changes in higher education in Louisiana. In 1990, however, the judge withdrew the order and put the case on hold, pending the U. S. Supreme Court’s review of Mississippi’s desegregation case. In 1992, Judge Schwartz stated that Louisiana had not desegregated its higher education system under the standards set in the Mississippi case. He ordered changes in governance, admission standards, and missions of Louisiana’s 20 colleges and universities. The order resulted in a single governing board for all Louisiana’s public institutions. The judge further ordered the elimination of remedial courses and the duplication of academic programs in adjacent PWI’s and HBCU’s (Jaschik, 1994).

The plan as ordered by Judge Schwartz proved to be controversial because the judge had “overstepped his authority and had failed to consider the ways in which Black students decide to enroll (p. 59)” (Darden, Bagaka’s, & Kamel, 1996). Blacks were one-third of Louisiana’s population and represented only seven percent of the student population at Louisiana State University (the flagship university). Therefore, in
December 1993, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals rejected the desegregation plan because it did not adequately establish links between the practices it sought to eliminate and illegal segregation.

On November 14, 1994, a federal judge approved what could be the end of the 20-year legal battle over Louisiana's desegregation plan. The plan would not close or merge any of the state's HBCU's and would not consolidate the four (4) boards governing Louisiana's system of higher education. The judge further ordered Louisiana to spend more than 100 million dollars to attract white students to HBCU's and black students to PWI's (Darden, Bagaka's, & Kamel, 1996).

Implemented in 1995, the Louisiana desegregation settlement plan seemed to have had but marginal impact on "other race" student enrollment at Southern University and Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, the two major university systems in Louisiana. Below in Table 5 are the percentages of black and white students at Louisiana State University and Southern University for Fall 1994, the last year before the consent decree and Fall 1997, three years after the consent decree. The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of black students by the total number of students and by dividing the number of white students by total number of white students to obtain the percentage of students according to race (Southern University Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research and Louisiana State University Budget and Planning Office, personal communication, September 11, 1998).
Table 5

Percentage of White and Black Students at Louisiana State University and Southern University One Year before Implementation of the Louisiana Desegregation Plan and Three Years after Implementation of the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Louisiana State University</th>
<th>Southern University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White students</td>
<td>Black students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Calculated by the researcher from figures provided by Southern University Office of Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, Louisiana State University Budget and Planning Office.

A Discussion of Race in Higher Education

Race and racism have been at the forefront of many discussions for centuries. However, the issue of race remains a recalcitrant issue and presents formidable challenges related to discrimination and historical perspectives. Such perspectives are most profoundly entrenched within the relations between African American and Caucasian American people. However, it is within the context of this relationship that the most obdurate issues are presented but are often unresolved because of social taboos around discussion of race (Benton & Daniel, 1996; Hacker, 1992).

Feagin and Sykes (1994) noted that discrimination is subtly embedded in the values and patterns of traditionally white colleges and that higher education is no better than society in addressing those issues. Benton and Daniel (1996) further iterated:

Perhaps in some social settings the option of avoiding topics of cultural diversity is still considered viable and possibly polite; yet public schools in this country are ethnically diverse. Outside of the military, public schools may be the only arena in the United States
where different social classes, ethnicities, and genders come together on a regular basis. Consequently we need to explore ways to all topics of diversity, including race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, religious affiliations, and physical abilities. On both the public school and university levels, it is the teacher’s and administration’s responsibility to create and maintain a safe environment in which respect for the learner and the learner’s viewpoints is a dominant characteristic so insights can be shared. (p. 8).

Goodwin (1994) expressed a similar position by stating that it is important for all individuals involved with American education to engage in a dialogue about multicultural education. The author further noted that until all Americans, including those of European descent, participate in the dialogue, the goals of equitable education cannot be realized.

Seveir (1996) pointed out that more students choose colleges because of image or reputation than for any other single reason. For many prospective students, image or perception was shaped within a context of segregation, it is reflected in enduring representation of racial reasoning even when the system has changed in its physical and structural presentation (Southern Education Foundation, 1998). Thus, the imagery associated with an institution will often represent past sociohistorical perspective rather than a careful analysis of current reality. This obdurate issue is held firmly in place by the universities’ unwillingness or inability to address problems of race as it relates to black and white Americans (Hacker, 1992). Lang (1992) states,

When we assess the role that academic institutions have played in the struggle for equality for minorities, we realize that their roles have not exemplified intellectual leadership. They have not been role models for the rest of society. Rather, they have reflected the same prejudices and injustices that have been prominent among the intellectual
masses, despite their presumed wealth of information and knowledge production. . . . Equal access and retention of minority students are serious problems with very serious consequences for the welfare and tranquility of our nation. If our institutions of higher education cannot foster the production of knowledge needed to solve these problems, they can hardly be depended upon to solve the problems envisioned by the 21st century, problems that will be created by high technology and post-industrialization. We may need to urgently rethink our educational systems’ priorities (p. 521).

Many of the perceptions that are held by students in Louisiana were formed within the context of a duel educational system (Darden, Bagaka’s & Kamel, 1996). The perceptions, spawned by historical division and racial hostility, have been finely honed to a point that despite laws that have promoted desegregation and racial harmony, institutions of higher education still face formidable, if not forbidding, challenges to merely comply with court mandates regarding desegregation (Bronner, 1998).

Studies Specifically Related to the Research Objectives

High School Student Perceptions

Few studies have been conducted that include the perceptions of high school students as they relate to desegregation and college choice (Freeman, 1997). Bacon, Schwartz, and Rothfard (1991) iterated that the relationship between school climate and positive school outcomes suggests the importance of assessing racial climate perception and intervening in areas of weakness. In their study, Bacon et al (1991) used purposive sampling in order to answer questions regarding perceptions of school racial climate. The Racial Climate Survey (RCS) taps many characteristics of the broad domain school climate such as the level of friendship and mutual support between school members, the
uniformity of treatment for students, perceptions of a safe and orderly environment, and the accessibility of group membership and social mixing (Bacon, Schwartz, and Rothfard, 1991). The RCS was administered to 2,882 students and 377 staff members in 36 schools in a large Florida district in order to investigate perceptions of school climate held by staff persons and students. An exploratory factor of the 12-item survey showed that items could be grouped into three themes: (1) perceptions of personal interaction, (2) perceptions of administrators’ and teachers’ respect and fairness for students of different races, and (3) the perceptions of students’ social interactions. Findings indicate that teachers and administrators, as a whole, held fairly positive perceptions of racial climate in the schools. Staff were also found to view their own interactions with people of different races and equity of staff’s treatment of students of different races more positively than they did students’ interaction as a group. Students’ social interaction were viewed by both students and staff as being the weakest of the factors investigated in the study. There were also significant intra-group differences on the variable race. For example, white staff members had significantly more positive perceptions of respect and fairness for students of different races than did black staff members. Similarly, white students and students in the category “other” had more positive perceptions of administrators’ and teachers’ respect and fairness than did black students (Bacon, Schwartz, and Rothfard, 1991).

Studies of discrimination and the perception of inequity are not uncommon phenomena as it relates to predominately white institutions and their treatment of black students (Davis, 1995; Feagin, 1992; Lang, 1992; Lesure, 1993; Saddlemire, 1996)
However studies of perceptions of white students on the campuses of historically black institutions have occurred much less frequently (Hazzard, 1988; Hazzard, 1989; Nixon & Henry, 1992). Brown (1986) asserted that, perhaps the reason is that black colleges have always operated under an “open-door” policy and admission has never been denied to anyone on the basis of race, religion or national origin. Despite this aphorism, black colleges still face unusual barriers in recruiting white students (Hazzard, 1989).

Descriptive data compiled in a study of 18 traditionally black public colleges by Brown (1973) suggested that white students on black campuses follow distinctive patterns and may experience social acceptance and academic success. However, black institutions of higher education seem to fare poorly in recruitment of traditional college age white students. Responses to a 59-item questionnaire revealed: (1) An almost even division of enrollment by sex, more than 50% were married, and the mean age of female students exceeded that of the mean age of males by three years, 30 to 27; (2) Two-thirds of the students were enrolled in full-time programs and reported above average grades; (3) The majority of students commuted daily to the campus; (4) Approximately 50% of the students financed their education through personal funds and assistance from their parents; (5) Nearly one-half of the students were transfers from predominately white institutions; (6) Convenience of location, availability of desired degree programs, and low tuition costs were the chief factors given for enrolling at black institutions; (7) A third of the students admitted reservations about enrolling at the black institutions; (8) 56% of the students had experienced practically no contact with blacks prior to their enrollment at the college; (9) More than half the students
experienced no difficulty in expressing themselves in college; (10) 75% of the students accepted black studies courses without hesitancy; (11) Approximately 40% of white students participated in non-academic activities on campus; and, (12) Socially, race did not appear to be a significant factor.

**Academic Quality**

Godard (as cited in Hazzard, 1989), has contended that the images that whites seem to have of black universities is one of inferiority. Black students attending white universities are seen as increasing educational opportunities while white students attending black universities are seen as compromising theirs.

Parker (as cited in Hazzard, 1989) contends that white high school graduates will have to overcome the opposition of parents and peers if they want to attend black institutions. The author additionally noted that peer pressure is greater at high school graduation than at any other time. Hazzard cited an additional barrier as that of a lack of “high-quality” students. The author contended that black institutions have a reputation of attracting students after white institutions have selected from available students and that those students who are left to attend black institutions are of dubious academic quality. The author further noted that although proximity, convenience, and program availability are noted among the general motivating factors for white students to attend black institutions, other factors may include easy entrance requirements and an opportunity to improve poor grades earned at other institutions (Hazzard, 1989).
Socio-Cultural Fit

Some researchers continue to seek explanations for African American student perception of predominately white campuses in terms of either overt or institutional racism (Feagin, 1992; Feagin & Sykes, 1994). Perhaps an even larger piece of the perception experience for students involves cultural congruence or institutional fit. This concept implies that groups of people simply, because of their cultural background, do things differently and that their experiences may be incongruent with the experiences of others. If this is the case, then students who are of a numerical minority of any race would feel uncomfortable when on a campus with a numerical majority of other-race students (Abraham & Jacobs, 1990).

The historical cultural development of African American and Caucasian relations in the United States is a peculiar matter. It is an arduous task, indeed, to separate the intricately woven fabrics of race and culture as they relate to perception (Hacker, 1992).

Faculty-Student and Peer Relationships

Perhaps one of the most salient areas of cultural incongruence involves the area of relationships. The literature is replete with references to the relative importance of relationship expectation for African American students in higher education (Davis, 1995; Freeman, 1997; Gossett, Cuyjet & Cockriel, 1996; McDonough & Antonio, 1996). Feagin (1992) described four levels of perceived discriminatory practices (aggression, exclusion, dismissal, and typecast) as they relate to relationships for African American students on predominately white campuses. The author further postulated that these dimensions can be described as they are perceived to be practiced.
by various players on the predominately white college campus. The roles described were those of students, professors, staff, and alumni.

Feagin (1992) asserted that the perceptions of relationships for African Americans on predominately white campuses are definable and are representative of discernable acts of perceived discrimination toward African American students.

Freeman (1997) provided more empirical validation of Feagin's assertions in a qualitative study of African American high students' perspectives on African American students in higher education. Freeman (1997) denotes three terms that are considered to be crucial in order to understand this hypothesis. Those terms are channeling, cultural capital, and social capital. Freeman defines the terms as follows:

1. **Channeling** - the environmental forces (whether individuals, institutions, or circumstances) that influence students' choices.

2. **Cultural capital** - assets, in the form of behaviors, on which individuals and or families can draw to meet a certain set of established values in society. Such values are generally established by the majority groups in society and encompass such behaviors as the way individuals speak and they way they dress.

3. **Social Capital** - the networks that provide information, social norms, and achievement support to individuals/and or family as they strive to meet the value requirements of the culture. (p. 527)
Table 6 illustrates the perceived discriminatory practices toward African American students on predominately white campuses.

Table 6

**Discriminatory Practices on Predominately White Campuses as Perceived by African American Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th>Dismissal</th>
<th>Typecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Epithets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist Jokes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denigrating hair, dress, groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating students as athletes or special students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection as friends</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating students as spokespersons for the group (all alike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accenting White model for writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursory treatment of students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of minority research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness to learn about students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzing intelligence of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Freeman (1997), channeling as it relates to college choice cuts across all forms of capital, cultural/social and economic/financial. This position holds that the more capital that the individual has, whether social or economic, the more likely that they will be influenced by forces internal to the home. Students are channeled by influences outside the home in directions that impact their decision-making process to participate in higher education or in this case, where to participate in higher education (Freeman, 1997).

Freeman’s study (1997) investigated African American high school students’ perceptions of barriers to their participation in higher education. Students were not asked to distinguish between institution type (predominately white or historically black) but their reactions were suggestive of having understood higher education as predominately white institutions. Freeman noted that students most often stressed a theme of being accepted for who they are and having someone to encourage them to maximize their potential. Additionally, students opined that teaching others about their culture and having more black teachers who “wanted to be there” as important solutions to perceived barriers. This appears to bear out Freeman’s assertion that students who have less capital (social, cultural, economic) will find other forces to be more important as a channeling agent to higher education. Given the relative socio-economic position of African American students to white students in our society, such external forces (e.g. relationships) become important in the decision of institutional type for African American students (Freeman, 1997).
Previous Other-Race Contact

Social scientists have debated the contact hypothesis for a number of decades (Allport, 1954; Jackman & Crane, 1996; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). The dominant hypothesis has been that close and sustained contact with members of different racial and ethnic groups promotes positive, tolerant attitudes towards those groups. Proponents of the contact hypothesis posit that racial segregation is a source of ignorance and that ignorance is a breeding ground for derogatory stereotypes and racial hostility. Adherents to the contact hypothesis further contend that if stronger social bonds could be forged between blacks and whites, racial attitudes would improve dramatically (Sigelman & Welch, 1993).

Researchers have noted three problems that plague the contact hypothesis: 1) Most research on interracial contact has been done in specific institutional contexts (e.g. housing developments, desegregated schools, the military, or laboratories). Such specialized, highly monitored settings do not answer the question of whether interracial contact results in positive racial attitudes in the general population, 2) Research on interracial contact has focused primarily on white racial attitudes without giving adequate shrift to the views of African Americans. Sigelman and Welch (1993) contend that because many African Americans are forced to encounter whites in public settings due to the demographic imbalance between whites and blacks, and that since such contact usually takes place under competitive and often hostile situation, it appears that casual interracial contact is not necessarily associated with positive interracial
attitudes among African Americans; and 3) The positive association reported between 
interracial contact and interracial attitude may primarily reflect a selection effect.

Previous studies focused primarily on intergroup attitudes rather than specifically 
on the attitudes of one group (whites) toward another group (blacks). It is also 
important to know whether interracial attitudes effect the attitudes of blacks toward 
whites. Sigelman and Welch (1993) noted that this question has, in the past, received 
very little attention and that a high proportion of the pertinent studies are extremely 
dated. The relevant question relative to desegregation in higher education and students’ 
perceptions involves whether perceptions are impacted by previous close other-race 
contacts on the part of prospective students.

Summary

Desegregation continues to be an obdurate issue for higher education. Research 
literature has not traditionally focused on understanding this point from the perspective 
of high school students (Freeman, 1997) and historically under-represented groups 
(Watson & Kuh, 1996). The literature has shown that perception can be a predictor of a 
future action such as choice of institution (Sevier, 1996). Given the history of race 
relations in our country, it stands to reason that perception is often couched in the 
context of race relations.

The focus of this study is grounded in an exploration of high school student 
perceptions as they are impacted by race, gender, and other variables. The study is 
meant to begin the process of addressing negative perceptions as they are identified and 
clarification provided to prospective students by institutions of higher education.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study was intended to describe the perceptions of high school students toward historically black colleges and universities and predominately white institutions of higher education in Louisiana. Selected Louisiana public high school students were asked to report their perceptions of two types of universities in Louisiana; historically black colleges and universities (HBCU’s) and predominately white Institutions (PWI’s) in Louisiana. Despite ameliorative efforts by the universities and the courts, segregation remains staunchly embedded in the fabric of higher education in Louisiana. Perhaps, resolution of this difficult issue can be aided by an examination of student perceptions of the two types of universities, HBCU’s and PWI’s.

This study examined 11th grade high school students’ perceptions as they relate to race and selected university types. The population of the study and the sample from that population, the instrument and its intended usage, procedure used in the study, data collection and analysis are described in this chapter.

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. Describe high school students in Louisiana on selected demographic and affective characteristics including the following:
   a. Race
   b. Gender
   c. Gender and Race
   d. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
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e. Racial make-up of high school attended
f. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
g. Student's plans regarding college attendance
h. Type of higher education institution students planned to attend
i. Students' report of close other-race friendships
j. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
k. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
l. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
m. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at PWI's
n. Perceptions of peer relationships at an HBCU
o. Perceptions of peer relationships at a PWI
p. Perceptions of peer relationships at an "other-race" college/university
q. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an HBCU
r. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on a PWI
s. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an "other-race" college/university.

2 Compare white and black high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
3. Compare male and female high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
   b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
   c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
   d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
   e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
   f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
   g. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
   h. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI
   i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

4. Describe interaction effects of race and gender on Louisiana high school students' perceptions regarding the following selected affective characteristics:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
   b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's

d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's

e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU

f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI

g. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus of an HBCU

h. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus of a PWI

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

5. Determine if a relationship exists between the self perceived amount of other-race-contact and the following perceptions of other-race colleges/universities:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at other-race colleges/universities

b. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at other-race colleges/universities

c. Anticipated peer relationships at an “other-race” college/university

d. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of “other-race colleges/universities.

6. Determine if a model exists which explains a significant portion of the variance in the perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of “other-race” college/university from the following characteristics:

a. Race

b. Gender

c. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

d. Racial make-up of high school attended
e. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)

f. Student’s plans regarding college attendance

g. Students’ report of close other-race friendships

h. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s

i. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s

j. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s

k. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s

l. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU

m. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as high school students in Louisiana who are prospective university students and who resided in Louisiana parishes where there was a “pairing” of an HBCU and a PWI. The four pairings of universities included (1) Southern University in New Orleans (SUNO) and the University of New Orleans (UNO) located in Orleans Parish, (2) Southern University (SU) and Louisiana State University (LSU) in Baton Rouge (East Baton Rouge Parish), (3) Grambling State University (GSU) and Louisiana Tech in Lincoln Parish, and (4) Louisiana State University - Shreveport (LSU-S) and Southern University- Shreveport (SU- S) in Caddo Parish. Three public high schools were selected from each of the four parishes on the basis of being within the 60-40 criteria or nearest proximity to the 60-40 criteria when such schools were not available and similarity of size of student
population (number of students enrolled). Three schools were chosen because that number represents the maximum number of schools in each parish that fit the prescribed criteria of racial balance and/or homogeneity.

The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. According to Ary, Jacob, and Razavieh (1996) there is no rule for sample size for this sampling technique. A class from each of the schools chosen was to represent the sampling population for the study. English III is a course that has been identified by the state of Louisiana as a requirement for high school graduation. By conjecture, one can expect that this specific group of students would have among them (a) students who plan to attend college, (b) students who are considering attending college, (c) students who function academically at a level where college attendance is a possibility and, (d) students who have no interest in attending college. This was done to decrease the threat to internal validity as a result of the selection process by providing a homogenous population of students. Therefore, the students involved in the study (accessible population) were all of the students attending a selected English III class the day the questionnaire was administered. Estimating classrooms to contain an average of 30 students, the total sample size was expected to be 360 students or less. This type of sample was used because of convenience, given the accessibility to student enrollment in schools in a rather large geographical area to be covered by the study. Because the instrument was only administered once, the slice in time study decreases the chance of biases being introduced into the study as a result of out-of-session discussion between students.
An additional contingency was effected in the event that all parishes did not give permission to conduct the study in a manner that would not corrupt the integrity of the research objectives. The only schools that were included in the study were those for which the parish school systems' central office had given permission for the researcher to conduct the study. Regional bias may have been introduced as a result of not having received permission from one of the four school districts (see limitations of the study).

Instrumentation

A researcher-developed instrument was designed to measure student perception of historically black colleges and universities and predominately white universities and thus was the data collection instrument used for the study. The instrument contained three sections. In the first section, the respondent was asked to provide demographic information. This information was used to describe the respondents' race and gender, thereby addressing objective 1. Section one also provided information for addressing objectives 4, 6, and 8, and 10. Section two and three were identical with the exception that the questions in section two pertains to HBCU’s and section three pertained to PWI’s. Both section two and three of the questionnaire consisted of four sub-scales, with a total of 18 items, which used a Likert-type response scale. The sub-scales were (1) Peer Interaction, which addressed high school students' perceptions of how much they anticipated being accepted by their peers on university campuses Peer interaction was based on the assertion that students may not feel welcome and/or may face isolation among their other-race majority peers on campuses where they are in the
numerical minority, (2) Professor/Staff Relationships, which addressed the perceived expected relationships between students and university faculty persons on university campuses, (3) Socio-cultural fit, which referred to the perceived racial climate on university campuses and, (4) Academic quality which referred to the perceived value of the education one receives at a certain university type. An interpretive scale was set up by the researcher in order to rate the responses to the individuals items on each sub-scale. The scale was as follows: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don't Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree.

The reliability of the scales (sub-scales) was estimated using the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1996) contended that the degree of reliability needed in a measure depends to a great extent on the use that is to be made of the results. The authors posit that when decisions are not being made about individuals, that "a lower reliability coefficient measure (.30 - .50) may be acceptable (p.282)". The reliability coefficients were determined for each of the four sub-scales as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale Category</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Responses (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Peer Relationships</td>
<td>.4994</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Faculty/ Staff Relations</td>
<td>.6524</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Socio-cultural fit</td>
<td>.6662</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Academic Quality</td>
<td>.9078</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The students in the English III classes were asked to respond to each of the 18 Likert-type items based on what they believed to be true for each type of university. Both of the two sections measured responses related to a specific type of university (H.B.C.U. or P.W.I.).

The first sub-scale of the Likert-type items was peer interaction. This section contained items that are designed to answer questions related to peer relationships on campus. These questions were related to objective 6, which addressed anticipated peer relationships at other-race schools. The second of the four sub-scales contained items that were related to objective 5, which addressed anticipated faculty/student relationships. The third sub-scale solicited responses related to objective 7, which addressed perceived socio-cultural experience on the part of the student. The fourth sub-scale solicits responses that were related to objective 4, which addressed perceived academic quality of each type of university (H.B.C.U. or P.W.I.).

In addition to the review by the doctoral committee of this researcher, the instrument was evaluated for content validity using a panel of experts. “Expert” panel members were defined as those who (a) have extensive knowledge of integration issues, (b) extensive knowledge of human diversity issues and perception, and (c) familiarity with the high school student culture. The panel selected for this process included the director of the Southern Regional Education Board, which oversees integration efforts and assists minority students in earning doctoral degrees as well as obtaining teaching positions in higher education. The panel also included two local psychologists who both
were well versed in the area of student perception as well as integration in higher education. The remaining panel members were professors who were familiar with student diversity on university campuses as well as integration efforts in Louisiana (see Appendix A).

The instrument was refined by using a field test method. After permission was received to conduct research in East Baton Rouge Parish, a field test site for the instrument was selected. The school selected was Robert E. Lee High School, which was one of four public schools in East Baton Rouge Parish classified by the Louisiana Department of Education as racially balanced. The principal of the school was contacted and permission obtained to contact the 11th grade counselor. The counselor agreed to provide a class that met the criteria of racial balance. The counselor declined to administer the questionnaire. The instrument was field tested and refined based on results from the 11th grade English III class after having been administered by the classroom teacher.

The teacher indicated that the field test group was comfortable with the content of the instrument and offered no comments for improvement. Some logistical changes were made after reviewing the structure of the questionnaire. Page numbers, a cover sheet with further explanation, a statement to continue to the next page, and a thank you were added to the instrument. The instrument used for data collection may be reviewed in Appendix A.
Procedures

Data Collection

The public high schools to be used in the study had been selected by consultation with the Louisiana Department of Education - Data Management Services. The requested list of schools were defined, based on racial balance (within 60-40 either race majority or nearest proximity to that defined balance). After receiving the list, the schools were further grouped by student population (similarity of student enrollment number). The addresses, phone numbers, and fax numbers of the schools selected were obtained from the web-site of the Louisiana Department of Education.

The central office staff designated to authorize research in their respective districts were contacted by telephone as an initial introduction. Upon agreement to participate, each was mailed a packet containing a letter of introduction, a summary of the study including objectives and procedures, a list of schools in their district which were to be included, and a sample questionnaire to be used in the study. Each of the Central Office staff persons was contacted after one week to ensure that they had received the packet. Permission to conduct research was granted by three of the four parishes requested, East Baton Rouge Parish, Lincoln Parish, and Orleans Parish (see Appendix B). Caddo Parish did not give permission even after initially agreeing verbally. An attempt was made to include Bossier Parish (an adjoining parish) in the study, however, the Central Office staff person declined citing the recent school tragedy.
in Colorado as the reason. The official said that they did not want to do anything that might “inflame” or cause “separation” among the students.

After having received permission to conduct the study in the selected public high schools and approvals were granted from the appropriate school administrator, the researcher contacted the principal of each of the selected schools. The principals were each mailed a letter thanking them for their consideration in allowing the study to take place in their schools, a summary of the study procedures and objectives, and a copy of the questionnaire. If three schools did not give permission for the study, then the researcher would select more than one class from a single school or from two schools such that the three classroom requirement was met in this way.

In East Baton Rouge Parish, two of the three eligible schools’ principals agreed to allow the study. The third principal cited the busy schedule of school activity as the reason for declining to allow the survey. All of the three schools’ principals contacted in Lincoln parish agreed to allow the study to take place in their respective schools. There was only one school in Orleans Parish that agreed to allow the study to proceed. There were no schools contacted in Caddo or Bossier Parishes because of not having received permission from Central Office staff persons to conduct research in the public schools in either of the parishes.

After receiving permission to survey students in the schools, the 11th grade counselors in each of the schools where permission had been granted by the principals were contacted. The counselors selected the classroom based on the criteria prescribed
by the researcher. Instructions for administering the questionnaire were provided to the designated person (counselor or teacher). Use of a school counselor was expected to decrease the chance of bias being introduced into the study by the teacher or the researcher. A class of students may identify with the teacher because of continuous contact and may perceive that they are expected to reflect the values and attitudes of the teacher in the classroom. Because of limited contact with the researcher, the students could have been swayed by the researcher's ethnicity or other characteristics. Therefore, the counselor would have been able to provide a neutralizing effect between these two scenarios.

The school administrator or counselor was asked to identify 11th grade English III classes that were racially balanced or represented the next nearest proximity to the 60-40 either race criteria by which the schools were selected. From these classes, one class was randomly selected by the researcher for participation in the study. The standard for selection included similarity of classroom size in relation to other selected classrooms and racial balance.

In the cases where the counselor declined to administer the questionnaire, the teacher was asked to administer the questionnaire. The third option was for the researcher to administer the instrument. This arrangement followed the original plan developed by the researcher. The goal was to minimize the threat to the external validity of the study as much as possible. Upon request, the researcher administered the questionnaires in the East Baton Rouge Parish schools. The counselor administered the
instrument in one of the three Lincoln Parish schools while the researcher administered
the instrument in the remaining two Lincoln Parish schools. The instrument was
administered by the counselor in the Orleans Parish school. Table 7 depicts the sources
of students’ responses to the survey.

Table 7

Source of Data Collected Regarding Students Included in the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Type School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>Magnet School</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>English III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>Regular Public School</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>English III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Regular Public School</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>English III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Regular Public School</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>English III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>Magnet School</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>English III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaires were hand delivered to the schools in East Baton Rouge and
Lincoln School Districts. By request, they were mailed in advance of the data collection
activity to the Orleans Parish school. The questionnaires were administered by the
researcher in East Baton Rouge and Lincoln parishes. A total of 177 usable
questionnaires were completed and returned for analysis.

Data Analysis

Objective 1: Means, frequencies and percentages were used to describe the
demographic characteristics of students responding to the survey. The demographic
variables were:
a) Gender
   b) Race
   c) Gender and Race
   d) Type of school attended (magnet or non-magnet)
   e) Racial balance of school
   f) Perception of level of previous other-race contact
   g) Student plans to attend college
   h) Type of higher education institution students planned to attend
   i) Students’ report of close other-race friendships
   j) Perception of quality of education at HBCU’s
   k) Perception of quality of education at PWI’s
   l) Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
   m) Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
   n) Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
   o) Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI
   p) Anticipated peer relationships at an “other-race” university
   q) Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
   r) Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
   s) Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an “other-race” university
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Objective 2: Compare white and black high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships at on the campus of an HBCU
h. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus of a PWI
i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

An independent t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between black and white students’ mean scores.

Objective 3: Compare male and female high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
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g. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU

h. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

i. Self-perceived of previous other-race contact

An Independent t-test was used to compare the male and female students’ overall mean scores.

Objective 4: Describe interaction effects of race and gender on Louisiana high school students’ perceptions regarding the following selected affective characteristics:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s

b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s

c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s

d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s

e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU

f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI

g. Anticipated peer relationships at HBCU’s

h. Anticipated peer relationships at PWI’s

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

The two factor ANOVA was used to determine interaction effects of race and gender.

Objective 5: Determine if a relationship exists between the amount of other-race-contact and the following perceptions of other-race colleges/ universities:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at other-race colleges/ universities

b. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at other-race colleges/ universities
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c. Anticipated peer relationships at an "other-race" college/university

d. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of "other-race colleges/universities.

Pearson's r was used to assess the relationships between the variables.

Objective 6: Determine if a model exists which explains a significant portion of the variance in the perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of "other-race" college/university from the following characteristics:

a. Race
b. Gender
c. Race and Gender
d. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
e. Racial make-up of high school attended
f. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
g. Students' plans regarding college attendance
h. Students' report of close other-race friendships
i. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
j. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
k. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
l. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
m. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
n. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI
Multiple regression was used to analyze the results of the question. The step-wise entry method was used.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of high school students in Louisiana regarding selected issues and characteristics of institutions of higher education which are classified as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) and Predominately White Institutions (PWI's). Data for the study were collected from 177 eleventh grade students attending public high school in East Baton Rouge, Lincoln, and Orleans parishes. Though selected as part of the sample, Caddo Parish, as well as its border parish, Bossier, declined to participate in the survey.

In this chapter, the findings are presented according to the research objectives. The first objective focused on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Objectives two, three and four focused on a comparison of student perception on 36 variables by race, gender, and the interaction effects of race and gender. Results from objective five described relationships between students' amount of other-race contact and their perceptions related to other-race colleges and universities. Objective six yielded a model through which a significant portion of the variance in student perception of social and cultural “fit” at other race-colleges and universities was explained.
Objective One

Objective one was to describe high school students responding to the survey on selected demographic characteristics. Demographic variables that were measured included gender, race, type of school attended (magnet or regular program), if school attended was racially balanced, whether students had plans to attend college, and perceived level of previous other-race contact.

Race of the Respondents

In accordance with the objectives of the study, students who responded to the category “race” as any group other than white/Caucasian American or black/African American did not have their responses to the questionnaire included in these results. The responses of the students who responded to the category “other” were removed in order to focus exclusively on the responses of white and black students. After having removed the responses of students who identified their own race as “other” on the questionnaire, there were a total of 177 black and white students represented in the survey. Of these 177 respondents, 67 (37.9%) were black and 110 (62.1%) were white.

Gender of the Respondents

The students were described on the variable gender. Of the 177 students responding, 83 (46.9%) were male and 94 (53.1%) were female.

Interaction of Race and Gender Regarding Respondents

Students responding to the survey were described according to the cross-tabulation of the race and gender variables. White females represented the largest
group of students in the survey (58/32.8%) followed by 54 white males (30.5%), 36 black females (20.3%) and 29 black males (16.4%). Table 8 represents the cross-tabulation of the variable race and gender:

Table 8

Cross-Tabulation of Race and Gender of Eleventh Grade Public High School Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'W/CA</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B/AA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'aW/CA=white/Caucasian American; 'bB/AA=black/African American

Student Perception of Other-Race Contact

Another variable on which students were described was their perception regarding their level of other-race contact. Other-race contact was intended to be a measure of consistent interaction with persons from another racial group.

The amount of other-race contact was measured by the students' responses to three items. These items asked students to indicate the amount of other-race contact they had in their church, their neighborhood, and their school. The response scale included the following values: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often.

In regard to the three settings, church, neighborhood, and school, both black students and white students reported experiencing the least amount of other-race contact at church and the most amount of other-race contact in the school setting.
Blacks students reported a mean score of 1.970 (SD = 1.052) regarding other-race contact at church and a mean score of 3.758 (SD = .528) regarding contact with other-race students at school. The mean score for other-race contact at church fell between the categories never and seldom while the mean score for other-race contact at school fell between the categories sometimes and often.

White students reported a mean score of 2.074 (SD = 1.141) regarding other-race contact at church and a mean score of 3.606 (SD = .720) regarding contact with other-race students at school. The mean score for other-race contact at church fell between the categories seldom and sometimes while the mean score for other-race contact at school fell between the categories sometimes and often (see Table 9).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Location</th>
<th>Black Mean</th>
<th>Black SD</th>
<th>White Mean</th>
<th>White SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>2.514</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The amount of other-race contact was measured by the students' responses to three items. These items asked students to indicate the amount of other-race contact they had in their church, their neighborhood, and their school. The response scale included the following values: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often.

The responses from the three items were then used to calculate a perceived other-race contact score. The score was defined as the sum of the responses to the three items. Therefore, the other-race contact scores ranged from the lowest possible score
of three to the highest possible score of 12. To aid in the interpretation of this score, this researcher established categories of interpretation as follows: 3-4 was classified as minimal or no contact, 5-7 was classified as little contact, 8-10 was classified as moderate contact and 11-12 was classified as much contact. Using the interpretive scale, the largest group (n = 80, 45.2%) of respondents was classified in the ‘little contact’ category of other race contact. In addition, no respondents had scores in the ‘minimal or no contact’ category. Table 10 shows the frequencies and percentages of students’ perceived level of previous other-race contact.

Table 10

Perceived Amount of Other-Race Contact of Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Scale</th>
<th>Sum of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal or No Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Contact</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Contact</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Contact</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An interpretive scale was developed by the researcher with a score of three being the minimum score possible and a score of 12 being the maximum score possible; 3-4 = minimal or no contact, 5-7 = little contact, 8-10 = moderate contact and 11-12 = much contact. Mean = 8.124, SD = 1.900

Type of School Attended

Another part of objective one was to describe high school students according to type of school attended (regular or magnet). Of the 177 respondents in the study,
there were 87 students (49.2%) attending magnet schools while 90 students (50.8%) attended regular public high schools.

Racial Balance of School

Objective one also stated that students would be described according to the racial balance of schools which they were currently attending (as measured by whether it was within the stated 60-40 criteria or its nearest proximity). Of the sample of students included in the study, 69 students (39%) attended racially balanced schools while the majority of students (108/61%) attended schools that not racially balanced.

Plans to Attend Institutions of Higher Education

A total of 175 students reported their plans for post secondary education. Two students did not respond to the item and three were undecided. Of the responses recorded, 156 (88.1%) students reported plans to attend a four-year university. Only 16 (9.0%) students reported that they had no plans to attend college (see Table 11).

Table 11

Post-Secondary Educational Plans Reported by Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Choice</th>
<th>Number of Students (n)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will Attend College</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Not Attend College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of Higher Education Institution Students Planned to Attend

Students were asked where they planned to attend college or to state any other plans for post high school educational pursuit. Those responses were grouped into types of universities (historically black or predominately white), undecided, and other, which included community college, technical school, or military. Twelve students (6.8%) reported plans to attend a historically black college or university (H.B.C.U.) while 107 (60.5%) of the students reported plans to attend a predominately white institution (PWI). Another 48 students (27.1%) reported that they were undecided where they would attend college. Eight students (4.5%) had plans to attend community college, technical school, or military service (see Table 12).

Table 12

Type of Post-Secondary Educational Institution Eleventh Grade Public School Respondents Reported they Planned to Attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Number of Students (n)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing this particular item, the researcher also noted only one student to attend HBCU's, only one student planned to attend an HBCU in Louisiana.
Close Other-Race Friendships

Respondents in the study were asked to indicate the approximate number of close friendships they had with other-race peers. Close other-race friendships was defined as persons from another racial background with whom the respondent regularly interacted and considered to be a close friend. They were asked to report the requested information on a three point scale with values as follows: 1=none, 2=some but less than fifty percent, and 3=more than fifty percent.

The responses received to the close other-race friendship item showed that the majority of students indicated the ‘some but less than 50% category’ (\(n=119, 68.8\%\)). Approximately equal numbers of responses were received in each of the other two response categories (\(n=29\) and \(n=25\) in the categories of ‘none’ and ‘50% or more’).

When the data were examined separately for white and black students, the results were generally similar except that black students reported a higher percentage in the ‘some but less than 50%’ category (\(n=71, 65.7\%\) for white respondents and \(n=48, 73.8\%\) for black respondents). In addition, a somewhat higher percentage of white respondents (\(n=21, 19.5\%\)) reported ‘none’ as their response category than did for black respondents (\(n=8, 12.3\%\)).

When the data was further broken down by race and gender, black female students more frequently reported having ‘more than 50%’ of their close friendships with other-race peers (\(n=7, 21.9\%\)) while black male students had both the highest
response in the category of 'some but less than 50%' (n = 25, 75.8%) and lowest response in the category of '50% or more' close friendships among other-race peers (n = 2, 6.0%). White males had the highest percentage of respondents who reported 'none' regarding close other-race friendships (n = 11, 20.8%). The responses of students regarding their report of close other-race friendships are in Table 13.

Table 13

Number of Close Other-Race Friendships Reported by Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Scale</th>
<th>Black Male n</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total Black n</th>
<th>White Male n</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total White n</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 173; Four individuals did not respond.

The participants in the study were asked to respond to 18 items using a Likert-type response scale that were arranged into four sub-scales. The sub-scales were students' perception of peer relationships, students' perception of faculty/student relationships, students' perception of socio-cultural fit, and students' perception of academic quality.
Students' perception of peer relationships was defined as the ideas that students hold about their future relationships among college-mates should they attend college. Student’s perception of faculty/student relationships involved what students believed would be true about the nature of their relationship with faculty members. Socio-cultural fit involves what the students believed about the congruence of their own social and cultural background with the campus atmosphere. Academic quality measured what students believed to be true regarding the quality of education at Louisiana universities. The students were asked to respond to these items for both HBCU’s and PWI’s. The participants’ mean scores on the individual items were combined into a single overall mean score according to each sub-scale.

The variable students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s was the variable which evidenced most overall disagreement by the student respondents (M = 2.872, SD = .547). Students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s was the variable with which students expressed the next strongest overall disagreement (M = 2.767, SD = .812). Students showed most overall agreement on the variable academic quality at PWI’s (M = 2.048, SD = .741). The variable faculty/student relationships at PWI’s was the second most overall agreed with items by the student respondents to the survey. The complete table of overall means for each of the variables are presented in Table 14.
Table 14

Overall Means for Each of the Variables to Which Eleventh Grade Public School Students Were Asked to Respond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships - HBCU</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Fit - HBCU</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships - PWI</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Fit - PWI</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Student Relationships- HBCU</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality - HBCU</td>
<td>2.355</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality - PWI</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Student Relationships- PWI</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree.

The students were asked to respond to the individual items on each sub-scale on a 5 point scale by selecting from a range of numbers, 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, and 5 = Strongly Disagree. An interpretive scale was set up by the researcher in order to rate the responses to the individuals items on each sub-scale. The scale was as follows: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree.

Students’ Perception of Quality of Education at HBCU’s

The respondents were requested to respond to items measuring students’ perception of the quality of education at historically black colleges and universities in
Louisiana. Of the individual items, ‘I will get a good job if I graduate from an HBI’ (M=2.605, SD=1.135) and ‘I will be well prepared for graduate school after attending an HBI’ (M=2.421, SD=.971) were the items with which students showed strongest disagreement (See Table 15). According to the interpretive scale, four items were in the ‘agree’ category and one item was in the ‘don’t know’ category. An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean on the scale was 2.355 (SD = .836).

**Students’ Perception of Quality of Education at PWI’s**

Students were also asked to respond to items that rated the students’ perception of quality of education at PWI’s. The items were identical to items on the sub-scale related to perception of quality of education at HBCU’s. Of these items, students least agreed with the items, ‘I can use the education in the future that I get at a PWI’* (M = 2.237, SD = .881) followed by the item ‘I will get a really good job if I graduate from a PWI’ (M=2.170, SD=.836). According to the interpretive scale, all of the items were in the “agree” category (see Table 15).

In order to examine the students’ perceptions of quality of education at PWI’s, an overall score was calculated for the items in this scale. This score was computed as the mean of the responses to the five items in this scale. The response scale used was a five point Likert-type scale ranging from 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree. The overall mean on the scale was 2.048 (SD = .741) (see Table 16).
Table 15

Perception of Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Quality of Education at HBCU's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will get a really good job if I graduate from an *HBI</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be well prepared for graduate school after attending an HBI</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will get a very good education at an HBI</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have to work hard to earn my degree at an HBI</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use the education in the future that I get at an HBI</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.355 (SD = .836)

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU.

Table 16

Perception of Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Quality of Education at PWI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can use the education in the future that I get at an PWI</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will get a really good job if I graduate from an PWI</td>
<td>2.170</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be well prepared for graduate school after a PWI</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will get a very good education at an PWI</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have to work hard to earn my degree at an PWI</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.048 (SD = .741)
Students' Perception of Faculty/Student Relationships at HBCU's

Four items were in the subs-scale, faculty/student relationships. The two items with which students most disagreed were 'I expect to have a good relationship with my professors at an HBI' and 'I will be graded fairly by the faculty if I attend an HBI'. The scores on the items were M=2.486/S.D.=1.822 and M=2.475/S.D.=1.108 respectively.

According to the interpretive scale, both items fell into the 'agree' category.

An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.389 (SD = .902) (see Table 17).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have a good relationship with my professors at an HBI</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be graded fairly by the faculty if I attend an HBI</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can go to faculty/staff if I have a problem outside of class at an HBI</td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can depend on my teachers to respect my culture - HBI</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don't Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 =Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don't Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall mean = 2.389 (SD = .902)

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU.
**Students' Perception of Faculty/Student Relationships at PWI's**

The students were asked to respond to four items that had a five point scale under the sub-scale, faculty/student relationships by selecting from a range of numbers, 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Don't Know, 4=Disagree, and 5=Strongly Disagree.

The items 'I expect to have a good relationship with my professors at a PWI' (M=2.266, SD=.906) and 'I can go to faculty/staff if I have a problem outside of class' (M=2.220, SD=.934) were those with which the students agreed least. However, according to the interpretive scale, both items were in the 'agree' category (see Table 18).

In order to examine the students' perceptions of faculty/student relationships at PWI's, an overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.183 (SD = .808).

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have a good relationship with my professors at a PWI</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can go to faculty/staff if I have a problem outside of class</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be graded fair by the faculty if I attend a PWI</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can depend on my teachers to respect my culture at a PWI</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don't Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don't Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.183 (SD = .808).
Anticipated Peer Relationships at HBCU's

Students were asked to respond to items that rated the students' perception of peer relationships at HBCU's. The students showed strongest disagreement with the items 'My same-race friends will tease me if I attend an HBI' and 'I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers at an HBI' (M = 3.614, SD = 1.264 and M = 3.222, SD = 1.142 respectively). According to the interpretive scale, the former item fell into the 'disagree' category while the latter was in the 'don't know' category.

An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.827 (SD = .647) (see Table 19).

Table 19

Perception of Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Peer Relationships at HBCU's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My same-race friends will tease me if I attend an *HBI</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not hear racist jokes if I attend an HBI</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be invited to social events with other-race peers at an HBI</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have lots of other-race friends at an HBI</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have good relationships with my peers</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don't Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don't Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.827 (SD = .647).

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU.
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Anticipated Peer Relationships at PWI's

Students were asked to respond to items that rated the students' perception of peer relationships at PWI's. The students showed strongest disagreement with the items 'My same-race friends will tease me if I attend a PWI' and 'I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers at a PWI' (M = 3.909 SD = 1.181 and M = 3.079, SD = 1.160 respectively). According to the interpretive scale, the former item fell into the 'disagree' category while the latter was in the 'don't know' category.

In order to examine the students' perceptions of peer relationships at PWI's, an overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.679 (SD = .567) (see Table 20).

Table 20

Perception of Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Peer Relationships at PWI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My same-race friends will tease me if I attend a PWI</td>
<td>3.909</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not hear racist jokes if I attend a PWI</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have lots of other-race friends at a PWI</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be invited to social events with other-race peers at a PWI</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have good relationships with my peers at a PWI</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don't Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don't Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.679 (SD = .567).
Anticipated Peer Relationships at Other-Race Universities

In order to achieve the objective of describing students' perceptions of peer relationships at 'other-race' universities, an overall mean was computed separately for white students and for black students. The overall means were found by calculating the white students' mean value on the variable students' perception of peer relationships at HBCU's and black students' mean value on the variable students' perception of peer relationships at PWI's. The overall mean for white students' perception of peer relationships at HBCU's was 2.870 (SD = .597) and for black students regarding the perception of peer relationships at PWI's was 2.594 (SD = .616). According to the interpretive scale, both means were in the 'Don't Know' category.

The overall score computed for the sub-scale relative to students' expectation of peer relationships on other-race campuses required that all the individual items included in the sub-scale be coded so that the positive response was consistently in the same response direction. For example, on this sub-scale a positive response to the item, 'I will not hear racist jokes if I attend an HBI' was agreement (1=strongly agree) while disagreement would be the positive response to the item, 'My same race friends will tease me if I attend an HBI'. Therefore, the responses to the items were reverse coded so that all of the items would have the more positive response as agreement and the mean of the five items in the sub-scale was calculated to measure the overall peer relationships score.
Of the individual items related to expected peer relationships on other-race campuses, the items with which the white students most disagreed were 'I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers at an HBI' (M = 3.395, SD = 1.016) and 'My same race friends will tease me if I attend an HBI ' (M = 3.281, SD = 1.190). According to the scale developed by the researcher, both items rated within the category, 'don't know'(see Table 19).

In order to examine the white students' perceptions of peer relationships at other-race universities, an overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.870 (SD = .597) (see Table 21).

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will not hear racist jokes if I attend an *HBI</td>
<td>3.395</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My same-race friends will tease me if I attend an HBI</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be invited to social events with other-race peers at an HBI</td>
<td>2.791</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have good relationships with my peers</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have lots of other-race friends at an HBI</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 =Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.870 (SD = .597)

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU
Black students rated the items in a similar manner when given the same choices in reference to Predominately White Institutions. The item ‘My same race friends will tease me if I attend a PWI’ (M = 3.455, SD = 1.291) was most disagreed with by black students on the sub-scale students’ perceptions of peer relationships on other-race campuses. The mean score for this item therefore fell into the ‘don’t know’ category on the interpretive scale. The item, ‘I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers’ (M = 3.119, SD = 1.213) was the second most disagreed with item among black students. This item rated within the category, ‘don’t know’.

An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.594 (SD = .616) (see Table 22).

Table 22

Perception of Black Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Peer Relationships at Other-Race Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My same-race friends will tease me if I attend an PWI</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers if I attend an PWI</td>
<td>3.119</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be invited to social events with other-race peers at an PWI</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have lots of other-race friends at an PWI</td>
<td>2.106</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to have good relationships with my peers</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.594 (SD = .616)
Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU's

Students were asked to respond to items that rated the students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's. The students showed strongest disagreement with the item 'I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend an HBI' (M = 2.864, SD = 1.135). The students showed strongest agreement with the item 'I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do if I attend an HBI' (M = 2.588, SD = 1.222). Both items were in the 'don't know' category.

An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.767(SD = .812) (see Table 23).

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend</td>
<td>2.864</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an HBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience racial discrimination at an HBI</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the students respect racial differences at HBI's</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at an HBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 =Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.767 (SD = .812)

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU
Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at PWI's

Students were asked to respond to items that rated the students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's. The students showed strongest disagreement with the item ‘Most of the students respect racial differences at PWI's’ (M = 2.599, SD = .949). The students showed strongest agreement with the item ‘I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do if I attend an PWI’ (M = 2.237, SD = 1.023). The former item was in the ‘don’t know’ category, while the latter was in the ‘agree’ category.

An overall score was calculated for the items included in this scale. The overall mean was 2.491(SD = .790) (see Table 24).

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the students respect racial differences at PWI's</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend a PWI</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience racial discrimination at a PWI</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do at a PWI</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 =Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.491 (SD = .790)
Students’ Perceptions of Socio-Cultural Fit on Other-Race Campuses

The means for the individual items under the sub-scale for the variable, students’ perception of socio-cultural fit on other-race campuses was computed into a single mean for each of the two groups, white students and black students. The students’ responses were measured for white students (M = 2.917, SD = .800) and for black students (M = 2.792, SD = .851). The overall mean for this sub-scale was in the ‘don’t know’ category regarding white students’ perception of socio-cultural fit on other-race campuses. The overall mean for the same sub-scale fell into the ‘don’t know’ category on the interpretive scale for black respondents regarding other-race campuses.

Regarding individual items on the variable perceived socio-cultural ‘fit’ on other-race campuses, white students showed strongest disagreement with the items ‘I do not expect to experience racial discrimination if I attend an HBI’ (M = 3.127, SD = 1.174) and ‘I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend an HBI’ (mean = 2.909, SD = 1.010). According to the scale developed by the researcher, both items rated within the category, ‘don’t know’ category. The item with which white students showed strongest agreement was ‘I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do at an HBI’ (M = 2.764, SD = 1.196) According to the instrument developed by the researcher, this item fell into the ‘don’t know’ category regarding the variable. Table 25 shows the white students’ ratings on the items relating to peer relationship expectations at HBCU’s.
Table 25

Perception of White Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Socio-Cultural Fit at Other-Race Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience racial discrimination at an *HBI</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend an HBI</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the students respect racial differences at HBI's</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do at an HBI</td>
<td>2.764</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.917 (SD = .800)

*HBI-Historically Black Institution was used on the survey instrument for purposes of consistency and is interchangeable with HBCU

Black students were asked to respond to items that addressed perception of socio-cultural fit on other-race campuses. The black students disagreed most with the item ‘I will not experience racial discrimination if I attend a PWI’ (M = 3.046, SD = 1.246) and ‘I will not experience violence by other students if I attend a PWI’ (M = 2.851, SD = 1.209). Both items rated within the category, ‘Don’t Know.’ The following table depicts the black students’ responses to the items (see Table 26).
Table 26

Perception of Black Eleventh Grade Public School Student Respondents Regarding Socio-Cultural Fit at Other-Race Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience racial discrimination at a PWI</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend a PWI</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the students respect racial differences at a PWI's</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do at a PWI</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree; Interpretive Scale: 1 to 1.5 = Strongly Agree, 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree, 2.51 to 3.49 = Don’t Know, 3.50 to 4.49 = Disagree, and 4.5 to 5.00 = Strongly disagree. Overall Mean = 2.792 (SD = .851)

Objective Two

Objective two of this study compared the scores of black and white students on several affective characteristics. Those selected characteristics included:

a. Perception of quality of education at HBCU’s
b. Perception of quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
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h. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

In accordance with the intent and purpose of the study, the variable race included only white and black students' responses to the items on the instrument. Therefore, race was measured as a dichotomous variable while all items representing the dependent variables were measured at the interval level. The items under each of the four categories, Peer Relationships, Faculty/Staff Relationships, Socio-Cultural Fit and Academic Quality, were computed into a single mean score for each of the respective categories. Where appropriate, reverse worded items were coded so that positive responses were all in the same direction. The t-test procedure was used to compare the means for each of the groups (white and black students) on the selected categories.

Students' Perception of Academic Quality at HBCU's and PWI's

Student perception of academic quality at HBCU's was the dependent variable in this part of the objective. The t-test was used to compare the means of the students within the independent variable (race) group. The black students more strongly agreed that they could receive a good quality education at an HBCU ($M = 2.036, SD = 762$) than did white students ($M = 2.554, SD = .822$). The mean score for black students fell into the 'Agree' category on the interpretive scale while the white students' scores fell into the 'Don't Know' range. Results of the t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups of students ($t_{73} = -4.165, p = .001$) (see Table 27).
The t-test procedure was used to compare the scores on the category, students' perception of academic quality at PWI's. Both black students and white students agreed that they could receive a quality education at a PWI. The mean score for black students (M = 2.045, SD = .7619) and that for white students (M = 2.049, SD = .8391) were almost identical on this variable. There were no significant difference (t_{175} = -.037, p = .970) between black and white students' perception of academic quality at PWI's (see Table 27).

Table 27

Comparison of Overall Means of Black and White Students on the Variables Perception of Academic Quality at HBCU's and PWI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception/ Type Institution</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality/ HBCU</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.165</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality/ PWI</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students' Perception of Faculty/Student Relationships at HBCU's and PWI's

A t-test was conducted in order to compare black and white students' scores on perception of faculty/staff relationships at HBCU's and at PWI's. Black students more strongly agreed that they could expect positive faculty/student relationships on the campus of an HBCU. The mean score for black students was 2.187 (SD = .909) and the mean score for white students was 2.500 (SD = .881). Results of the t-test were found to be significantly different (t_{173} = -2.261, p = <.05). The mean scores for students'
perception of faculty/staff relationships at PWI's were also significantly different. White students agreed more strongly than black students regarding their perception of relationships between faculty and students at a PWI. The mean score for white students was 2.0091 (SD = .700) as compared to the mean of 2.474 (SD = .895) for black students. The scores were found to be significantly different ($t_{174} = 3.833, p < .01$) (see Table 28).

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>2.474</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>n=66</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students' Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU's and PWI's

The students in the study were asked to rate their perceptions of their own social and cultural fit on the campus of HBCU's and PWI's. The mean score for black students and for white students were computed for the selected variables. The scores were then compared between the two groups in order to determine differences. The t-test procedure was used to determine if the difference between the groups' mean scores was significant.

The mean score for black students was 2.519 (SD = .775) regarding perception of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of HBCU's while the score for white students was
2.917 (SD = .800). Although the mean score for both groups of students fell into the 'Don't Know' category, the t-test indicated that the difference between the mean scores for the two groups of students was significant ($t_{173} = -3.231, p < .01$).

On the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's, the mean score for black students was 2.792 (SD = .851). The white students' mean score was 2.310, SD = .693. The mean scores were found to be significantly different ($t_{173} = 4.087, p = < .01$) between the groups of black students and white students (see Table 29).

Table 29

Comparison of Overall Means of Black and White Students on the Variables Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU's and PWI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception/Type Institution</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Fit-HBCU's</td>
<td>2.519</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=66$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$n=109$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.231</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Fit-PWI's</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=66$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$n=109$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students' Perception of Peer Relationships at HBCU's and PWI's

Black and white students were also compared on their scores relative to their perception of anticipated peer relationships at HBCU's. Both groups of students indicated by their mean score on this item that they didn’t know if they would experience positive peer relationships at an HBCU. The mean score for black students on the variable perception of peer relationships at HBCU's was 2.758 (SD = .616) and the score for white students was 2.870 (SD = .597). The groups of students were similar regarding
their uncertainty that they would have positive peer relationships at an HBCU. The t-test procedure showed that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups was not significant ($t_{173} = -1.113, p = .267$).

Black students and white students were compared on their scores for the variable students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s. The mean score for black students was 2.594 (SD = .616) and the mean score for white students was 2.730 (SD = .532). The mean scores for the two groups both fell into the don’t know category regarding peer relationships on the campus of a PWI. The independent t-test procedure was used to compare the means of the two groups of students. The difference between the means of the two groups of students was not found to be significant ($t_{172} = -1.541, p = .125$). Table 30 shows the results of the t-test.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception/ Type Institution</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Perception HBCU’s</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>2.870</td>
<td>-1.113</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=66</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer perception PWI’s</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>-1.541</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=65</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ Perception of Previous Other-Race Contact

Students were asked to rate the amount of contact that they had previously experienced with other-race students in their home, their schools, and their
neighborhoods. The mean for black students was 7.985 (SD = .1.927) and the mean for white students was 8.209 (SD = .1.887). The results of the t-test showed the difference between the groups’ means was not significant (see Table 31).

Table 31

Comparison of Means of Black and White Students on The Variable Overall Perception of Previous Other-Race Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception of Other-Race Contact</td>
<td>7.985 1.927</td>
<td>8.209 1.887</td>
<td>-.760</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=67</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Three

Objective three was to compare male and female Louisiana public high school students on selected affective characteristics. The affective characteristics included were:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships at HBCU’s
h. Anticipated peer relationships at PWI’s
Male and female high school students were compared on their mean scores for items that measured perception for each of the dependent variables, academic quality, peer relationships, faculty/student relationships, and socio-cultural fit. An independent t-test was used to compare the means of the two groups (male and female). The results of the tests are contained in Table 28.

**Students' Perception of Academic Quality at HBCU's and PWI's**

Regarding male and female overall means scores for the dependent variable, student perception of academic quality at HBCU's, the mean score for males was 2.378 (SD = .974) and for females was 2.336 (SD = .698). The scores were not found to be significantly different according to the t-test results ($t_{173} = .335$, $p = .738$).

On the dependent variable, academic quality at PWI's, the overall mean score for males was 1.998 (SD = .767) whereas the mean score for females was 2.092 (SD = .719). The students' scores for perception of academic quality at PWI's produced no significant differences between the two groups ($t_{175} = -.841$, $p = .402$).

**Students' Perception of Faculty/Student Relationships at HBCU's and PWI's**

Male and female students were compared on their scores for perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s and at PWI’s. The mean score for males on perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s was 2.319 (SD = .878) and for females was 2.435 (SD = .9242). The mean score for males regarding perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s was 2.181 (SD = .835) and was 2.186 (SD = .788) for females. The scores were not found to be significantly different between males and
females on either perceptions of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s ($t_{173} = -0.845, p = 0.399$) or on the campus of a PWI ($t_{174} = -0.039, p = 0.969$).

**Students’ Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU’s and PWI’s**

The mean scores for male and female students’ perception of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of HBCU’s and PWI’s were compared. The male students’ mean score for perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s was 2.714 (SD = .876) while the mean score for females was 2.815 (SD = .753). The mean score for perception of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of PWI’s for males was 2.456 (SD = .849) and the mean score for females on this variable was 2.522 (SD = .737). The results of the $t$-test showed no significant differences between the scores of the two groups regarding either HBCU’s ($t_{173} = -0.821, p = 0.413$) or PWI’s ($t_{173} = -0.536, p = 0.593$).

**Students’ Perception of Peer Relationships at HBCU’s and PWI’s**

Comparisons were made between the groups of male and female students on their mean scores regarding perception of peer relationships on the campuses of HBCU’s and on the campuses of PWI’s. The mean score for males on perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s was 2.861 (SD = .729) and the mean score for females on this variable was 2.798 (.566). The mean score for males regarding perception of peer relationships at PWI’s was 2.644 (SD = .621) whereas the mean score for the female group of students was 2.710 (SD = .5180). The scores were not significantly different between the groups on perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s ($t_{173} = .643, p = .521$) or for perception of peer relationships at PWI’s ($t_{172} = -0.756, p = .451$).
Students’ Perception of Previous Other-Race Contact

The mean other-race contact score for males was 7.807 (SD = 1.797) and the mean other-race contact score for females was 8.404 (SD = 1.953). The results of the independent t-test showed that there was a significant difference regarding the male and female students’ mean score on the variable students’ perception of previous other-race contact (t175 = -2.107, p = .037). Females had significantly more contact with other-race students than did males (see Table 32).

Table 32

Comparison of Selected Affective Measures Regarding HBCU’s and PWI’s by Gender of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception of</td>
<td>7.807</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>8.404</td>
<td>1.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other-race contact</td>
<td>n = 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Four

Objective four was to describe any interactive effects of race and gender on selected affective characteristics. The affective characteristics noted were as follows:

a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an PWI

g. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus on an HBCU

h. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus on an PWI

i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

A Factorial Analysis of Variance was used to determine interaction effects of race and gender on the selected dependent variables. The dependent variables in the test were students' perception of academic quality, perception of faculty/student relationships, perception of peer relationships, perception of socio-cultural fit and perceived level of previous other-race contact. All of the dependent variables except perceived level of previous other-race contact were tested relative to both HBCU's and PWI's. The two factor ANOVA provided the results relative to whether there were any significant interaction effects. Table 28 contains the results of the test.

**Students' Perception of Academic Quality at HBCU's and PWI's**

In the first analysis, students' perception of academic quality was the dependent variable. The interaction effects of race and gender were assessed for both HBCU's and PWI's. Results of the two factor ANOVA indicated that, regarding the variable students' perception of academic quality at HBCU's, there were no significant interaction effects for race and gender ($F_{(1,171)} = .929, p = .336$). There was no significant interaction of race and gender regarding the variable students' perception of academic quality at PWI's ($F_{(1,173)} = .195, p = .660$).
Students' Perception of Faculty/Student Relationships at HBCU's and PWI's

The Test of Between-Subjects Effects showed there to be no significant interaction effects on the students’ mean scores regarding perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s \((F_{(1,171)} = .580, \ p = .447)\). There were also no significant interactions noted for students’ perception of faculty/staff and student relationships at PWI’s \((F_{(1,172)} = .502, \ p = .480)\).

Students' Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU's and PWI's

The two factor ANOVA yielded no significant interaction for race and gender on either student perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s \((F_{(1,171)} = .046, \ p = .831)\) or the students’ perception of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of PWI’s \((F_{(1,171)} = .378, \ p = .539)\).

Students' Perception of Peer Relationships at HBCU's and PWI's

The two factor ANOVA showed that there was a significant interaction effect for race and gender as it relates to perceptions of peer relationships at HBCU’s \((F_{(1,171)} = 5.348, \ p = .022)\) (see Table 33). There was a dis-ordinal interaction between the four groups of students. White males disagreed more than did black males regarding the variable students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s \((M = 2.989, \ SD = .709\) and \(M = 2.628, \ SD = .721\) respectively). Black females showed stronger disagreement than did white females on the variable students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s \((M = 2.860, \ SD = .713\) and \(M = 2.757, \ SD = .446\) respectively (see Table 33).
The overall mean score of the students on the dependent variable, perception of peer relationships at PWI's were also assessed for possible interaction effects of race and gender. The results of the two factor ANOVA showed that there was no significant interaction between the two groups ($F(11,70) = .334, \ p = .564$).

Students' Perception of Other-Race Contact

The students' reports of other race contact was analyzed in order to ascertain if there was an interaction of race and gender on the students' perceived amount of previous other race contact. The two factor ANOVA was used to conduct this analysis. The results of the ANOVA indicated no significant interaction relative to race and gender on the variable students' perception of other-race contact ($F(1,173) = 3.690, \ p = .056$).
Objective Five

Objective five of the study was to determine if a relationship exists between the students’ level of other-race contact and selected perceptions of other-race universities. The perceptions being tested were perception of quality of education at other-race universities, anticipated faculty/student relationships at other-race universities, anticipated peer relationships at other-race universities, and perception of social and cultural fit on the campus of other-race universities. The analysis was done separately for each of two groups of students (blacks and whites) in order to assess perceptions toward “other-race” universities.

Therefore, the Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation procedure was used to assess the linear relationship between perceived amount of other-race contact and each of the other variables in the objective. For interpretation of correlation coefficients, Davis’ proposed set of descriptors was used (Davis, 1971) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>very strong association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between Black Students’ Perception of Other-Race Contact and Selected Variables

Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation results indicated that there was no significant relationship between black students’ perception of other-race contact and their
perceptions of academic quality at PWI’s ($r = -0.017, p = 0.889$). There was no significant relationship between black students’ perceived level of other-race contact and their perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s ($r = 0.078, p = 0.533$). There was also no significant relationship between black students’ perceived level of other-race contact and socio-cultural fit at PWI’s ($r = 0.156, p = 0.208$) (see Table 34).

White Students’ Perception of Other-Race Contact and Selected Variables

The examination of data revealed no significant relationship between white students’ level of other-race contact and the students’ perception of academic quality at HBCU’s ($r = -0.181, p = 0.061$) (see Table 34).

Table 34

Relationships between Black and White Students’ Perceived Level of Other-Race Contact and Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Students’ Perception</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality at PWI’s</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student relationships at PWI’s</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural fit at PWI’s</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships at PWI’s</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Students’ Perception</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality at HBCU’s</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationships at HBCU’s</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective Six

Objective six was to determine if a model existed to explain a significant portion of the variance in the students' perceived social and cultural fit at HBCU's and PWI’s. This particular variable was included in this objective because students are often “channeled” by influences outside the home in directions that impact their decision-making process to participate in higher education or in this case, where to participate in higher education (Freeman, 1997). The predictor variables were as follows:

a. Race
b. Gender
c. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
d. Racial make-up of high school attended
e. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
f. Student’s plans regarding college attendance
h. Students’ report of close other-race friendships
i. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
j. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
k. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
l. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
m. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
n. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

The objective was accomplished using multiple regression analysis with students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s as the dependent variable. The other variables
were treated as independent variables and step-wise entry of the variables was used because of the exploratory nature of the study. In this regression model, variables were added that increased the explained variance by one percent or more as long as the regression model remained significant.

The dichotomous variables in the study were coded into numeric categories for the purposes of the study. For the variable, race, black was coded as “1” and white was coded “2”. For the variable gender, male was coded as “1” and female coded as “2”. The racial balance of the respondents’ high school was coded with “1” representing the schools that fell into the 60-40 stated criteria and “2” representing those that did not. Type of school attended was also coded with “1” representing magnet schools and “2” representing regular public high schools.

**Relationship between Students’ Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at PWI’s and Selected Variables**

For descriptive purposes, two-way correlations between the factors that were used as independent variables in the regression procedure and the scores on the dependent variable socio-cultural fit are presented in Table 35. The strongest relationship between students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s and the selected variables was found to be with the variable students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s \( (r = .737, p = .<.001) \). Students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s and students’ perception of academic quality at PWI’s presented the next two strongest relationships with the variable students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s \( (r = .523, p = .<.001 \) and \( r = .464, p = .<.001 \) respectively).
Table 35

Relationship between Selected Variables and Students’ Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at PWI’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff relationships-PWI</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships-PWI</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-PWI</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships-HBI</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural fit-HBI</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff relationships-HBI</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to attend college</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-HBI</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived level of other-race contact</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Race (Black = 1, White = 2); Plans to Attend College (Will Attend College = 1, Will not Attend = 2, Undecided = 3); Gender (Male = 1, Female = 2), Type of School Attended (Magnet School = 1, Regular School = 2)

The variable which entered the model first was students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s. Considered alone, this variable contributed 54.4% of the variance in students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s.

Four other predictor variables explained an additional 13.3% of the variance in students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s. The five variables explained a total of 66.7% of the variance in students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s. The students’
perception of faculty/student and peer relationships at PWI's were associated positively with the perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's. On the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's, black students tended to be associated with the higher values thereby showing more disagreement the measure than white students regarding perception of socio-cultural fit. The students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's and perceived amount of other-race contact were positively associated with perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s (see Table 36).

Table 36

Regression Analysis for Students' Perceptions of Socio-Cultural Fit at PWI's and Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.019</td>
<td>54.047</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F-Change</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student-PWI</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>190.739</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relations-PWI</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>17.370</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>12.699</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc-fit/HBCU</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>16.343</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-race contact</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>5.177</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continued)
### Variables not in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans to attend college</td>
<td>-.982</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-HBI</td>
<td>-2.120</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-PWI</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student relationships-HBI</td>
<td>-1.588</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships-HBI</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Race (Black = 1, White = 2); Plans to Attend College (Will Attend College = 1, Will not Attend = 2, Undecided = 3); Gender (Male = 1, Female = 2), Type of School Attended (Magnet School = 1, Regular School = 2)

#### Students’ Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU’s and Selected Variables

Students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at Historically Black Colleges and Universities was used as the dependent variable in the second analysis. For descriptive purposes, two-way correlations between the factors that were used as independent variables in the regression procedure and the scores on the dependent variable socio-cultural fit are presented in Table 37. The strongest relationship between students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s and the selected variables was found to be with the variable students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s ($r = .668$, $p = <.001$). Students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s and students’ perception of academic quality at HBCU’s presented the next two strongest relationships with the variable students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s ($r = .647$, $p = <.001$ and $r = .596$, $p = <.001$ respectively).
The independent variables gender, race, racial balance of school, and type of school attended were coded using the same procedure as for students’ perception socio-cultural fit at PWI’s. The step-wise entry method was again used in this analysis.

The variable that entered the model first was student perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s. Considered alone, this variable contributed 44.6% of the variance in students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s.

Five other predictor variables explained an additional 23.6% of the variance in students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s. Those variables included the following: students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s, students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s, academic quality at HBCU’s, students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s, socio-cultural fit at PWI’s, and type of school attended. The sum of the six variables explained a total of 68.2% of the variance in students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s (see Table 38).

The students’ perception of faculty/student relationships, peer relationships, and academic quality at HBCU’s tended to be associated positively with perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s. Students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s was positively associated with perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s.

Perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s and type of school attended (magnet or regular) were negatively associated with the students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s (see Table 38).
Table 37

**Relationship between Selected Variables and Students’ Perception of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU’s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff relationships-HBI</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships-HBI</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-HBI</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships-PWI</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural fit-PWI</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-PWI</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of other-race contact</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student relationships-PWI</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to attend college</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Race (Black = 1, White = 2); Plans to Attend College (Will Attend College = 1, Will not Attend = 2, Undecided = 3); Gender (Male = 1, Female = 2), Type of School Attended (Magnet School = 1, Regular School = 2)

Table 38

**Regression Analysis for Students’ Perceptions of Socio-Cultural Fit at HBCU’s and Predictor Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.840</td>
<td>55.223</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Variables in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student-HBI</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>128.786</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relations-HBI</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>45.006</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-HBI</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>18.348</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Student-PWI</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>5.697</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural fit-PWI</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>21.776</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>4.328</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables not in the Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to attend college</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality-PWI</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of other-race contact</td>
<td>-.782</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Race (Black = 1, White = 2); Plans to Attend College (Will Attend College = 1, Will not Attend = 2, Undecided = 3); Gender (Male = 1, Female = 2); Type of School Attended (Magnet School = 1, Regular School = 2)

The overall results of the study demonstrate that 11th students who live in near proximity to HBCU's and PWI's have measurable perceptions of these types of institutions prior to completion of high school. The students' perceptions differ along racial lines but few differences exist relative to gender or amount of previous other-race contact. A significant model was also found which explains the variance in students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's and PWI's.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS,
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to examine Louisiana high school students' perceptions regarding two types of universities in Louisiana, HBCU's and PWI's. To accomplish the purpose of this exploratory study, specific objectives were formulated to guide this researcher.

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Describe high school students in Louisiana on selected demographic and affective characteristics including the following:
   a. Race
   b. Gender
   c. Gender and Race
   d. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
   e. Racial make-up of high school attended
   f. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
   g. Student's plans regarding college attendance
   h. Type of higher education institution students planned to attend
   i. Students' report of close other-race friendships
   j. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
   k. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
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l. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
m. Perceptions of faculty-student relationships at PWI's
n. Perceptions of peer relationships at an "other-race" college/university, and
o. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an "other-race" college/university.

2 Compare white and black high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
   b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
   c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
   d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
   e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
   f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
   g. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
   h. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI
   i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

3. Compare male and female high school students in Louisiana on the following selected affective characteristics:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU's
   b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI's
   c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU's
   d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI's
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships at HBCU’s
h. Anticipated peer relationships at PWI’s
i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

4. Describe interaction effects of race and gender on Louisiana high school students’ perceptions regarding the following selected affective characteristics:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
   b. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
c. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
d. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
e. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on an HBCU
f. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus on a PWI
g. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus on an HBCU
h. Anticipated peer relationships on the campus on a PWI
i. Perception of level of previous other-race contact

5. Determine if a relationship exists between the self perceived amount of other-race contact and the following perceptions of other-race colleges/ universities:
   a. Perceptions of the quality of education at other-race colleges/ universities
   b. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at other-race colleges/ universities
c. Anticipated peer relationships at an “other-race” college/ university
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d. Perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of "other-race colleges/universities.

6. Determine if a model exists which explains a significant portion of the variance in the perceived social and cultural fit on the campus of "other-race" college/university from the following characteristics:
   a. Race
   b. Gender
   c. Perception of level of previous other-race contact
   d. Racial make-up of high school attended
   e. Type of high school attended (magnet or regular program)
   f. Student’s plans regarding college attendance
   g. Students’ report of close other-race friendships
   h. Perceptions of the quality of education at HBCU’s
   i. Perceptions of the quality of education at PWI’s
   j. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at HBCU’s
   k. Anticipated faculty-student relationships at PWI’s
   l. Anticipated peer relationships at an HBCU
   m. Anticipated peer relationships at a PWI

Procedures

The target population for this study was defined as high school students in Louisiana who are prospective university students. The accessible population for this study was defined as eleventh grade students who attend schools that are reported to be racially...
balanced (60-40 either race majority or its nearest proximity) and located within a parish where there is a pairing of an HBCU and a PWI. The sampling technique used is called a purposive sample. The usable sample size totaled 177.

A researcher developed instrument, validated by a panel of experts and field tested by a group of 11th grade students in a racially balanced school that had been excluded from the study, was used for data collection. Revisions were made to the instrument based on a review of the literature, the researcher’s doctoral committee, expert panel recommendations, and finally, as a result of the field test. A final version of the instrument was used to collect the data.

The final instrument completed consisted of three sections. In the first section, the respondent was asked to provide demographic information. This information was used to describe the respondents’ race and gender, thereby addressing objective 1. Section one will also provide information for addressing objectives 4, 6, and 8, and 10. Section two and three were identical with the exception that the questions in section two pertained to HBCU’s and section three pertained to PWI’s. Both section two and three of the questionnaire consisted of four subsections with a total of 18 Likert-type items. The subsections were (1) Peer Interaction, which addressed high school students’ perceptions of how much they will be accepted by their peers on university campuses (2) Professor/Staff Relationships, which addressed the perceived expected relationships between students and university staff persons on university campuses (3) Socio-cultural fit, which referred to the perceived racial climate on university campuses and (4)
Academic Quality, which referred to the perceived value of the education received at a certain university type.

Data Analysis

The alpha was set at .05 a priori. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients were used to analyze the data.

Findings

1. Findings related to objective one (student demographics) included the following:
   (a) Of the 177 students in the sample, the majority (n= 110, 62.1%) were white/ Caucasian American while 67 students (37.9%) were black/ African American.
   (b) The majority of the students (n=94, 53.1%) were female and 83 students (46.9%) reported their gender as male.
   (c) The majority of students were white females (n= 58, 32.8%) followed by white males (n= 54, 30.5%), black females (n = 36, 20.3%) and black males (n = 29, 16.4%).
   (d) Regarding the students' perception of other-race contact, the largest group of students were found to be in the "little contact" category (n=80, 45.2%).
   (e) A minority of students (n= 69, 39.0%) attended racially balanced schools while the majority (n = 108, 61.0%) did not attend schools defined within the 60-40 racial balance criterium.
(f) Students were almost equally divided between those attending "regular public high schools" (n = 90, 50.8%) those attending "magnet schools" (n = 87, 49.2%).

(g) One hundred fifty-six students (88.1%) reported that they planned to attend a four year university. Sixteen students (9.0%) reported that they did not plan to attend college. Three students (1.7%) reported that they were undecided whether they would attend college.

(h) The majority of the students (n= 108, 60.5%) reported that they planned to attend a predominately white institution (PWI). Forty-eight students (27.1%) of the students reported that they were undecided where they would attend college. Only 12 students (6.8%) reported plans to attend a historically black college/university (HBCU). Eight students (4.5%) reported plans to attend community college, technical school, or military service.

(i) The majority of both black students (n= 44, 68.8%) and white students (n= 70, 63.1%) reported that the number of their "close other-race friends” were ‘fifty-percent or less’ regarding the overall percentage of their friends.

(j) On a five point Likert-type scale with a range of one to five (1= strongly agree and five = strongly disagree), students had a mean score of 2.355 (SD=.836) on the variable perception of quality of education at HBCU’s, falling into the “agree” category.
(k) On a five point Likert-type scale, students had a mean score of 2.048 (SD=.741) on the variable perception of quality of education at PWI’s, falling into the “agree” category.

(l) On a five point Likert-type scale, students had a mean score of 2.380 (SD=.902) on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s which also fell into the “agree” category.

(m) On a five point Likert-type scale, students had a mean score of 2.183 (SD=.808) on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s, falling into the “agree” category.

(n) White students’ mean score was 2.870 (SD=.597) on the variable perception of peer relationships at other-race universities falling into the “don’t know” category.

(o) Black students had a mean score of 2.594 (SD=.616) on the variable perception of peer relationships at other-race universities which fell into the “don’t know” category.

(p) White students’ mean score was 2.917 (SD=.800) on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at other-race universities which fell into the “don’t know” category.

(q) Black students had a mean score of 2.792 (SD=.851) on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at other-race universities which also fell into the “don’t know” category.
Findings related to objective two (racial group comparisons) were as follows:

(a) Black students had a significantly more positive perception of academic quality at HBCU’s (mean = 2.036) than did white students (mean = 2.554) \((t_{173} = -4.165, p < .001)\).

(b) No significant difference was found between black and white students’ perceptions of quality of education at PWI’s.

(c) Black students held a significantly more positive perception regarding faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s (mean = 2.187) than did white students (mean = 2.500) \((t_{173} = -2.261, p < .05)\).

(c) White students held a significantly more positive perception regarding faculty/student relationships at PWI’s (mean = 2.009) than did black students (mean = 2.474) \((t_{174} = 3.833, p < .01)\).

(d) Black students’ perceptions of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of HBCU’s were significantly more positive (mean = 2.519) than were those for white students (mean = 2.917) \((t_{173} = -3.231, p < .01)\).

(e) White students’ perceptions of socio-cultural fit on the campuses of PWI’s were significantly more positive (mean = 2.310) than were those for black students (mean = 2.792) \((t_{173} = 4.087, p < .01)\).

(f) No statistically significant difference between black and white students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(g) No statistically significant difference between black and white students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s was found.
(h) No statistically significant difference between black and white students’ perception of other-race contact was found.

Findings related to objective three (gender comparison) included the following:

(a) No significance between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of academic quality at HBCU’s was found.

(b) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of academic quality at PWI’s was found.

(c) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(d) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s was found.

(e) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s was found.

(f) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s was found.

(g) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(h) No significant difference between the scores of males and females on the variable perception of peer relationships at PWI’s was found.

(i) A significant difference was found between the perceived level of other-race contact by female students (mean = 8.404) and the scores of male students (7.807) ($t_{175} = -2.107, p = .451$).
Findings related to objective four (interaction of gender and race) included the following:

(a) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of quality of education at HBCU’s was found.

(b) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of quality of education at PWI’s was found.

(c) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(d) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s was found.

(e) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s was found.

(f) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s was found.

(g) A significant interaction effect of race and gender was found regarding the variable perception of peer relationships on the campus of HBCU’s ($p = .022$).

(h) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of peer relationships at PWI’s was found.

(i) No significant interaction effects of race and gender on the variable perception of other-race contact was found.
Findings related to objective five were as follows:

(a) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of academic quality at HBCU’s was found.

(b) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of academic quality at PWI’s was found.

(c) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(d) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s was found.

(e) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s was found.

(f) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of peer relationships at PWI’s was found.

(g) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s was found.

(h) No significant relationship between students’ perception of other-race contact and perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s was found.

The findings related to objective six (model for socio-cultural fit) were as follows:

(a) A significant model was found which explained a significant portion (67.7%) of the variance in perceived social and cultural fit on other-race campuses (PWI’s and HBCU’s). Regarding PWI’s, six variables met the criteria for entrance into the significant model ($F = 190.739$, $p < .001$). Those variables
were students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at PWI's, students' perception of peer relationships at PWI's, race, students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's, students' perception of amount of other-race contact, and region.

(b) A significant model was found which explained a significant portion (68.2%) of the variance in perceived social and cultural fit on the campuses of HBCU's. Eight variables met the criteria for entrance into the significant model. Those variables were students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at HBCU's, students' perception of peer relationships at HBCU's, region, type of school attended (magnet or regular), students' perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI's, students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's, and students' perception of academic quality at PWI's.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Since the results of the study were obtained using a purposive sample, it cannot be generalized to all Louisiana 11th grade students. Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made by the researcher:

Conclusions for Objective One

The majority of 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU's and PWI's in Louisiana are white female students in racially balanced schools who had little other-race contact or close other-race friends. The majority of the students also attend magnet schools and have plans to attend a four-year predominately white institution of higher education.
The conclusions are based on the findings that 110 (62.1%) of the students in the study reported their race as white/Caucasian American, that 94 (53.1%) of the students in the study reported their gender as female, that 58 (32.8%) of the students were white female, and that 80 students (45.2%) reported that they had little other-race contact in their church, school, or neighborhood. Also, 69 students (39.0%) were found to be attending racially balanced schools, 87 students (49.2%) were attending magnet schools, 156 students (88.1%) had plans to attend a four-year university, and 108 students (60.5%) had plans to attend a predominately white university. The conclusion regarding close other-race friendships were based on the finding that the majority of the black students (n = 44, 68.8%) and the majority of white students (n = 70, 63.1%) reported that they have some but less than 50% of close other-race friends.

The average 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana believe that they can get a good quality education at HBCU’s. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score on the variable student perception of academic quality at HBCU’s (mean = 2.355, SD = .836) was in the “agree” category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana believe that the quality of education offered at PWI’s is of good quality. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score on the variable student perception of academic quality at PWI’s (mean = 2.048, SD = .741) was in the ‘agree’ category on the
Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average white 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana believe that they will have a good relationship with faculty/staff at HBCU’s. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score on the variable student perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s (mean = 2.380, SD = .902) was in the ‘agree’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average black 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana believe that they will have a good relationship with the faculty/staff at PWI’s. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score on the variable student perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s (mean = 2.183, SD = .808) was in the ‘agree’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average white 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana are not sure if they will be accepted among their peers at HBCU’s. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score for white students on the variable student perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s (mean = 2.870, SD = .597) was in the ‘Don’t Know’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.
The average black 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU's and PWI's in Louisiana are not sure whether they will be accepted by their peers at other-race universities. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score for black students on the variable student perception of peer relationships at PWI’s (mean = 2.594, SD = .616) was in the ‘Don’t Know’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average white 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana are not sure if their own social and cultural background would be valued at an other-race university. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score for white students on the variable student perception of socio-cultural fit at other-race universities (mean = 2.917, SD = .800) was in the ‘Don’t Know’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.

The average black 11th grade students who live in close proximity to HBCU’s and PWI’s in Louisiana are unsure if they will fit socially and culturally on the campus of an other-race universities. This conclusion was based on the finding that the mean score for black students on the variable student perception of socio-cultural fit at other-race universities (mean = 2.792, SD = .851) was in the ‘Don’t Know’ category on the Likert-type instrument which had a range of one to five with one being strongly agree and five being strongly disagree.
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Recommendations for Objective One

1. Historically Black Colleges and Universities need to develop strategies to recruit black students as well as other-race students. This recommendation stems from the finding that only 12 of the entire sample of 177 students planned to attend an HBCU.

2. Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Predominately White Institutions need to begin promoting programs that identify and highlight positive peer interactions on their respective campuses. This recommendation stems from the fact that the students were uncertain regarding anticipated peer relationships on other-race campuses.

3. Further studies are crucial to understand students’ ambivalence as to whether they will fit socially and culturally on other-race campuses. Other variables should be included in the study in order to develop a stronger regression model. This recommendation stems from the fact that the students were uncertain regarding anticipated socio-cultural fit on other-race campuses.

Conclusions for Objective Two

The race of the students impacts their perception of academic quality at HBCU’s. There is a considerable difference as to what white students believe about the academic quality at HBCU’s and the perception of black students regarding same. Black students have a significantly more positive perception of the quality of education offered at HBCU’s than do white students. This was based upon the finding that there was a
significant difference between black and white students’ overall means for the variable perceptions of academic quality at HBCU’s ($t = -4.165, p = .001$).

The race of the students does not impact their perception of academic quality at PWI’s. White and black students have nearly identical perceptions regarding the quality of education offered by PWI’s in Louisiana. Both groups of students believe that they can receive a high quality of education at a PWI. This was based upon the finding that the overall mean scores for the variable, perceptions of academic quality at PWI’s, were not significantly different between white and black students according to the t-test procedure ($t = -.037, p = .970$).

The race of the students impacts their perception of anticipated faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s. White students are considerably more ambivalent about the expected relationships between faculty and students at HBCU’s than are black students regarding same. This was based upon the finding that there was a significant difference between black and white students’ overall mean scores on the variable, perceptions of faculty/student relationships at HBCU’s ($t = -2.261, p = .05$).

The race of the students impacts their perception of anticipated faculty/student relationships at PWI’s. White students are more positive about expected relationships between faculty and students at PWI’s than are black students. This was based upon the finding that there was a significant difference between black and white students’ overall mean scores on the variable, perceptions of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s ($t = -2.261, p = .05$).
The race of the students impacts their perception of anticipated socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s. White students are less positive in their belief about their own social and cultural fit on the campus of an HBCU (other-race university) than are black students. This was based upon the finding that there was a significant difference between black and white students’ overall mean scores on the variable, perceptions of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s ($t = -3.231, p = <.01$).

The race of the students impacts their perception of anticipated socio-cultural fit at PWI’s. Black students are less positive in their belief about their own social and cultural fit on the campus of a PWI (other-race university) than are white students. This was based upon the finding that there was a significant difference between black and white students’ overall mean scores on the variable, perceptions of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s ($t = 4.087, p = <.01$).

The race of the students does not impact their perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s. Black students as well as white students were similar in their belief that they may not be accepted by their peers on the campus of HBCU’s. This was based upon the finding that there was no significant difference between black students’ overall mean (mean = 2.758, SD = .720) and white students’ overall mean (mean = 2.870, SD = .579) on students’ perceptions of peer relationships at HBCU’s ($t = -1.113, p = .267$).

The race of the students does not impact their perception of peer relationships at PWI’s. White students, as well as black students, were unsure if they would be accepted by peers on the campus of a PWI. This was based upon the finding that there was no significant difference between black students’ overall mean (mean = 2.594, SD = .616)
and white students’ overall mean (mean = 2.730, SD = .532) on students’ perceptions of peer relationships at HBCU’s (t = -1.541, p = .125).

Black students and white students have about the same amount of other-race contact in their church, neighborhood, and school. This was based upon the finding that there is no significant difference between black and white students’ scores on students’ perception of other-race contact.

**Recommendations for Objective Two**

1. HBCU’s must consider marketing strategies for white students that emphasize the academic components of the university as well as non-cognitive offerings of the university.

2. HBCU’s and PWI’s must conduct joint studies on the causes of other-race students’ relative discomfort on their campuses regarding faculty/staff relationships. The institutions need to develop culturally competent programs to recruit and educate faculty/staff in culturally competent work with students.

3. HBCU’s and PWI’s must conduct joint studies on the causes of other-race students’ relative discomfort on their campuses regarding their perceived social and cultural fit and develop strategies for integrating social and cultural group characteristics into the overall university culture.

**Conclusions for Objective Three**

Whether a student is male or female has an impact on how much other-race contact the students experience. This is based on the finding that there was a significant difference between the mean score of male and female students on the variable students’ perception
of level of other-race contact. Whether a student is male or female has no significant impact on their perceptions of any of the other variables in this objective. This is based on the finding that there were no significant differences in the overall means of male and female students' scores on the variable students' perceptions of academic quality, faculty/student relationships, socio-cultural fit, peer relationships for either type university.

**Conclusions for Objective Four**

Whether the student is a black male, black female, white male, or white female has no significant influence on their perception of academic quality at HBCU's. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall mean scores for these four groups of students regarding the variable students' perception of academic quality at HBCU's.

Whether the student is a black male, black female, white male, or white female has no significant influence on their perception of academic quality at PWI's. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall mean scores for these four groups of students regarding the variable students' perception of academic quality at PWI's.

Interactions of race and gender does not impact the students' perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU's. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall means of students regarding race and gender on the variable students' perception of faculty/student relationships at HBCU's.
Interactions of race and gender does not impact the students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall means of students regarding race and gender on the variable students’ perception of faculty/student relationships at PWI’s.

Whether the student is a black male, black female, white male, or white female has no significant influence on their perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall mean scores for these four groups of students regarding the variable students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU’s.

Whether the student is a black male, black female, white male, or white female has no significant influence on their perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant difference between the overall mean scores for these four groups of students regarding the variable students’ perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI’s.

An interaction of race and gender will impact the students’ perception of peer relationships at HBCU’s. This is based upon the finding that there is a significant interaction effect of race and gender on the students’ scores on the variable students’ perceptions of peer relationships at HBCU’s ($p = .022$).

Interactions of race and gender does not impact the students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant interaction of race and gender regarding the variable students’ perception of peer relationships at PWI’s.
Whether the student is black male, black female, white male, or white female does not impact the students' perception of level of other-race contact. This conclusion is based upon the finding that there was not a significant interaction of race and gender regarding the variable students' perception of level of other-race contact.

**Recommendations for Objective Four**

4. Further study must be conducted in order to determine which group(s) of students regarding race and gender, differed significantly on the variable perception of peer relationships at HBCU's.

**Conclusions for Objective Five**

The amount of previous other-race contact had no effect on any of the variables included in this objective. This conclusion was based on the finding that there was no relationship between black students' perception of contact with other-race students and students' perception of academic quality, faculty/student relationships, socio-cultural fit, or peer relationships at PWI's. Further, this conclusion was based on the finding that there was no significant relationship found between white students' perception of contact with other-race students and students' perception of academic quality, faculty/student relationships, socio-cultural fit, or peer relationships at HBCU's.

**Conclusions for Objective Six**

A significant explanatory model was found to explain a significant portion of the variance in the students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's. This was based upon the finding that a model exists that explains 67.7% in students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's.
Students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at PWI's, students' perception of peer relationships at PWI's, race, students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's, students' perception of other-race contact, and region were the variables allowed to enter an explanatory model for students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's with students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at PWI's as lead variable (54.4%). This was based on the finding that each of the six variables identified did contribute one percent or more of explanatory power to the model, and the model remained significant.

A significant explanatory model can explain a significant portion of the variance in the students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's. This was based upon the finding that a model exists that explains 65.7% of the variance in students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's.

Students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at HBCU's, students' perception of peer relationships at HBCU's, type school attended, gender and race, students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at PWI's, students' perception of socio-cultural fit at PWI's, and students' perception of academic quality at PWI's were the variables allowed to enter an explanatory model for students' perception of socio-cultural fit at HBCU's with students' perception of faculty/staff relationships at HBCU's as lead variable (44.6%). This was based on the finding that each of the variables identified did contribute one percent or more of explanatory power to the model and the model remained significant.
**Recommendations for Objective Six**

1. Additional research must be conducted to identify additional variables which might explain students' perception of socio-cultural fit at other-race universities.

**Discussion and Implications**

As the institutions of higher education in Louisiana struggle to diversify their respective campuses, consideration must be given to perception held by prospective students which usually takes the form of institutional image. Marketing strategies should not exclude candid discussions about race and perception of other-race institutions. Findings from this study suggest that race is a salient feature in students' perceptions as they relate to various aspects of higher education. Race is reflected prominently throughout the study in the analysis of students' perceptions for each of the objectives. Black students are concerned about how they will be treated by faculty/staff and peers at PWI's. White students are clearly concerned about the same issues on the campuses of HBCU's.

That society continues to be characterized by racial polarization is evident by the fact that the majority of students reported 'little contact' regarding contact with other-race students. Further, the frequency of other-race contact that was reported by the students indicated that contact at church and in the students' neighborhoods was 'never' to 'sometimes'. Prejudicial perceptions can be formed early on by a lack of interaction in religious institutions and neighborhoods. Perhaps the amount of other-race contact has little effect on the students' perceptions as a reflection of little contact at church and in the neighborhood early on. PWI's and HBCU's have an opportunity to further explore this
situation and to develop programs that will enable the community to facilitate increased interracial contact in these areas.

HBCU’s should not rely on marketing strategies that reflect only a historical commitment to black students (as important as that mission is) but should increase the focus on academic quality as well as other important aspects of the university. Although black students evidenced stronger positive regard for academic quality at HBCU’s than did white students’, the groups of students were almost identical in a positive response to items measuring perception of academic quality at PWI’s. Perhaps black students realize that success in this society is tied to one’s ability to closely approximate ‘whiteness’. This assertion is further buttressed by the fact that, of the 177 students included in the survey, only 12 students planned to attend HBCU’s. It is incumbent upon HBCU’s to promote the academic aspects with respect to the accomplishments of former students and academic offerings at the universities.

PWI’s should find a way to encourage black students to attend their respective campuses by conveying the message that their culture is important and that they will not experience marginalization and discrimination on the campuses of PWI’s. Further research is needed to determine how and when the students’ perceptions are formed and the impact of such perceptions on college choice. It is critical that officials of PWI’s and HBCU’s discuss the important issues as impacted by race, not in an emotional blame-fixing manner, but in a studied dialog that is objective and beneficial to all persons involved. The university structure stands as the perfect setting to promote and carry forth such discussions. When these issues are resolved, the universities (PWI’s and HBCU’s) can get
to the serious business of educating students without court sanctions and externally imposed mandates.

**Implications for Higher Education**

This study is a beginning point for careful observation and reflection about race, perception, and higher education. Perception impacts decisions that are made regarding mundane issues such as where to get one’s hair cut as well as more complex issues such as where to live or attend school. Race has, over the course of history, played a major role in decision making as it relates to our societal structure. The function of any system of education is to sustain the culture of which it is a part (Wilson, 1978). As society painfully struggles to transform from a culture characterized by ethnocentricity and dominant race supremacy, it must also consider the implications of a truly pluralistic, integrated society. The current power structures, including higher education, must take time to examine those issues which are race driven and which continue to plague the nation by interfering with human relations.

Neither type of institution, HBCU or PWI, can claim a moral high road in the battle to recruit and educate other-race students. Both types of institutions are guilty of race based recruitment practices. While HBCU’s assertively market themselves as “historically black”, PWI’s continue to assert their historical “whiteness” by marketing their “tradition”. In the case of the former, Hacker (1992) most succinctly states:

There should not be any objections to a private college calling itself a “historically black” school just as Brigham Young University can refer to itself as a “historically Mormon” University. If such schools are in anyway segregated, they are so by choice and not by imposition. But what of the forty-three historically campuses campuses that remain parts
of the state systems? Their persistence would seem to betoken
governmental sponsorship of racial segregation. It is true that in cities,
many public schools have all black enrollments. But this is because they
are located in neighborhoods where virtually all the children are black.
However, this isolation does not usually hold for state colleges, which
draw their undergraduates from may parts of the state (p. 155).

Predominately white institutions are almost always viewed as “white schools” by
white as well as black students and parents. When such schools speak of their “tradition”
and “heritage”, it is not a tradition of openness to other-race students that comes to mind.
Rather, what goes unspoken is the tradition of exclusion and a message to potential
students (and their parents) that this institution will be as “white” as possible. Black
students are often chided for attempting to find some level of comfort within this hostile
situation by grouping amongst themselves. Hacker (1992) noted:

Black students are frequently berated for sticking closely together,
especially at campus dining tables. Whites who talk this way seldom
think about how they too have a circle of white companions. Indeed,
they almost invariably sit at “white tables”. But, it may be replied,
there are many kinds of white people, and white students select their
friends based on shared temperaments or interests, not simply
because they belong to one’s own race. If white students cared to
look, they would see that black students do not simply sit down
alongside any other blacks. The also have preferences based on
outlooks and affinities. At the same time, they do have a shared
experience of belonging to a black minority on a largely white
campus (p. 151).

In this study, black students and white students differed significantly on three of the
four sub-scales regarding their perceptions. The students’ perception of academic quality,
faculty/student relationships, and socio-cultural fit differed along the lines of race with
blacks agreeing more with items more favorable toward HBCU’s and white students
agreeing more with items more favorable toward PWI’s. Although one is tempted to say that
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this was predictable, there should be a cause for alarm precisely because, in this day and
time, it is predictable, and that society is willing to let this tragic commentary on human
inter-existence be an unremarkable occurrence in our lives.

Another interesting point regarding the differences between the groups' perceptions is
that, although there was a significant difference between the students' perceptions regarding
the universities, only 12 of the 177 students surveyed planned to attend an HBCU. It appears
that these 11th grade students believe that their best chance for success in a society that is
plagued by institution racism is to align themselves with an institution where rewards are
often meted out because of one's proximity to the dominant culture. This phenomena is well
understood by those who are involved in anti-racist activities in higher education. Hacker
(1992) again noted:

Hence the Americans have chosen to give to race, is particular to
the artifact of “whiteness” which sets a floor on how far people of
that complexion can fall. No matter how degraded their lives, white
people are allowed to believe that they possess the blood, the genes, the
patrimony of superiority. No matter what happens, they can never become
“black”. White Americans of all classes
have found it comforting to preserve blacks as a subordinate
caste: a presence, which despite all its pain and problems,
still provides whites with some solace in a stressful
world (p. 217).

This study began to examine the dimensions of perception as it relates to race. Future
studies should focus on additional elements of this recalcitrant issue. It is in the interest of
our nation and society that people of all ethnic backgrounds put aside personal biases,
popular issues of the day, and personal racism in order to resolve these difficult issues.
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<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Louisiana State University 111 Peabody Hall, College of Education Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, LA 70803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Toldson, Ed.D</td>
<td>Professor, Southern University</td>
<td>Center for Psychological Healthcare 816 Main Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kofi Lomotey, Ph.D</td>
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APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Perceptions Toward Louisiana's Institutions of Higher Education

SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Directions: This questionnaire is divided into three parts. Please respond to all sections as directed.

SECTION ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Place an X in the space provided or write in the appropriate blank “other”

1. Gender
   1) Male
   2) Female

2. Race
   1) Black/African American
   2) White/Caucasian American
   3) Other (please specify)____________________

3. I interact with whites this much in my:
   Church 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often
   Neighborhood 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often
   School 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often

4. I interact with blacks this much in my:
   Church 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often
   Neighborhood 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often
   School 1) Never 2) Seldom 3) Sometimes 4) Often

5. What proportion of your close friends are black:
   1) None
   2) Some but less than 50%
   3) About 50% or more

6. I have this many close friends who are white:
   1) None
   2) Some but less than 50%
   3) About 50% or more

7. I plan to attend college:
   1) Yes (If yes, then name college)________________________
   2) No (If no, then what, i.e. Community college etc.)________
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Section Two: **Perceptions Toward Historically Black Institutions**

Directions: The following statements describe perceptions/attitude of individuals towards historically black institutions/colleges or universities. Please rate each of the statements according to what you believe to be true regarding historically black institutions (HBI's). Using the scale given below, circle the responses which best express your beliefs about HBI's.

**PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS.**

**Historically Black Institutions:**
- Southern University (SU)
- Grambling State University (GSU)
- Southern University-Shreveport (SU-S)
- Southern University-New Orleans (SUNO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I expect to have good relationships with my peers at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I attend an HBI, I will be invited to social events with other-race peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to have lots of other-race friends at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My same-race friends will tease me if I attend an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I will be graded fairly by faculty if I attend an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can go to faculty/staff if I have a problem outside of class at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can depend on my teachers to respect my culture at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I expect to have a good relationship with my professors - HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I do not expect to experience racial discrimination if I attend an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Most of the students respect racial differences at HBI's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do if I attend an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I will receive a very good education at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I will get a really good job if I graduate from an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I will have to work hard to earn my degree at a HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I will be well prepared for graduate school at a HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can use the education in the future that I will get at an HBI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
Section Three Perceptions Toward Predominately White Institutions

Directions: The following statements describe perceptions/attitude of individuals towards predominately white institutions/colleges or universities. Please rate each of the statements according to what you believe to be true regarding predominately white institutions (PWI's). Using the scale given below, circle the responses which best express your beliefs about PWI's. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS

Predominately White Institutions:
Louisiana State University (LSU)
Louisiana Tech University (La-Tech)
LSU University-Shreveport (LSU-S)
University of New Orleans (UNO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I expect to have good relationships with my peers at a PWI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I attend a PWI, I will be invited to social events with other-race peers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will not hear racist jokes from my other-race peers at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to have lots of other-race friends at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My same-race friends will tease me if I attend a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I will be graded fairly by faculty if I attend a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can go to faculty/staff if I have a problem outside of class at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can depend on my teachers to respect my culture at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I expect to have a good relationship with my professors at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I do not expect to experience racial discrimination if I attend a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I do not expect to experience violence by other students if I attend a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Most of the students respect racial differences at PWI's.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I expect to meet people who like the same music or movies that I do if I attend a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I will receive a very good education at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I will get a really good job if I graduate from a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I will have to work hard to earn my degree at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I will be well prepared for graduate school at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can use the education in the future that I will get at a PWI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation
- End of Survey -
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF REQUEST TO DISTRICT OFFICES AND RESPONSES

SUBJECT: Louisiana High School Students' Perception of Historically Black College and Universities and Predominately White Colleges and Universities

August 19, 1998

Dear School Dr. XXXX,

I am a Doctoral Candidate at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. I am writing to solicit your support for the research that I am conducting. The purpose of the research is to describe high school students' perceptions toward the two types of universities (predominately white and historically black) in Louisiana. Your parish school system is located within a parish where there is one of each type of university. Therefore, I believe that students in your system will likely have formed some opinion/perception of the types of institutions and, further, may represent the views held by the majority population. It is expected that three (3) classes will be chosen from three different schools that have been randomly sampled from a list of racially balanced schools in your parish.

Authorization to conduct the study will be solicited from the appropriate school official in each school selected. The questionnaire will be administered by one of my colleagues after receiving training from the researcher. All responses will be confidential.

Once again, I would like to elicit your support in this project in the form of a letter of support. I have attached a summary of the proposed study and a sample questionnaire. Thank you in advance for your kind consideration in this matter.

Dennis W. Dillon, MSW-ACSW
Doctoral Candidate
Louisiana State University

Note: The names and addresses of the recipients were deleted in order to protect their right to confidentiality.
February 19, 1999

Mr. Dennis W. Dillon
9820 Great Smoky Avenue
Baton Rouge, LA 70814

Dear Mr. Dillon,

I am in receipt of your application for research. You may proceed with your research, but please be sure and discuss your project with the principal of each school you select to survey. Have them sign this letter in the space provided acknowledging their permission to proceed.

Please return the signed letter to me. Thank you.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Technical Resource Assistant

---

Approval

Principal

School

Approval

Principal

School

Approval

Principal

School
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March 19, 1999

Memo To: Dennis Dillon
From:
Subject: Request to conduct research

Your request to conduct research in East Baton Rouge schools has been approved. We are very interested to know what you discover about the perceptions of students who are planning to attend a college or university. We ask, however, that you not begin data collection until after April 16, which is the last day for state testing.

Please contact the individual principals for their permission to collect data in individual schools and to determine the best way to minimize disruption to the regular school day.

If you have any questions, please call me at 922-5612. Thank you for your interest in East Baton Rouge schools.
May 3, 1999

To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Dennis Dillon has permission from the Lincoln Parish School Board Staff to contact principals in Lincoln Parish schools regarding a survey for his doctoral study. His survey concerns attitudes regarding Historically Black Colleges and Predominately White Colleges.

Please feel free to contact me for further information if needed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Assistant Superintendent
# APPENDIX D

## GENDER AND RACE OF STUDENTS

### Gender and Race of Students Enrolled in Selected Universities for 1997-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution of Higher Education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>14,256</td>
<td>15,675</td>
<td>29,931</td>
<td>21,567</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>22,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU-BR</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>9,567</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>9,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNO</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>3,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>6,675</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSU</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>5,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-Tech</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>8,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU-S</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>4,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU-S</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSU-BR - Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge

SU-BR- Southern University in Baton Rouge

SUNO- Southern University in New Orleans

UNO - University of New Orleans

GSU - Grambling State University

LA-Tech- Louisiana Tech University

LSU-S - Louisiana State University in Shreveport

SU-S - Southern University in Shreveport
VITA

Dennis Dillon is a native of Franklinton, Louisiana. He is one of 13 children born to the late Willie and James H. Dillon. Dennis was reared by his parents in rural Washington Parish on a farm which his parents owned. The values of education, hard work, and self respect were promoted by Dennis' parents despite the harsh realities of poverty and oppression. The belief that God is the ultimate power and that justice would prevail was also promoted by the parents. Dennis has been married for the past 17 years to Kimberly Daniels Dillon and with whom he has four children Justin, Darrien, Joshua, and Kourtney.

Dennis began attending elementary at the racially segregated Washington Parish Elementary School in Franklinton, Louisiana. Desegregation of the public schools was ordered, and Dennis began attending Franklinton Elementary School which was formerly limited to white students only. Dennis then attended and graduated from Pine High School in Pine, Louisiana after that school was ordered to desegregate.

Dennis graduated cum laude from Southeastern Louisiana University with a bachelors degree in Social Work in 1989. He served on the curriculum committee for SLU during this time. He then entered the advanced standing program at Louisiana State University and earned the degree of Master of Social Work in one year whereas the usual time is two years. Dennis was
employed by the Louisiana Department of Safety and Corrections and was a member of their employee selection committee during the master’s program. Dennis became employed by The Casey Family Program in 1990 after graduating from LSU. The Casey Family Program is a long term foster care agency with corporate headquarters in Seattle, Washington. Dennis has been recognized as a leader in the program. He has been a presenter for local and national organizations in the field of child welfare. Dennis also has published internationally in the *Journal of Child Welfare*.

Dennis has served on various national, state, and local committees: a grant reviewer for The United States Department of Education, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Federal Youth Service Bureau (FYSB), and Governor Foster’s Teacher’s Initiative Program. Dennis has also been recognized by the Federal Youth Service Bureau (FYSB), a branch of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), as an expert in the field of child welfare and is a Peer Monitor for programs across the country.

Dennis was a Huel Perkins Doctoral Fellow at Louisiana State University as well as a Southern Regional Education Board Doctoral Fellow while pursuing a doctoral degree in Vocational Education. The Huel Perkins Fellowship is awarded on a competitive basis to minority students enrolled in graduate programs at Louisiana State University.
The Southern Regional Education Doctoral Scholars program is a national program provided to minority students in order to encourage such students to graduate from a doctoral program and to pursue a teaching career in higher education.
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