DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 170 HE 012 001

AUTHOR Leon, David Jess
TITLE Institutional Racism and the Educational Opportunity Program: A Study of Organizational Change and Strategies for Reform.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Boston, MA, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Affirmative Action; Centralization; *College Integration; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Decentralization; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Integration Methods; Models; *Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; Racial Discrimination; Racial Integration; *Racism
IDENTIFIERS *Equal Opportunity Programs; University of California Berkeley; University of California Santa Barbara; University of Washington

ABSTRACT

Various organizational modes for implementing desegregation in higher education are examined with specific reference to the effects of programs at the University of Washington, the University of California at Santa Barbara, and the University of California at Berkeley. Each school established Equal Opportunity Programs (EOP) that differ structurally and operationally. The University of Washington program illustrates a self-determination model, a unified, self-contained, and relatively autonomous office. A partial-determination model was used by UC Santa Barbara where EOP operates under a somewhat decentralized system. EOP at the UC Berkeley follows an integration model where all EOP clients use regular student services for advice and assistance. The extent to which each of these models may lend itself to or embody institutional racism is examined. It is suggested that wherever racial disparities exist in an institution, institutional racism exists. Enrollment figures, relative academic performance and general sense of well-being of EOP students are all factors that should be examined when measuring institutional racism. The EOP program at the University of Washington, designed and run by minorities, is viewed as the least vulnerable to institutional racism. Since EOP at UC Santa Barbara has less autonomy it may be more susceptible to institutional racism. The decentralized program at Berkeley is viewed as the most vulnerable to institutional racism since its clients have the least amount of internal control. (SF)

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM AND THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM: A STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND STRATEGIES FOR REFORM

David Jess León

School of Education
University of California, Berkeley

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, 1979

Introduction

As most of you know, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the historic Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education. In the past quarter century we have witnessed the end of de jure segregation of schools in the South, and an attack on de facto segregation in the North and West. However, despite the vigorous efforts of the courts and federal government, many minorities still see equality of opportunity in our classrooms as a distant dream, or, worse, an impossible one.

With these considerations in mind, I undertook to examine relative success of different organizational modes of implementing desegregation in higher education. I decided to focus on the University of Washington, the University of California at Santa Barbara, and the University of California at Berkeley. Each of these institutions has accepted the basic premise of affirmative action, and each has thus established an Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) designed to recruit and support students from minority backgrounds. But, structurally and operationally, these programs differ greatly. It thus seems important to inquire into the varying effects, if any, of these programs on the clients they are supposed to help. Such an exploratory investigation might also lay the groundwork for a model EOP structure, one which would best facilitate the explicit purpose of the program.

Organizational Patterns

The programs under scrutiny exemplify three different organizational patterns: the self-determination model, the partial-determination model, and the integration model.

EOP at the University of Washington illustrates the self-determination

model. It is a unified, self-contained, relatively autonomous body. A Vice-President for Minority Affairs oversees the program's workings. He is a line administrative officer and, at the same time, a professor in an academic department. He reports directly to the President, and can speak with him whenever he wants, merely by picking up the phone. He also sits on the President's internal cabinet, which meets regularly to decide important campus issues. Beneath him are five separate ethnic administrative units -- black, Chicano, poor white, Asian American, and Native American -- which handle the affairs of their clients from recruitment through academic and personal counseling. The directors of the support services (study skill center, ethnic cultural center, and tutorial center) also report directly to the Vice-President.

EOP at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California represents the partial-determination model. Its director, an Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, ranks quite a bit lower in the hierarchy than his counterpart at the University of Washington. He reports to the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and Student Affairs, who in turn reports to the Chancellor. The Assistant Vice Chancellor is white, as are his superiors. Below him lie four minority components -- black, Chicano, Asian American, and American Indian. A Chicano associate director supervises the activities of the Chicano component, and a Black associate director oversees the others. These two administrators meet regularly with the Assistant Vice Chancellor to discuss and plan the future of EOP. This somewhat decentralized "troika" system lacks the functional coherence of the self-determination model. For instance, the support services for EOP students have been combined with regular student services. EOP is thus partially integrated into the overall administrative structure.

EOP at the Berkeley campus of the University of California follows the integration model. Distinct minority units do not exist in the bureaucratic

structure; though minorities are employed as directors, counselors, secretaries, and so forth. All EOP clients use regular student services for advice and assistance. Hierarchically, EOP ranks even lower than at Santa Barbara. Its director (a minority) reports to the Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs (also a minority), who reports to the Vice Chancellor, who, in turn, reports to the Chancellor. Minorities serve in key positions on campus. For example, the Director of Relations with Schools, who heads the Berkeley's recruitment effort, is a minority, as are several of his aides. Minorities are also employed in offices such as Financial Aid and the Student Learning Center, which have a direct impact on EOP students.

These models represent a cross-section of EOP organizational schemata, and can thus aid us in determining the strengths and weaknesses of each. The integration model, for instance, has been criticized for fragmenting responsibility within the program; hence, when problems arise, each office tends to blame the others for them. Such matters of efficiency can be fairly easy to spot. Much less simple to identify, and thus more insidious, is the extent to which the models may lend themselves to or embody institutional racism. Despite the inflammatory term "racism" in the name of this concept, it is quite subtle, and deserves some exposition.

Institutional Racism

As an individual may be racist, so may an institution. In the latter case, however, racist policies tend to become embedded in the perceived functions, even the very assumptions, of an organization. Such fundamental biases regulate the institution's daily operations. And because these attitudes are often so basic and impersonal, actors on the scene may implement them in their workaday roles without the slightest awareness of their racist nature

(cf. Benokraitis & Feagin, 1974; Blauner, 1972; Feagin, 1977 and 1978; Molotch and Wolf, 1970; Wellman, 1977).

The following are important characteristics of institutional racism:

1. It does not necessarily stem from overt or even recognized prejudice.

2. It tends to operate either through exclusion or restriction of the participation of minority groups, by procedures that have become conventional, part of the bureaucratic system.

3. It affords us no person to blame, as the rules bear the brunt of the onus.

4. It tends to be less visible than individual racism.

5. Once established in an institution, it takes on a life of its own.

6. It defends the advantages whites have obtained as a result of the subordination of racial minorities.

Because of the difficulties in detecting institutional racism, especially in its administrative workings, it is helpful to have a convenient external standard by which to identify it. Therefore we might say that wherever racial disparities exist in an institution, institutional racism exists, regardless of the intent or motives of the organization itself. Hence, it is clearly possible for institutional racism to creep even into an affirmative action program like EOP. And since it could do so quite stealthily, one must monitor for it carefully, and not feel particularly surprised if it shows up. Hence, an EOP program could fail because it is racist in itself, or operates in an institutionally racist context. In examining EOP structures it is thus vital to assess their vulnerability to this problem.

Locus of Control

One might get some measure of the extent of institutional racism

in an organization by examining statistics. For instance, the percentage of minorities enrolled in a given university might serve as such an index. But we cannot gain a complete idea of the effectiveness of the various EOP programs through enrollment figures alone. We must also look into relative academic performance and general sense of well-being.

Numerous researchers have documented the fact that minorities tend to get lower grades in universities than whites (e.g., Bank, 1979; Feagin, 1977; Froe, 1964; Morgan, 1970; Edington, 1969; Guerra et al., 1969; et al.). Investigators have also studied minorities for personality correlates of inferior scholastic achievement in college. They have gotten, by and large, mixed results; "the controversy is still growing concerning the degree (if any) to which [minority] students may exhibit qualities such as anxiety, fear of failure, negative self-concept, and inappropriate levels of aspiration" (Klingelhofer & Hollander, 1973: 10). But about one distinctive minority trait there is little dispute: sense of an external locus of control.

Locus of control refers to one's expectations about the determinants of rewards. According to Keller and Pugh,

> An internally oriented individual expects reinforcement to occur as a consequence of his or her behavior; an externally oriented individual expects reinforcement to be controlled by fate, chance, or powerful others. (1976: 110).

Sense of external control implies such qualities as powerlessness, alienation, and anomie; it resembles the popular notion of "fatalism." A number of studies have claimed that minorities are generally more external than whites (Delco, 1969; Harper, 1969; Noble, 1966; Resnik & Kaplan, 1971; Vontress, 1969; et al.). An investigation cited by Battle and Rotter (1963) found whites more internal than Chicanos, who, in turn, were more internal than Native Americans. Coleman et al. (1966) concluded that, in his large sample, whites were most

internal, followed by Asian Americans, then blacks, Chicanos, and Native Americans in a clump, and, finally, Puerto Ricans. As Klingelhofer and Hollander note,

> Thus far, the research . . . does suggest that a large proportion of [minority] students suffer from the belief that they are externally controlled, that they lack the power to manage their environment, and to obtain rewards by their own behavior. (1973: 95)

Of the several measures of locus of control, Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Control of Reinforcement Scale (I-E Scale) has proven most popular among investigators (cf. Lefcourt, 1976). But since the very concept of locus of control is still undergoing refinement, we must interpret scores on the I-E Scale with a certain perspicacity. Crandall et al. (1965) pointed out the distinction between perceived control by other people and control by larger forces or fate, important "since academic success and failure may have little to do with chance or luck but still be subject to external control through teachers' behaviors" (Crandall et al., 1965). Gurin et al. (1969) developed this notion further by distinguishing between beliefs about the amount of control oneself has (Personal Control) and most people in society have (Control Ideology). A person with high internal personal control feels he can reliably attain rewards through his own efforts; one with high external personal control believes that fate or the whim of outside authorities plays a greater part in his getting rewards than his own exertions do. On the other hand, a person with high internal control ideology assumes that most other people can achieve success through their own efforts; one with high external control ideology believes that most other people generally cannot. Since Rotter's I-E Scale leaned heavily toward the ideological variable, Gurin et al. amended it with both Personal Control and Control Ideology subscales.

The distinction led to important discoveries. Gurin et al. (1969)

found that black college students in the South with high internal personal control scored higher on achievement tests, made better grades, and did better on an anagrams task. Those with high internal control ideology performed less well on these measures. Lao (1970), in a study of 1,493 black males, concluded that high internal personal control correlated with higher entrance test scores, grades, and anagram test scores. Moreover, it also seems related to more ambitious educational goals and greater academic self-confidence among minorities (Lao, 1970), as well as to anticipation of more prestigious jobs (Gurin & Katz, 1966). Thus, minority students with a well-developed sense of internal personal control are likely to do better on tests, achieve more in school, and strive for more beyond school.

Intriguingly, studies exist which report strategies for strengthening the sense of internal control. Noble, stressing political concerns, suggested that "there must be some tangible evidence that a) learning equips [black youth] to share in the power structure, and b) some feeling that educators . . . are sympathetic to the need for them to strive for power [i.e., reward]" (1966). Gurin and Katz (1966) found that, while sense of personal control did not differ between minority freshmen who later in the year became social activists, and those who did not, by June the activists had developed a stronger sense of internal personal control, as well as a greater belief in the harmfulness of discrimination. The investigators concluded that working toward social change had boosted the sense of internal control. They thus recommended, not only activism, but also education of minorities toward a realistic apprehension of the way society works, so they neither exaggerate nor minimize the effects of racism on their lives. Leon (1973) demonstrated that academically successful minority freshmen tend to develop a greater sense of internal personal control during their first year. She suggested:

> Those who would counsel disadvantaged students would do well to build up and reinforce attitudes of personal control. . . . It seems that college faculty and administrators may be in the crucial position of being able to channel in a positive direction some of the feelings of disillusionment with traditional institutions and values. Affirmative action for change could be of great social benefit. (527)

Klingelhofer and Hollander (1973) express this idea more forcefully:

> Programs can, and should, be instituted that are aimed at developing in [minority] students a realistic sense of both personal and collective power; such programs must include the development of a campus environment that not only encourages, but is responsive to efforts at personal control. (101)

EOP is such a program. Indeed, at the University of Washington and the University of California it is the only large minority unit within the bureaucratic structure. It thus seems reasonable to suppose that EOP can either foster or hinder its clients' development of internal personal control, and hence of higher grades and greater well-being. It likewise seems reasonable to suppose that different EOP structures would attain this end with varying degrees of success.

General Hypotheses

Given the above, three general hypotheses emerge:

1. Since EOP at the University of Washington is a program designed and run by minorities, it should be least vulnerable to institutional racism, and its clients should tend to develop the strongest sense of internal personal control. One might measure the success of the program both by retention and graduation rates, and, perhaps to a lesser extent, by grades.

2. Since EOP at UC Santa Barbara has less autonomy than its counterpart at the University of Washington, it should be more susceptible to institutional racism, and its students should develop a less strong sense of internal control. The measures in Hypothesis 1 could be used.

3. Since EOP at UC Berkeley is a decentralized program, it should be most vulnerable to institutional racism, and its clients should have developed the least amount of internal control. Again, indicators as in Hypothesis 1 could be used.

Tentative Findings and Conclusions

At this time I had expected to come before you with some general findings to either support or refute the above hypotheses. However, due to funding and administrative troubles, I am forced to postpone discussion of these research questions. I do have certain observations to report about each of the programs. All of them are in trouble. Each university is experiencing a sharp decline in its black population, a slow rise or leveling of its Chicano group, and a dramatic increase in Asian Americans (cf. Bank, 1979). Each campus has its explanation for this phenomenon, and few of them are based on actual research. In any case, if the West really does set trends for the rest of the country, I do not forsee meaningful desegregation of higher education in America in the near future.

REFERENCES

Banks, William
1979 The status of student affirmative action at UC Berkeley: Some observations and recommendations. Unpublished paper. Afro-American Studies, U.C. Berkeley.

Battle, E., and J. Rotter
1963 "Children's feeling of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group." Journal of Personality, 31: 482-490.

Benokraitis, N., and J. Feagin
1974 "Institutional racism." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Montreal.

Blauner, R.
1972 Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Coleman, J., E. Campbell, C. Hobson, J. McPartland, A. Mood, F. Weinfield, R. York
1966 Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

Crandall, V., W. Katkovsky, V. Crandall
1965 "Children's beliefs in their control of reinforcement in intellectual-academic achievement situations." Child Development 36: 91-109.

Delco, E., G. Matthews, R. Rogers
1969 "Opportunities and responsibilities for developing human resources." Liberal Education 55: 235-243.

Edington, E.
1969 "Academic achievement of American Indian students -- review of recent research." Paper presented at rural sociological meetings, San Francisco.

Feagin, Joe
1978 Racial and Ethnic Relations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1977 "Indirect institutionalized discrimination." American Politics Quarterly 5(April): 177-200.

Froe, O.
1964 "Educational planning for disadvantaged college youth." Journal of Negro Education 33: 290-303.

Guerra, M.
1969 "The retention of Mexican American students in higher education with special reference to bilingual and bicultural problems." Paper presented at conference on increasing opportunities for Mexican American students in higher education, California State University, Long Beach.

Gurin, P., G. Gurin, R. Lao, M. Beattie
1969 "Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth," Journal of Social Issues 25: 29-53.

Gurin, P., and D. Katz
1966 Motivation and aspiration in the Negro college. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Harper, F.
1969 "Black student revolt on the white campus." Journal of College Student Personnel 10: 291-295.

Keller, J. and R. Pugh
1976 "Sex similarities and differences in locus of control in relation to academic adjustment measures." Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance 9 (October): 110-118.

Klingelhofer, E. and L. Hollander
1973 Educational characteristics and needs of new students. University of California, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Lao, R.
1970 "Internal-external control and competent and innovative behavior among Negro college students." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 14: 263-270.

Lefcourt, H.
1976 Locus of control: current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale: New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Leon, G.
1973 "Personality change in the specially admitted disadvantaged student after one year in college." Journal of Clinical Psychology 30 (October): 522-528.

Molotch H. and E. Wolf
1970 "Institutional racism in one place." Unpublished paper. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Morgan, G.
1970 The ghetto college student: a descriptive essay on college youth from the inner city. American College Testing Program, No. 3.

Noble, J.
1966 "Guidance and counseling of minority youth," in M. Smith (ed.), Guidance-personnel work: future tense. New York: Teachers College Press.

Resnik, S., and B. Kaplan
1971 "College programs for Black adults." Journal of Higher Education 42: 202-218.

Vontress, C.
1969 "Cultural differences: implications for counseling." Journal of Negro Education 38: 266-275.

Wellman, D.
1977 Portraits of white racism. New York: Cambridge University Press.