



5-2014

## **Perceived Racial Discrimination by Students of Color among Social Work Programs in the United States: A Cross-Sectional Study**

Mira Hanna

*University of Tennessee - Knoxville, mhanna8@utk.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes)



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Hanna, Mira, "Perceived Racial Discrimination by Students of Color among Social Work Programs in the United States: A Cross-Sectional Study. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2014.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes/2713](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/2713)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Mira Hanna entitled "Perceived Racial Discrimination by Students of Color among Social Work Programs in the United States: A Cross-Sectional Study." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Social Work.

Stan L. Bowie, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

John S. Wodarski, Rodney A. Ellis

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Perceived Racial Discrimination by Students of Color among Social Work Programs in the  
United States: A Cross-Sectional Study

A Thesis Presented for the  
Master of Science  
Degree  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Mira Hanna

May 2014

### **Dedications**

I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Edward and Lucy Hanna, and to my sister Ann, whose unfailing love and support throughout my life has allowed me the freedom to pursue my dreams.

I also dedicate this thesis to future generations of social work students. May you always have the strength and determination to achieve your goals and positively impact the lives of others.

### **Acknowledgements**

First, I must acknowledge God's love, grace, and protection that constantly envelop me as I continue to grow as a person and a professional.

I would also like to thank the faculty and staff at the UT College of Social Work who provided me with the prerequisite knowledge and skills to complete my education and embark upon my professional journey.

Finally, I extend my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Stan Bowie. Thank you for working so tirelessly to prepare me to become a successful student, researcher, and professional. Thank you for your mentorship and your constant encouragement that strengthen and inspire me to continue to grow professionally. I hope to be able to repay you by supporting and motivating others as you have done for me so enthusiastically over the past two years.

### **Abstract**

Social work is a profession that is based upon principles such as social justice and dignity and worth of the person. As such, social work education ought to reflect those values by ensuring that all students receive an adequate education in an environment characterized by fair and equal treatment of all students, including students of color. There is a lack of research, however, that addresses the experiences of students of color in colleges of social work across the United States. This study addresses this gap in literature by conducting a secondary data analysis of the data gathered using the Bowie-Hancock Preparation for Graduate Social Work Education (PGSWE) Scale. The sample included 377 students from underrepresented racial groups who graduated from accredited MSW programs between 1958 and 2002. Frequency distributions and measures of central tendency were conducted to obtain sample demographics and answer several of the research questions. Chi-square tests were also conducted to determine the relationship between respondent demographics and their perception of racial discrimination during both undergraduate and graduate education. At first glance the results indicated that a majority of respondents had low perceptions of discrimination during their social work education. Nonetheless, further examination of chi-square tests revealed that respondents who attended predominantly Black institutions were much more likely to report fair treatment than their counterparts who attended predominantly White institutions. Implications for social work education and practice as well as study strengths and limitations are also discussed.

## Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Conceptual Framework.....	2
CHAPTER 2 Literature Review .....	5
Implementing Diversity Standard in Social Work Education.....	5
Efforts to Combat Racism in Social Work Education .....	8
Unsatisfactory Progress to Achieve Diversity Standard.....	9
Implications of Racism in Social Work Education.....	11
Report on Methodological Approaches in Existing Literature .....	12
Gaps in Literature .....	17
Purpose and Significance of the Study .....	17
CHAPTER 3 Methodology.....	19
Research Design and Research Questions .....	19
Instrumentation .....	20
Sampling .....	21
Data Analysis.....	21
CHAPTER 4 Results.....	22
Sample Characteristics.....	22
Awareness of Institutional Racism and Extent Affected by It.....	22
Perception of Fair and Equal Treatment by Administration.....	23
Perception of Fair and Equal Treatment by Faculty .....	23

	vi
Perception of Administration/Faculty Sensitivity to Needs of Students of Color .....	24
Relationships between Variables during Undergraduate Education.....	24
Relationships between Variables during Graduate Education.....	27
CHAPTER 5 Discussion and Conclusions .....	31
Significant Factors .....	31
Non-Significant Factors .....	32
Implications for Social Work Education and Practice.....	34
Strengths and Limitations of the Study.....	34
Conclusion .....	36
References .....	37
Appendices.....	44
Appendix A PGSWE Survey.....	45
Appendix B Tables .....	62
Vita.....	78



## List of Tables

Table 1 Demographics .....	63
Table 2 Education .....	64
Table 3 Awareness of Institutional Racism & Extent Affected by It .....	64
Table 4 Fair & Equal Treatment – Administration.....	65
Table 5 Fair & Equal Treatment – Faculty .....	65
Table 6 Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs.....	66
Table 7 Chi-Square Tests – Undergraduate .....	67
Table 8 Awareness of Institutional Racism & School’s Primary Ethnicity .....	68
Table 9 Extent Affected by It & School’s Primary Ethnicity.....	68
Table 10 Fair Treatment by Administration & Childhood SES .....	68
Table 11 Fair Treatment by Administration & School’s Primary Ethnicity.....	69
Table 12 Fair Treatment by Faculty & Childhood SES.....	69
Table 13 Fair Treatment by Faculty & School’s Primary Ethnicity .....	69
Table 14 Chi-Square Tests – Graduate .....	70
Table 15 Awareness of Institutional Racism & Race .....	72
Table 16 Awareness of Institutional Racism & Nationality .....	72
Table 17 Awareness of Institutional Racism & School’s Primary Ethnicity .....	72
Table 18 Extent Affected by It & School’s Primary Ethnicity.....	72
Table 19 Fair Treatment by Faculty & Race .....	73
Table 20 Fair Treatment by Faculty & Childhood SES.....	73
Table 21 Fair Treatment by Faculty & School’s Primary Ethnicity.....	73
Table 22 Faculty Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & School’s Primary Ethnicity .....	74

Table 23 Administration Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & Nationality .....	74
Table 24 Administration Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & School's Primary Ethnicity .....	74
Table 25 Awareness of Lack of Relevant Course Content and Nationality .....	74
Table 26 Awareness of Lack of Relevant Course Content & School's Primary Ethnicity .....	75

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **Introduction**

#### **Background**

Social work is a profession that proclaims a strong commitment to the innate worth of human life, as is evidenced by the statement of “dignity and worth of the person” in the six core values of the profession (NASW, 2008). Nonetheless, the development of social work as a profession is also heavily influenced by cultural attitudes and values that prevail at any point in time, and which are constantly evolving. For instance, as a result of the changing national climate following the Civil Rights movement, social work literature began to evaluate the importance of cultural diversity and inclusion of underrepresented racial groups (URGs) as students and faculty members in schools of social work across the country (Jani, Pierce, Ortiz, & Sowbel, 2011). This movement led the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) to amend its Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) to include a nondiscrimination clause that required schools of social work to promote diversity among students, faculty, and field instructors as well as other college staff (CSWE, 1971). Soon thereafter, CSWE (1973) again revised its EPAS to include requirements for curriculums that reflect the knowledge of various racial and ethnic groups.

Although CSWE guidelines have undergone various stages of development since that time (see Jani et al., 2011 for a comprehensive discussion of the evolution of CSWE’s diversity standard), the 1971 addition of the nondiscrimination standard marked the beginning of a new era in social work education that promised to eliminate discriminatory practices against students

and faculty from underrepresented racial groups and emphasized the importance of culturally competent practice for all social workers.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Despite this significant progress, however, little is known about the impact of the diversity standard on the experiences of social work students from underrepresented racial groups. In fact, available literature suggests that since 1974, there has been limited growth, and indeed some decline, in enrollment and graduation rates of students of color in schools of social work across the United States (Bowie, Banks, & Davis-Buckley, 2013; Bowie, Cherry, & House Wooding, 2005). In addition, national demographic projections predict that members of underrepresented racial groups will replace Caucasians as the majority ethnic group by 2042 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). The implications of those statistics are grave, particularly when coupled with research findings that clients typically prefer to work with social workers who share their racial background and often prematurely terminate relationships with social workers from different racial groups (Bowie et al., 2005; Proctor & Davis, 1983). The current exploratory study seeks to assess whether perceived discrimination in social work programs might be a pertinent factor in the declining enrollment and graduation rates of people of color that pose a nationwide problem for the future of the social work profession.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Discussion of perceptions of racial discrimination requires first a concrete understanding of the concept of racism. Despite its widespread use in the literature and other venues, however, the meaning of racism is often fleeting, with little consensus about its appropriate conceptualization. The difficulty arises from the increasingly diminished prevalence of overtly

racist practices, such as slavery and segregation; instead, today's version of racism is generally much more subtle. For example, Ikuenobe (2011) describes several types of personalities that range along a spectrum of racial attitudes and discriminatory actions. One such type is the "benevolent racist," whom Ikuenobe describes as an individual who sincerely sympathizes with the struggles of people of color and seeks to help them, but whose feelings stem from belief in the innate inferiority of oppressed groups and their need for help.

Moving beyond individual practices, racism has become deeply ingrained in all major institutions in the United States as a way of preserving the power structure that allows the dominant European-American racial group to control the majority of the country's resources (Feagin & Elias, 2013). This emphasis on power as it relates to racism further complicates the concept and has sparked debate in the literature about who can be labeled as a racist (Hoyt, 2012; Ikuenobe, 2011). Hoyt examines the concept of  $R = P + P$ , which posits prejudice and power as prerequisites for racism. Under this formula, it would be impossible to label members of underrepresented racial groups as racists because they systematically lack the power required to oppress others. For the purposes of this study, Hoyt's conceptualization of racism will be used that:

To be *prejudiced*, one need only harbor preconceived opinions (positive or negative) not based on reason. To be a *racist*, one need only believe in race and in the inferiority or superiority of races. To *oppress*, one must have power over the target of one's oppression. If one behaves oppressively on an interpersonal level based on the belief that races exist and that members of different races are superior or inferior to one another, then one commits race-based oppression. To commit *institutional race-based oppression*,

one must have racist beliefs and the power to act on them at an institutional level. (Hoyt, 2012, p. 233)

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

#### Implementing Diversity Standard in Social Work Education

Since the addition of the diversity standard to accreditation requirements, social work scholars and educators have sought to integrate content on diverse populations into the curriculum to satisfy the new requirements and prepare students for culturally competent practice. This task proved difficult, however, primarily because the diversity standard was much too vague to provide any concrete plan of action. More specifically, the standard merely required that content on underrepresented racial groups be included in social work education, but stopped short of describing the type of content to be covered or specifying whether such content was to be added to existing curriculums or if specialized courses were to be created to cover this new material (Proctor & Davis, 1983). In addition, Proctor and Davis argue that the objectives of each school of social work affect the means by which it chooses to implement the diversity standard. Some schools adopt the “intrapersonal training model,” which assumes that changing students’ attitudes and stereotypes about diverse racial groups will lead to effective practice with those groups; this change in attitudes is believed to be accomplished through inclusion of historical information about various cultural groups in the curriculum. In contrast, some schools adopt the “prescriptive training model,” which focuses on instilling specific skills deemed necessary to work with diverse populations.

In a survey of graduate social work faculty (Gutierrez, Fredricksen, & Soifer, 1999), virtually all respondents reported that inclusion of content on underrepresented racial groups as well as types of oppression was *very important* or *important*. However, more statistically

significant support was given to content on diverse populations than on types of oppression. The authors concluded that although developing sensitivity to diverse racial groups was more valued by the respondents, instruction on types of oppression was more vital to breaking down institutional barriers and achieving social justice – the ultimate goal of the profession of social work. This discrepancy in views among faculty is a manifestation of the struggle that Proctor and Davis (1983) described regarding what type of diversity content should be incorporated into social work curriculums.

Moreover, Longres (1972) argues that schools of social work themselves perpetuate racism through practices that deny access to large numbers of students and faculty from underrepresented racial groups. Although they might not intentionally act in a biased manner, social work faculty, most of whom are White and affluent, generally have limited contact with members of other racial or social groups. This leads to the faulty assumption that there are no qualified non-White faculty, as well as discomfort in dealing with non-White students. This, in turn, results in the perpetuation of institutional racism and failure of effective implementation of the diversity standard.

In light of such developments, there is increased pressure on schools of social work to adopt practical methods for teaching culturally competent practice (Jeffery, 2005). In addition, Butler, Elliott, and Stopard (2003) argue that combating racism and racist attitudes must become a top priority for schools of social work even in the absence of students or faculty from underrepresented racial groups. There are several suggestions in the literature that might prove helpful for achieving those goals in social work education. In terms of content, Schiele (2007) contends that because people of color suffer from multiple types of oppression in comparison



with other marginalized groups, content on underrepresented racial groups ought to be emphasized in social work curriculums. Similarly, Graham (2009) warns against the recently diminished interest in including Black perspectives and Black studies in social work education, and urges social work scholars and educators to support exploration of issues that disproportionately affect Black communities.

Traditional methods of instruction, such as the information-transmission approach, tend to be didactic in nature and place the focus on the teacher, a method that is deemed inappropriate for the exploration of content as complex and fluid as culture. Instead, an experiential learning approach that focuses on teaching students how to obtain knowledge, rather than the acquisition of knowledge itself, is recommended as an alternative. This model of learning emphasizes group discussions and relegates the role of the teacher to that of a facilitator. Through participating in experiential learning and sharing their views with others, students begin to engage in self-reflection in a safe environment (Crompton, 1974; Nakanishi & Rittner, 1992), allowing them to comfortably explore their multiple cultural identities and gain a better understanding of the concept of multiculturalism (Fellin, 2000). Regardless of the particular methods used to incorporate content about cultural diversity in social work education, however, Carrillo, Holzhalt, and Thyer (1993) argue that students should constantly engage in self-assessment to measure the degree to which their attitudes about diverse groups have changed as a result of completing coursework on diversity. The authors believe that only through consistently and systematically gathering such quantitative data will social work educators be able to measure the effectiveness of instruction about diversity, and in turn the successful implementation of the CSWE diversity standard.

## **Efforts to Combat Racism in Social Work Education**

In the decades following the implementation of the diversity standard, schools of social work across the country sought to modify their educational philosophy in order to rectify existing structural practices that were deemed oppressive to students and faculty from underrepresented racial groups. One such school is the Smith College School for Social Work, which vowed to become an anti-racist institution in 1994 (Basham, Donner, Killough, & Wekmeister Rozas, 1997). To achieve this goal, the College implemented several changes, including redesigning the field education curriculum to include an anti-racism assignment where students are expected to use their knowledge and skills to combat racism and oppression at their field agencies (Basham, Donner, & Everett, 2001; Donner, Everett, & Basham, 2004). Preliminary evaluation of this endeavor produced mixed results; field agencies were much less resistant than expected (Donner et al., 2004), but students often felt uncomfortable challenging agency structure due to their status as interns or their racial identity (Basham et al., 2001).

Some schools chose to incorporate diversity in their curriculums through crafting courses that provide knowledge in hopes of changing students' attitudes and beliefs about various racial groups (Arnold, 1970; Garcia & Van Soest, 1997; Spears, 2004). Although the results cannot be generalized due to small sample sizes and other variables, feedback from students who participated in such courses often reflected increased levels of self-awareness, sensitivity to racial issues, and knowledge about the extent of racism and oppression (Spears, 2004). Even more frequently, however, discussion surrounding issues of race evoked strong feelings, such as guilt and frustration, due to the sensitive and complex nature of the topic (Arnold, 1970; Garcia & Van Soest, 1997). Increasingly, larger universities are implementing their own diversity

standards, requiring students to complete courses on diversity as part of their core graduation requirements. Results of those efforts suggest that students who complete more than one course on diversity are more likely to understand the structure of oppression and support race-based policy that seeks to eradicate institutional racism (Levonyan Radloff, 2010).

In contrast to the traditional didactic method of transmitting information about diversity to students, some colleges of social work have adopted more creative methods for discussing topics of race and racism (Deepak & Garcia Biggs, 2011; Miller & Donner, 2000; Wulff, St. George, Faul, Frey, & Frey, 2010). For example, one campus hosted a structured, public event that discussed the topic of racism through the format of a group dialogue led by experienced facilitators (Miller & Donner, 2000). Another college used elements of drama to stage an interview between a reporter and “Mr. Racism,” using satire, humor, and facts to shed light on the complexity of racism and oppression (Wulff et al., 2010). Examination of those creative approaches ultimately indicates that using group discussions, drama, and technology, such as personal stories and videos (Deepak & Garcia Biggs, 2011), show more promise than traditional methods in changing attitudes about race and combating racism among college students.

### **Unsatisfactory Progress to Achieve Diversity Standard**

At the time of initial introduction of the diversity standard requirement, literature indicated that the inclusion of content on underrepresented racial groups was, at best, peripheral, and at worst, it served to further perpetuate institutional racism (Herrick, 1978). Dominelli (1989) along with Santa Cruz, Helper, and Helper (1979) further discussed the implications of institutional racism that produced “educationally disadvantaged students” (p.297) from underrepresented racial groups who struggle to succeed in higher education, including social

work education. Santa Cruz et al. also observed that educationally disadvantaged students disproportionately experience health-related problems that frequently lead to their premature departure from college. Clearly, social work education struggled to fully incorporate the diversity standard in its structure for years following the introduction of the requirement.

Now, after nearly four decades of perfecting the method of implementation, literature still points to unsatisfactory inclusion of content on diversity in social work education. Bowie (2003) and Bowie, Hall, and Johnson (2011) examined the perception of African American MSW graduates of the extent that diversity and multiculturalism (DMC) content was present in their required Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) courses at the time of their enrollment. They found that content on diversity was seriously lacking in HBSE courses, often resulting from, according to respondents, instructors' lack of interest in covering the material. As a result, students from underrepresented racial groups felt pressured to bring up DMC content themselves. Daniel (2011a) reported similar findings, stating that students of color reported uncertainty about their White counterparts' preparation for culturally competent practice upon graduation due to limited, often inaccurate content on diversity in the curriculum. To speak out against such practices would have been arduous, however, since students from underrepresented racial groups often feel resented by others who view their presence as merely the result of affirmative action policies (Longres & Seltzer, 1994). Perhaps this helps to explain the findings of Bowie et al. (2011), who found statistically significant differences between the experiences of African American students who attended historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and those who attended traditionally White institutions (TWIs) in terms of diversity content and perceptions of administration and faculty fairness.

The extent of racism in social work education is not limited to students, however, as faculty from underrepresented racial groups report similar experiences within the educational institution. Those experiences include: verbal insults, covert discrimination practices, difficult tenure track, and superficial hiring practices that seek to fulfill a quota rather than genuinely improve the level of diversity within the college (Roberts & Anderson Smith, 2002).

Unfortunately, evidence suggests that despite the profession's proclaimed dedication to furthering diversity and ensuring culturally sensitive practice, members of underrepresented racial groups suffer from discrimination that is equivalent to that reported by faculty and students of color in other educational disciplines (Marcus et al., 2003; Miller & Sujitparapitaya, 2010).

### **Implications of Racism in Social Work Education**

The gravity of the presence of racism in social work education is that its implications extend far beyond the educational institution to encompass other areas of social work practice. For example, even outside the boundaries of college, social work students of color completing their required field practice under the supervision of field instructors with different racial backgrounds than themselves report feelings of discomfort and anticipate a myriad of potential problems to occur (McRoy, Freeman, Logan, & Blackmon, 1986). In addition, almost all students surveyed in one study (Razack, 2001) reported observing various forms of racial injustices at their field agencies. However, the students were reluctant to discuss issues of racism with their field instructors due to the power differential inherent in the student-supervisor relationship, virtually the same issue that was raised after the implementation of the anti-racism field assignment at the Smith College School for Social Work (Basham et al., 2001; Donner et al., 2004).

Even when students of color earn their degrees and enter the professional field, however, racism persists in social work, causing social workers from underrepresented racial groups to report concerns about experiencing racism in their practice and questioning opportunities for upward mobility (Daniel, 2011b). Indeed, Bowie et al. (2013) discovered that a bigger proportion of White, Bachelor level social workers earn an income of \$15,000-\$20,000 per year when compared to their African American counterparts. Furthermore, African American social workers are more likely to work at government agencies while White social workers are more likely to work in private agencies. Those findings are consistent with Dominelli's (1989) argument that Black social workers, when found, tend to work at the lower levels of the agency structure and that they are typically used to superficially satisfy diversity standards or are expected to practice exclusively with clients from their racial group.

### **Report on Methodological Approaches in Existing Literature**

The preceding literature review represents the bulk of available literature on topics of racism and race issues in social work education spanning more than four decades. Those studies, in turn, reflect a diverse range of methodologies – each of which has strengths and limitations. To better understand the available literature and contextualize the findings, this section provides a chronological summary of the specific research designs used by each of the studies cited in the previous section.

Prior to the introduction of the CSWE diversity standard, Arnold (1970) used a qualitative design to examine the perceptions of MSW students and faculty at the University of Pennsylvania following implementation of a new course on racism. In 1972, Longres conducted a literature review to examine conditions within colleges of social work that perpetuate

institutional racism and limit their ability to diversify their faculty, in turn affecting the quality of diversity-related education that students receive. Crompton (1974) also provided a literature review examining differences between various instructional approaches in transferring knowledge about underrepresented racial groups and discussing alternatives for more effective diversity education. In another literature review, Herrick (1978) evaluates the manner in which diversity content is included in social work education and examines social work institutions' role in perpetuating institutional racism. In 1979, Santa Cruz et al. used ethnographic observation to explore the experiences of educationally disadvantaged students in one graduate social work program.

During the next decade, a handful of articles continued to track the status and experiences of underrepresented racial groups in social work education and professional practice. For instance, Proctor and Davis (1983) provided a literature review questioning the vague language of the CSWE diversity standard and describing a number of different approaches to incorporate content on underrepresented racial groups into social work education that vary based on the desired outcomes of such efforts. McRoy et al. (1986) examined cross-cultural relationships in the context of field practice through a mixed methods design using questionnaires and interviews with students and field instructors at three universities. Finally, Dominelli (1989) conducted a literature review investigating the effect of racism on members of underrepresented racial groups in professional practice as well as educational settings. Although the focus of this article was on Britain, its findings were consistent with available literature on the same topics in the United States.

Research conducted in the 1990s focused primarily on issues of implementation of diversity content in social work education. In 1992, Nakanishi and Rittner provided a literature review examining the inclusionary cultural model as an effective tool for teaching social work students about culture and diversity. In addition, Carrillo et al. (1993) examined the literature and reported a number of appropriate quantitative measures that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction about diversity in changing social work students' perceptions of diverse groups of people. In 1994, Longres and Seltzer used case studies and literature review to analyze the effect of racism on recruitment and retention of students of color in social work. Basham et al. (1997) provided a case study detailing Smith College's efforts to become an anti-racist institution. Also in 1997, Garcia and Van Soest conducted an exploratory study using a qualitative design to measure the effect of MSW students' enrollment in a course on diversity in changing their understanding of their social identity and views about race and oppression. Gutierrez et al. (1999) in turn conducted a quantitative, descriptive study to examine the views of social work faculty about the importance of diversity content in social work education.

By the turn of the century, interest in issues of diversity in social work education had vastly increased. In 2000, Fellin conducted a literature review to conceptualize the emphasis on multiculturalism in social work education. Also in 2000, Miller and Donner conducted a case study using a survey design to assess MSW students' views about issues of race and racism after attending an event designed to increase student awareness about those topics. The following year, Razack (2001) conducted a study using both qualitative and quantitative methods to explore the experiences of BSW students of color within their field education setting. Basham et al. (2001) also focused on field education, conducting focus groups with faculty, field



instructors, and students to discuss their perceptions of the anti-racist field assignment recently implemented as a requirement in the Smith College field curriculum. Seeking to investigate the issue from a difference perspective, Roberts and Anderson Smith (2002) conducted a qualitative study to examine the experiences of African American faculty at predominantly White schools of social work. In addition, moving beyond social work education, Marcus et al. (2003) used a survey design to explore perceptions of discrimination among students on the campus of a university in Montgomery, Alabama. In the same year, Bowie (2003) used a mixed methods design to examine the presence of DMC content in HBSE courses as perceived by African American MSW graduates who attended predominantly White institutions. Also in 2003, Butler et al. developed a literature review suggesting ways for improvement in anti-racist social work education.

In 2004, Smith College faculty continued to report on the results of various efforts intended to fulfill their College's commitment to become an anti-racist institution. Donner et al. (2004) conducted an exploratory study using secondary data to examine the extent of agency collaboration with the school's anti-racist field assignment. In addition, Spears (2004) used quantitative and qualitative methods to study the impact of a cultural competency course on MSW students' racial identity. In 2005, Jeffery examined the relationship between Canadian social work educators' race and their perception of anti-racist social work practice using a qualitative design. During the same year, Bowie (2005) used survey data to investigate factors that influenced career and graduate school choices for African American MSW graduates. In 2007, Schiele conducted a literature review describing trends in multicultural content inclusion in social work education and discussing their implications. Graham (2008) also provided a

literature review discussing the importance of including Black perspectives in social work education.

Wulff et al. (2010) used a case study design to discuss the effectiveness of creative approaches in combating racism on campus. By that time, interest in diversity and anti-racism began to extend beyond social work settings. For instance, using a survey design, Levonyan Radloff (2010) examined the relationship between completion of a university's diversity graduation requirement and students' views on equal opportunities for racially diverse groups. Miller and Sujitparapitaya (2010) also used a survey design to investigate students' perceptions of discrimination at a racially mixed university. In 2011, Jani et al. provided a literature review detailing the introduction and evolution of CSWE's diversity standard that is the focus of this study. Also in 2011, Ikuenobe provided a conceptual framework for thinking about racism in its recent, more subtle forms. Deepak and Garcia Biggs (2011) used a qualitative design to measure BSW students' perception of the use of intimate technology in HBSE courses as a method of learning about discrimination and racism. In contrast, Bowie et al. (2011) employed a survey design to retrospectively examine African American MSW graduates' perception of the presence of adequate diversity content in HBSE classes. Corroborating Bowie's (2005) previous research, Daniel (2011b) interviewed 45 students from underrepresented racial groups at a large, urban university to determine contextual factors affecting their career choices. Daniel (2011a) conducted a second study during the same year, also using an interview design, to examine MSW students of colors' perceptions of multiculturalism instruction in social work education.

More recently, Hoyt (2012) provided a conceptual framework, used as the main reference for this study, of the meaning of racism. Feagin and Elias (2013) also discussed theories of

racism in a literature review published the following year. Finally, Bowie et al. (2013) continued to examine career choice factors for MSW graduates in the United States using a survey design, this time with a bigger sample of 1,020 individuals from both African American and Caucasian racial groups.

### **Gaps in Literature**

The literature discussed thus far points to a serious discrepancy between social work's professed interest in furthering diversity and achieving social justice and a reality that reflects persisting institutional racism and racial discrimination in both the educational and professional realms. Moreover, there is a gap in the literature assessing the extent to which schools of social work have effectively implemented the diversity standard set forth by CSWE nearly four decades ago. Indeed, no study has been conducted thus far that has directly measured perceived racial discrimination by social work students from underrepresented racial groups. In addition, the few studies whose results have peripherally mentioned the topic cannot be generalized due to small sample sizes and other variables.

### **Purpose and Significance of the Study**

This study seeks to address the current gap in literature that fails to provide a clear description of the extent to which social work students of color experience discrimination within social work institutions. More specifically, this exploratory study examines levels of perceived racial discrimination among students of color enrolled in social work programs over the past several decades. The findings of this study will shed light on the degree of advancement in social work education's true commitment to eradicating racism, recruiting students from diverse racial backgrounds, and preparing practitioners who will be competent in providing services to an

increasingly diverse clientele. To achieve those goals, data collected in this study was analyzed to ascertain the following as it relates to study respondents:

1. Perceived institutional racism at their social work programs and how it affected them;
2. Perceived fair and equal treatment by their social work faculty and administration;
3. Perceived sensitivity of their social work faculty and administration to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups; and to,
4. Determine whether respondent demographic or variables are related at a statistically significant level to the variables delineated above.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **Methodology**

#### **Research Design and Research Questions**

This study utilizes a secondary data analysis approach to examine an existing data set collected using the Bowie-Hancock Preparation for Graduate Social Work Education (PGSWE) Scale. This data was collected during the period between May 1996 and December 2003 using a non-experimental, cross-sectional survey design. This data was analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. What percentages of respondents perceive that “institutional racism” existed at their social work programs and to what extent were they affected by it?
2. To what extent did respondents perceive that they received fair and equal treatment by their social work program administration, in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid availability, scheduling of classes, and so forth?
3. To what extent did respondents perceive that they received fair and equal treatment by their social work program faculty, in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and academic problem resolution?
4. To what extent did respondents perceive that their social work program administration was sensitive to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups?
5. To what extent did respondents perceive that their social work program faculty was sensitive to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups?

6. What specific respondent demographic or other factors are related at a statistically significant level to the variables delineated above?

### **Instrumentation**

The data used in this study was gathered using the Bowie-Hancock Preparation for Graduate Social Work Education (PGSWE) Scale that was developed to assess the degree to which individuals were prepared to navigate through the various aspects of the graduate school environment and to complete an MSW program. The PGSWE survey consists of predominantly closed-ended questions and Likert scale response options. The scale consists of three domains: social, psychological, and cognitive, with two subscales within each domain. This current study utilizes the Perceived Fairness of Treatment Subscale (PFTS) of the Psychological Domain. This subscale was chosen due to its ability to provide data specific to the research questions listed above. The PFTS contains four questions that measure the extent to which respondents felt that their undergraduate and graduate social work program administration treated them fairly and equally in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid availability, and availability of classes, among other factors; and the extent to which respondents felt that their undergraduate and graduate faculty treated them fairly and equally in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and academic problem resolution. The PFTS was found to have an alpha coefficient of .71 for African American respondents. The current study also uses other non-classified Psychological Domain questions from the PGSWE Scale to answer the research questions.

In addition to questions pertaining to each of the domains, the PGSWE scale collects a large amount of background information about respondents, including demographic information, family history, and information about respondents' undergraduate and graduate educational

experience. Those variables were used to provide a context for differences among groups of respondents included in the sample. The PGSWE scale is further discussed in the literature (Bowie & Hancock, 1998). A copy of the PGSWE survey is available in Appendix A.

### **Sampling**

Data used for this study was obtained using a purposive and intermittent snowball sampling design between May 1996 and December 2003. The original sample consisted of 1,054 MSW graduates from 19 states and the District of Columbia. The majority of respondents were Caucasian (64.2%) and African American (32.5%), followed by much smaller percentages of other racial groups, including Latinos, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans. For the purposes of this study, a differential data analysis was conducted to isolate respondents of color (N=377) from the original sample since the research questions specifically target this population.

### **Data Analysis**

Data for this study was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Frequency distributions and measures of central tendency were used to determine the demographic characteristics of the sample and answer some of the research questions. In addition, chi-square tests were used to identify variables that contribute to perceived discrimination among respondents in the sample.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **Results**

#### **Sample Characteristics**

Of the 1,054 survey respondents who reported their race, 35.8% (N=377) identified as people of color. This is the group that constitutes the focus of this study. Within this sample, the largest concentration of respondents were African American/Black (91%, N=343), followed by much smaller numbers of Hispanic/Latino (5.3%, N=20), Asian/Pacific Islander (2.4%, N=9), and Native American (1.3%, N=5) individuals. Several countries of origin other than the United States were represented in this sample, including Haiti, Cuba, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, South American nations, and African nations, among others. The average age of respondents was 58.02 (SD=10.60). The majority of the sample were females (79%, N=298) and nearly half of them (43.6%, N=149) had a bachelor's degree in social work. The years of graduation from an MSW program ranged from 1958 to 2002 (M=1990.60, SD=9.54). In addition, more than half of respondents (58.9%, N=219) attended predominantly White undergraduate schools while a third (30.6%, N=114) attended predominantly Black undergraduate schools. In comparison, a larger majority of respondents attended predominantly White graduate schools (72.4%, N=97) and 17.2% (N=23) attended predominantly Black graduate schools. Tables 1 and 2 outline the demographic and education characteristics of the sample. All tables are included in Appendix B.

#### **Awareness of Institutional Racism and Extent Affected by It**

Nearly three-fourths of respondents (73.0%, N=257) reported that they were aware of the existence of institutional racism while enrolled in their undergraduate institution. In addition, 70.5% (N=227) believed they were affected by institutional racism at their undergraduate



schools, with 49.7% (N=160) reporting that they were affected by it *somewhat* or *a great deal*. Similarly, 78.3% (N=274) of respondents reported that they were aware of the existence of institutional racism while enrolled in their graduate school. A significant number were ever affected by it (76.9%, N=246), with more than half (57.2%, N=183) reporting that they were affected by institutional racism in graduate school *somewhat* or *a great deal*. Table 3 further outlines this data.

### **Perception of Fair and Equal Treatment by Administration**

A significant majority of respondents (83.6%, N=311) reported that they received *very* or *moderately fair and equal* treatment by their undergraduate school administration in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid eligibility, and class scheduling, among other things. In contrast, only 2.4% (N=9) reported receiving *not fair and equal* treatment by undergraduate administration. Similarly, 80.2% (N=299) of the sample said that they received *very* or *moderately fair and equal* treatment by their graduate school administration in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid eligibility, class scheduling, and field placement. A small percentage (6.2%, N=23) reported that they received *not fair and equal* treatment by their graduate school administration in those areas. Table 4 outlines the data described in this section.

### **Perception of Fair and Equal Treatment by Faculty**

A slightly smaller percentage of the sample (79.1%, N=295) reported that they received *very* or *moderately fair and equal* treatment by their undergraduate school faculty in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and academic problem resolution, among other areas. A small number of respondents (5.4%, N=20) said that they received *not fair and equal* treatment by their undergraduate school faculty. Similarly, 77.4% (N=287) of respondents reported

receiving *very* or *moderately fair and equal* treatment by their graduate school faculty in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and academic problem resolution. Consistent with data thus far, only 6.5% (N=24) of the sample said they received *not fair and equal* treatment by their graduate school faculty. Table 5 further outlines this data.

### **Perception of Administration/Faculty Sensitivity to Needs of Students of Color**

More than half of respondents (55.2%, N=203) believed that their graduate school administration was *very* or *somewhat sensitive* to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups. Meanwhile, a small percentage of the sample (14.7%, N=54) believed that the sensitivity of graduate school administration to the concerns and needs of this group of students was *non-existent*. In comparison, the degree of sensitivity of graduate school faculty to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups was rated slightly higher, with 59.4% (N=222) of respondents reporting *very* or *somewhat sensitive* faculty. A comparably small number (13.4%, N=50) said that the sensitivity of graduate school faculty to the needs and concerns of this group of students was *non-existent*. Table 6 outlines this information.

### **Relationships between Variables during Undergraduate Education**

In order to examine the relationship between variables and assess whether any demographic or other variables are correlated with perceived discrimination among social work students of color, chi-square tests of independence were performed. Prior to running such tests, however, a number of variables were recoded in SPSS. For example, both “year of undergraduate graduation” and the “year of MSW graduation” were recoded to transform them into categorical variables suitable for chi-square testing. Two categories were created: *prior to*

*1972 and 1972 and after*. The rationale for this categorization of years of graduation is that the diversity standard was added by CSWE in 1971; thus respondents who graduated prior to 1972 were unlikely to have been affected by this change, whereas one would expect that the diversity standard would begin yielding results beginning the year after its implementation. In addition, several other variables were collapsed into a smaller number of categories due to insufficient expected cell counts that threatened the integrity of chi-square tests. For instance, race was recoded into *Black* and *other people of color*; nationality was recoded into *United States* and *other nation*; and childhood SES was recoded into *lower class*, *working class*, *middle class*, and *upper middle/upper class*. Moreover, also due to insufficient data in some chi-square cells, comparisons were drawn only between *predominantly Black* and *predominantly White* institutions for both undergraduate and graduate schools, eliminating *equally populated* schools.

After variable recoding was complete, two groups of chi-square tests were conducted to answer the research question, one for respondents' experiences during their undergraduate education and another for their experiences during their graduate education. The independent variables used for the first group of tests were: gender, race, nationality, childhood socioeconomic status, undergraduate major, year of graduation from undergraduate institution, and undergraduate school primary ethnicity. The dependent variables for this group of tests were: awareness of institutional racism during undergraduate education, extent affected by institutional racism during undergraduate education, perception of fair treatment by administration during undergraduate education, and perception of fair treatment by faculty during undergraduate education (see Table 7 for a complete list of chi-square results for this group).

Chi-square tests of independence revealed that the primary ethnicity of respondents' schools was significantly correlated with student's perceived racial discrimination during their undergraduate education. Indeed, this variable was found to be correlated at a statistically significant level to all of the dependent variables tested. For instance, awareness of institutional racism and undergraduate school primary ethnicity were related at a statistically significant level (Chi-square value=26.58, df=1, p=.000, V=.291). Closer examination of data reveals that significantly more respondents who attended predominantly White institutions were aware of the existence of institutional racism (83.1%, N=167) compared to those who attended predominantly Black (56.3%, N=63) institutions. The extent that respondents were affected by institutional racism and undergraduate school primary ethnicity were also related at a statistically significant level (Chi-square value=54.60, df=3, p=.000, V=.436). More than half of respondents who attended predominantly Black institutions (57.6%, N=57) reported that they were *not at all* affected by institutional racism, while a much smaller proportion of students attending predominantly White institutions (16.5%, N=31) reported the same.

Similarly, perception of fair treatment by administration and undergraduate school primary ethnicity were related at a statistically significant level (Chi-square value=36.77, df=3, p=.000, V=.333). More than three-fourths of respondents who attended predominantly Black institutions (76.3%, N=87) reported that they received *very fair and equal* treatment from administration. In contrast, 41.5% (N=90) of respondents who attended predominantly White schools reported the same. Finally, perception of fair treatment by faculty and undergraduate school primary ethnicity were related at a statistically significant level (Chi-square value=55.62, df=3, p=.000, V=.409). Significantly more respondents who attended predominantly Black

institutions reported that they received *very fair and equal* treatment from faculty (79.8%, N=91) compared to 37.6% (N=82) who attended predominantly White institutions.

In addition to school's primary ethnicity, childhood SES was found to be related at a statistically significant level to two dependent variables. Childhood SES and perception of fair treatment by administration were significantly correlated (Chi-square value=6.99, df=9,  $p=.048$ , Tau-b=-.092). Respondents who reported a *middle class* childhood SES had the highest incident of *very fair and equal* treatment (57.8%, N=59) and the lowest rate of *not fair and equal* treatment (0.0%, N=0). In contrast, both respondents who reported *lower class* and *upper middle/upper class* had the lowest incidents of *very fair and equal* treatment (43.2%, N=19, and 54.2%, N=13, respectively) and the highest rates of *not fair and equal* treatment (4.5%, N=2, and 4.2%, N=1, respectively). Childhood SES was also statistically significantly related to respondents' perception of fair treatment by undergraduate faculty (Chi-square value=16.71, df=9,  $p=.001$ , Tau-b=-.151). Respondents with a childhood SES of *upper middle/upper class* reported the highest rates of *very fair and equal* treatment (70.8%, N=17) and the lowest rate of *not fair and equal* treatment (0.0%, N=0). In contrast, individuals with a childhood SES of *lower class* reported the highest level of *not fair and equal* treatment (11.4%, N=5), and those with a childhood SES of *working class* reported the lowest levels of *very fair and equal* treatment (44.6%, N=90). Tables 9 through 13 provide a cross-tabulation of all statistically significant variables discussed in this section.

### **Relationships between Variables during Graduate Education**

The independent variables used for the second group of testing, related to students' perception of racial discrimination during their graduate social work education, were: gender,

race, nationality, childhood socioeconomic status, year of graduation from MSW program, and graduate school primary ethnicity. The dependent variables in this group were: awareness of institutional racism; extent affected by it; perception of fair treatment by administration; perception of fair treatment by faculty; perception of faculty sensitivity to concerns of students from underrepresented racial groups; perception of administration sensitivity to concerns of students from underrepresented racial groups; and awareness of lack of course content relevant to experiences of students from underrepresented racial groups (see Table 14 for a complete list of chi-square results for this group).

Chi-square tests of independence revealed a number of significant relationships in this sample. The most significant variable to students' perception of racial discrimination was graduate school primary ethnicity, which was significantly related to six of the seven dependent variables tested. It was related to awareness of institutional racism during graduate school (Chi-square value=31.48, df=1, p=.000, V=.519), with students from predominantly White institutions being much more aware of the existence of institutional racism than their counterparts from predominantly Black institutions (92.7%, N=89, and 42.9%, N=9, respectively). The extent affected by institutional racism during graduate school was also significantly related to this variable (Chi-square value=27.88, df=3, p=.000, V=.506); with more than half of respondents from predominantly Black institutions (55.6%, N=10) reporting that they were *not at all* affected, whereas 36.3% (N=33) of respondents from predominantly White institutions reported being affected *a great deal* by institutional racism. Similarly, school's primary ethnicity was significantly related to students' perception of fair treatment by graduate school faculty (Chi-square value=14.38, df=3, p=.002, V=.348). None of the respondents who attended

predominantly Black institutions reported *not fair and equal* treatment, while 10.3% (N=10) of those who attended predominantly White institutions reported the same.

Graduate school primary ethnicity was also significantly related to perception of faculty sensitivity to concerns of students from underrepresented racial groups (Chi-square value=22.40,  $df=3$ ,  $p=.000$ ,  $V=.432$ ), with 56.5% (N=13) of those who attended predominantly Black institutions reporting that faculty were *very sensitive* to their concerns, compared to only 13.4% (N=13) of those who attended predominantly White institutions. Likewise, this variable was related to perception of administration sensitivity to concerns of students from underrepresented racial groups (Chi-square value=24.83,  $df=3$ ,  $p=.000$ ,  $V=.457$ ), with a larger proportion of respondents who attended predominantly Black institutions (60.9%, N=14) reporting that administrators were *very sensitive* to their concerns, compared to only 13.5% (N=13) of respondents who attended predominantly White institutions who reported the same. School's primary ethnicity was also related to respondents' awareness of lack of course content that is relevant to experiences of students from underrepresented racial groups (Chi-square value=29.56,  $df=3$ ,  $p=.000$ ,  $V=.498$ ). Significantly more respondents from predominantly White institutions (36.5%, N=35) reported being aware of this lack of relevant course content *a great deal*, compared to only 13.0% (N=3) of respondents from predominantly Black institutions who reported the same.

In addition, race was found to be significantly related to two of the dependent variables. The first one is awareness of institutional racism during graduate school (Chi-square value=6.93,  $df=1$ ,  $p=.009$ ,  $V=.141$ ), with Black respondents much more likely to have been aware of the existence of institutional racism (79.8%, N=265) compared to respondents from other racial

groups (52.9%, N=9). The second dependent variable significantly related to race is perception of fair treatment by graduate school faculty (Chi-square value=9.90, df=3, p=.019, V=.163), with a much smaller proportion of Black respondents reporting *very fair and equal* treatment (41.7%, N=141) compared to respondents from other racial groups (69.7%, N=23). Another significant relationship was found between childhood SES and perception of fair treatment by faculty (Chi-square value=17.12, df=9, p=.006, Tau-b=-.131). Respondents with a childhood SES of *upper middle/upper class* reported both the highest level of *very fair and equal* treatment (58.3%, N=14) and the highest level of *not fair and equal* treatment (12.5%, N=3).

Moreover, nationality was significantly related to three dependent variables. The first variable is awareness of institutional racism (Chi-square value=4.73, df=1, p=.030, V=.117), with respondents from the United States reporting a much higher rate of awareness (80.3%, N=236) compared to respondents from other nations (66.7%, N=34). Nationality was also related to perception of administration sensitivity to concerns of students from underrepresented racial groups (Chi-square value=8.80, df=3, p=.032, V=.155), with a greater proportion of respondents from the United States reporting that administrators were *very sensitive* to their needs (20.2%, N=61) compared to 11.3% (N=7) of respondents from other nations. The third dependent variable significantly related to nationality is awareness of lack of course content that is relevant to experiences of students from underrepresented racial groups (Chi-square value=9.05, df=3, p=.029, V=.159), with proportionately more respondents from the United States reporting being aware of this *a great deal* (30.5%, N=91) compared to respondents from other nations (19.4%, N=12). Tables 15 through 26 provide a cross-tabulation of all statistically significant variables discussed in this section.



## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion and Conclusions

#### Significant Factors

Results of this study indicate that, by far, the most statistically significant factor to students' perceptions of discrimination in colleges of social work is the primary ethnicity of the school they attend. Repeatedly, chi-square testing revealed that students of color who attend predominantly Black institutions are much more likely to report perceptions of fair treatment by faculty and administration as well as a higher level of perceived faculty and administration sensitivity to the concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups. Those results are consistent with the findings of Bowie et al. (2011) that compared African American student experiences in HBCUs and TWIs. Perhaps predominantly Black institutions are inherently less racist due to the racial composition of their student and faculty populations. Or perhaps faculty and administration at those institutions use more effective methods of teaching diversity content to their students. While an in-depth discussion of the differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White institutions is beyond the scope of this study, ultimately, as the single most significant predictor of perceived fairness of treatment by students of color in both undergraduate and graduate education, it is a worthy topic for future research.

Testing further revealed that race and nationality were occasionally significant predictors of respondents' perceptions of fair treatment. Black respondents were less likely to report fair treatment by faculty when compared to other students of color. In contrast, students from the United States were more likely to report perceived administration sensitivity to concerns and needs of students from underrepresented racial groups. Due to the design of this study, it is

impossible to discern whether those differences between groups are merely differences in perception or whether they have a basis in concrete experiences. Nonetheless, such discrepancies are noteworthy as they can have far-reaching implications on the study of multiculturalism in social work. Clearly, experiences of individuals vary significantly for a variety of reasons, deeming the traditional clustering of all people of color into one group largely erroneous.

Another variable that was intermittently significant to perceptions of discrimination was childhood socioeconomic status. Although those results are difficult to interpret due to a small sample size, chi-square testing revealed an often curvilinear relationship between childhood socioeconomic status and perceptions of fair treatment by faculty and administration. It appears that a higher socioeconomic status mitigates perception of discrimination by students of color, but only to an extent. As individuals reach the upper class, however, their perception of unfair treatment increases. Further research is necessary to establish the reasons behind the statistically significant relationships discussed here.

### **Non-Significant Factors**

Perhaps as equally interesting as the factors found to be significantly related to perceptions of fair treatment are the factors that were found to have no significant relationship with such perceptions. The most prominent of those variables is year of graduation. Indeed, the premise of this study was that the CSWE diversity standard, introduced in 1971, would have impacted social work education, particularly in terms of improving experiences for students of color. It appears, however, that this assumption was incorrect, given that year of graduation was not found to be significantly related to any of the dependent variables tested in this study. Nonetheless, one ought not to be too hasty to dismiss the diversity standard as ineffective based

on those results. Indeed, Arnold's (1970) study, previously cited in the literature review, indicates that efforts to combat racism in colleges of social work preceded the introduction of the diversity standard in 1971. It is possible, therefore, that this explains the apparent lack of difference between perceptions of racial discrimination prior to and after 1971. Future research could further investigate this issue by conducting a comprehensive literature review on the topic prior to 1971.

Another factor that was found to be lacking in significance was undergraduate major. No statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of discrimination of students who had undergraduate degrees in social work and those who had undergraduate degrees in other disciplines. This is seemingly in stark contrast to the idea that social work is a profession that takes a special interest in combating racism and ensuring fairness of treatment for all people. At the surface, therefore, this seems to contribute to the conclusion that the diversity standard has been largely ineffective, and that social work as a profession is not truly committed to eliminating racism. Nonetheless, results of this study simply indicate that there is no difference between perceptions of discrimination in social work and other disciplines, not the extent to which discrimination actually exists in either setting. In addition, there is a distinct amount of literature discussed above that assesses perceptions of, and efforts to eradicate, racism from higher education in settings other than social work. As such, it would be erroneous to interpret those results to mean that the social work profession has failed in its mission to implement positive changes in social work education, as it is equally plausible that the entire higher education system in the United States is moving toward appreciation of cultural competence and cultural diversity.

## **Implications for Social Work Education and Practice**

Despite the qualifiers discussed in the previous section, results of this study do, indeed, indicate that students of color continue to feel disadvantaged in social work education nearly four decades following the introduction of the diversity standard, especially in predominantly White institutions. The implications of those perceptions of racial discrimination in social work education are grave, particularly as they relate to cultural competence that is an essential part of effective social work practice. The trouble with lacking diversity content and a fair environment in social work institutions is that White social workers, who constitute the majority of practitioners in the United States, will be largely unprepared to effectively practice with an increasingly diverse clientele. Moreover, the decreasing enrollment and graduation rates of students of color in colleges of social work, noted by Bowie et al. (2013), will likely continue to plummet if students continue to perceive that ensuring diversity and cultural competence is not a priority in their institutions of social work education.

## **Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

This study has several strengths that add to its value to social work education. It is the first known study to specifically examine perception of racial discrimination in schools of social work using a number of variables to determine the overall experiences of students of color. In addition, the sample size of 377 along with the range of schools and states represented within the sample increase the generalizability of results. Finally, the cross-sectional design of the study allows it to examine the experiences of students of color in social work education over a span of nearly 50 years.

As mentioned above, a considerable strength of this current study is its ability to compare the experiences and perceptions of students whose period of enrollment spans across nearly half a century. It is precisely this fact, however, that also poses the greatest limitation of the study. Respondents included in this sample typically completed the PGSWE scale many years, even decades, after their graduation from an MSW program. As such, it is virtually impossible to be completely confident in the accuracy of reported perceptions. Indeed, maturation, history, recall error, and passage of time all pose threats to the internal validity of the study. Another limitation of this study is its emphasis on perceptions of racial discrimination. Although perception is a powerful force that undoubtedly affects one's experiences, it is also very subjective and depends on a myriad of factors that could, theoretically, have no connection to the actual environment within colleges of social work. Due to the relatively large sample size in this study, it might be expected that fluctuations in individual perceptions would be evened out. However, this cannot be guaranteed.

Future research could address this second limitation by examining concrete indicators of racial discrimination in schools of social work, including: the number of students and faculty from underrepresented racial groups, the types of diversity content incorporated into classes, and the proportion of students of color who successfully complete MSW programs, among other things. Comparisons between perceptions and concrete indicators of discrimination would provide valuable insight to schools of social work that seek to fully incorporate the diversity standard and eliminate racism and discrimination from their educational settings.

## **Conclusion**

This exploratory study sought to understand the extent to which CSWE's diversity standard is effectively implemented in social work institutions. This was done by examining perceptions of discrimination of social work students of color. Using data collected from the PGSWE scale, a secondary data analysis was conducted for 377 respondents who identified as people of color. Results indicate that the single most significant predictor of perceived racial discrimination is whether students attended predominantly Black or White institutions. No difference was found between respondents who graduated before and after the implementation of the diversity standard in 1971. More research is needed to corroborate those findings and further examine the reasons for the differences, or lack thereof, between the various groups studied herein.

## References

- Arnold, H. D. (1970). American racism: Implications for social work. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 6*(2), 7-12.
- Basham, K. K., Donner, S., & Everett, J. E. (2001). A controversial commitment: The anti-racism field assignment. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 21*(1/2), 157-174.
- Basham, K. K., Donner, S., Killough, R. M., & Wekmeister Rozas, L. (1997). Becoming an anti-racist institution. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 67*(3), 564-585.
- Bowie, S. L. (2003). Perceived diversity and multi-culturalism content in HBSE courses: An integrative methodological survey of African American MSW graduates from predominantly White institutions. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 8*(1), 1-23.
- Bowie, S. L., Banks, S., & Davis-Buckley, R. J. (2013). *Differential career choice factors for Caucasian and African American MSW graduates in the United States: Implications for the social work labor force, diversity, and evidence-based recruitment strategies for students of color*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bowie, S. L., Cherry, D. J., & House Wooding, L. (2005). African American MSW students: Personal influences on social work careers and factors in graduate school selection. *Social Work Education, 24*(2), 169-184.
- Bowie, S. L., Hall, J. C., & Johnson, O. J. (2011). Integrating diversity into graduate social work education: A 30-year retrospective view by MSW-level African American social workers. *Journal of Black Studies, 42*(7), 1080-1105.



- Bowie, S. L., & Hancock, H. (1998). Preparation for graduate social work education: Assessing the reliability and validity of a new measure for determining recruitment and retention correlates among African American and Caribbean Students. *Black Caucus: Journal of the National Association of Black Social Workers*, 3, 1-20.
- Butler, A., Elliott, T., & Stopard, N. (2003). Living up to the standards we set: A critical account of the development of anti-racist standards. *Social Work Education*, 22(3), 271-282.
- Carrillo, D. F., Holzhalb, C. M., & Thyer, B. A. (1993). Assessing social work students' attitudes related to cultural diversity: A review of selected measures. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 29(3), 263-268.
- Council on Social Work Education. (1971). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (Rev. ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Council on Social Work Education. (1973). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (Rev. ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Crompton, D. W. (1974). Minority content in social work education – Promise or pitfall?, *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 10(1), 9-18.
- Daniel, C. (2011a). Lessons learned: Pedagogical tensions and struggles with instruction on multiculturalism in social work. *Social Work Education*, 30(3), 250-265.
- Daniel, C. (2011b). The path to social work: Contextual determinants of career choice among racial/ethnic minority students. *Social Work Education*, 30(8), 895-910.

- Deepak, A. C., & Garcia Biggs, M. J. (2011). Intimate technology: A tool for teaching anti-racism in social work education. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 20*(1), 39-56.
- Dominelli, L. (1989). An uncaring profession? An examination of racism in social work. *New Community, 15*(3), 391-403.
- Donner, S., Everett, J., & Basham, K. (2004). The antiracism field assignment: Beginning results and lessons learned. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 24*(3/4), 147-163.
- Feagin, J., & Elias, S. (2013). Symposium on rethinking racial formation theory. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36*(6), 931-960.
- Fellin, P. (2000). Revisiting multiculturalism in social work. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(2) 261-278.
- Garcia, B., & Van Soest, D. (1997). Changing perceptions of diversity and oppression: MSW students discuss the effects of a required course. *Journal of Social Work Education, 33*(1), 119-129.
- Graham, M. (2009). Reframing Black perspectives in social work: New directions?, *Social Work Education, 28*(3), 268-280.
- Gutierrez, L., Fredricksen, K., & Soifer, S. (1999). Perspectives of social work faculty on diversity and societal oppression content: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Social Work Education, 35*(3), 409-419.
- Herrick, J. E. (1978). The perpetuation of institutional racism through ethnic and racial minority content in the curriculum of schools of social work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 5*(6), 527-537.

- Hoyt, C., Jr. (2012). The pedagogy of the meaning of racism: Reconciling a distant discourse. *Social Work, 57*(3), 225-234.
- Ikuenobe, P. (2011). Conceptualizing racism and its subtle forms. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 41*(2), 161-181.
- Jani, J. S., Pierce, D., Ortiz, L., & Sowbel, L. (2011). Access to intersectionality, content to competence: Deconstructing social work education diversity standards. *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(2), 283-301.
- Jeffery, D. (2005). 'What good is anti-racist social work if you can't master it'? Exploring a paradox in anti-racist social work education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(4), 409-425.
- Levonyan Radloff, T. D. (2010). College students' perceptions of equal opportunity for African Americans and race-based policy: Do diversity course requirements make a difference?, *College Student Journal, 44*(2), 558-564.
- Longres, J. (1972). The impact of racism on social work education. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 8*(1), 31-41.
- Longres, J. F., & Seltzer, G. (1994). Racism: Its implications for the education of minority social work students. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 3*(1), 59-75.
- Marcus, A., Mullins, L. C., Brackett, K. P., Tang, Z., Allen, A. M., & Pruett, D. W. (2003). Perceptions of racism on campus. *College Student Journal, 37*(4), 611-626.

- McRoy, R. G., Freeman, E. M., Logan, S. L., & Blackmon, B. (1986). Cross-cultural field supervision: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 22(1), 50-56.
- Miller, B., & Sujitparapitaya, S. (2010). Campus climate in the twenty-first century: Estimating perceptions of discrimination at a racially mixed institution, 1994-2006. *New Direction for Institutional Research*, 145, 29-52.
- Miller, J., & Donner, S. (2000). More than just talk: The use of racial dialogues to combat racism. *Social Work with Groups*, 23(3), 31-53.
- Nakanishi, M., & Rittner, B. (1992). The inclusionary cultural model. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28(1), 27-35.
- National Association of Social Workers (NASW). (2008). *Code of Ethics*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/code.asp>
- Proctor, E. K., & Davis, L. E. (1983). Minority content in social work education: A question of objectives. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 19(2), 85-93.
- Razack, N. (2001). Diversity and difference in the field education encounter: Racial minority students in the practicum. *Social Work Education*, 20(2), 219-232.
- Roberts, T. L., & Anderson Smith, L. (2002). The illusion of inclusion: An analysis of approaches to diversity within predominantly White schools of social work. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 22(3/4), 189-211.
- Santa Cruz, L. A., Helper, S. A., & Helper, M. (1979). Educationally disadvantaged students and social work education. *Social Work*, 24(4), 297-303.

- Schiele, J. H. (2007). Minority fellowship program implications of the equality-of-oppressions paradigm for curriculum content on people of color. *Journal of Social Work Education, 43*(1), 83-100.
- Spears, S. S. (2004). The impact of a cultural competency course on the racial identity of MSWs. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 74*(2), 271-288.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008). *National population projections*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/2009projections.html>
- Wulff, D., St. George, S., Faul, A. C., Frey, A., & Frey, S. (2010). Drama in the academy. *Qualitative Social Work, 9*(1), 111-127.

## Appendices

**Appendix A**  
**PGSWE Survey**

**THE BOWIE-HANCOCK PREPARATION FOR GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK  
EDUCATION (PGSWE) SURVEY (For individuals with the M.S.W. Degree) MULTI-  
GROUP VERSION**

1. Year enrolled in the M.S.W. Program
2. Year graduated from the M.S.W. Program
3. Year of your birth.
4. Gender
  1. \_\_\_\_\_ Male
  2. \_\_\_\_\_ Female
5. Race
  1. \_\_\_\_\_ White
  2. \_\_\_\_\_ Black
  3. \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic
  4. \_\_\_\_\_ Asian/Pacific Islander
  5. \_\_\_\_\_ Native American/Native Alaskan
6. Nationality (Select only one)
  1. \_\_\_\_\_ United States
  2. \_\_\_\_\_ Bahamas
  3. \_\_\_\_\_ Cuba
  4. \_\_\_\_\_ Dominican Republic
  5. \_\_\_\_\_ Haiti
  6. \_\_\_\_\_ Jamaica
  7. \_\_\_\_\_ Granada
  8. \_\_\_\_\_ Trinidad-Tobago
  9. \_\_\_\_\_ Puerto Rico
  10. \_\_\_\_\_ Other Caribbean Nation (specify)
  11. \_\_\_\_\_ Other Latin American Nation (specify)
  12. \_\_\_\_\_ Asian Nation (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  13. \_\_\_\_\_ African nation (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  14. \_\_\_\_\_ European nation (Specify)
  15. \_\_\_\_\_ Other nation (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
7. Name of undergraduate school



- 7A Name of graduate school
8. Year graduated from undergraduate school.
9. Undergraduate major:
10. How would you classify the racial make-up of your **undergraduate** school during your attendance there?
1. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly black (i.e., HBCU)
  2. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly white
  3. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly multicultural
11. How would you classify the racial make-up of your **graduate** school during your attendance there?
1. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly black (i.e., HBCU)
  2. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly white
  3. \_\_\_\_ Predominantly multicultural
12. During childhood, your family's socioeconomic status was:
1. \_\_\_\_ Lower class
  2. \_\_\_\_ Working class
  3. \_\_\_\_ Middle class
  4. \_\_\_\_ Upper middle class
  5. \_\_\_\_ Upper class
13. Who did you primarily live with as a child? (Check all that apply)
1. \_\_\_\_ Mom
  2. \_\_\_\_ Dad
  3. \_\_\_\_ Siblings (how many? \_\_\_\_\_ )
  4. \_\_\_\_ Grandparent(s)
  5. \_\_\_\_ Aunt(s)
  6. \_\_\_\_ Uncle(s)
  7. \_\_\_\_ Cousin(s)
  8. \_\_\_\_ Other (Please list
14. Circle an educational level (if you know it) for each person designated as an **immediate** family member above.

<u>Relative</u> <u>Graduate School</u>	<u>Elem./Jr. High</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>College/Technical</u>
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16 17 18 19

15. When you were a child, what was your **father's** (or other male primary caretaker's) primary occupation?  
(Specify)
16. When you were a child, what was your **mother's** (or other female primary caretaker's) primary occupation?  
(Specify)
17. What was your socio-economic status prior to entering the M.S.W. program?
1. \_\_\_\_\_ Lower class
  2. \_\_\_\_\_ Working class
  3. \_\_\_\_\_ Middle class
  4. \_\_\_\_\_ Upper middle class
  5. \_\_\_\_\_ Upper class

In this section, please indicate the extent to which the following statements are reflective of your employment experience **prior to entering the M.S.W. Program.**

18. I held supervisory positions.
1. \_\_\_\_\_ Never
  2. \_\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
  3. \_\_\_\_\_ Frequently

- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

19. I had active committee assignments.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ Never
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Frequently
- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

20. I was required to work in groups or teams in order to achieve related objectives.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ Never
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Frequently
- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

21. I had deadlines to meet.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ Never
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Frequently
- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

22. Task groups were an effective way to meet work objectives.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ Never
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Frequently
- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

23. How frequently was the task group or committee assignment a positive experience?

- 1.\_\_\_\_ Never
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Occasionally
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Frequently
- 4.\_\_\_\_ Always
- 5.\_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

24. **What level of influence did the following persons have on your decision to pursue a M.S.W. Degree? (Assign a value based on the following: 1=no influence 2=little influence 3=moderate influence 4=a great deal of influence)**
- 1. \_\_\_\_ Family member(s)
  - 2. \_\_\_\_ Friends
  - 3. \_\_\_\_ Guidance or career counselor
  - 4. \_\_\_\_ High school counselor
  - 5. \_\_\_\_ College professor
  - 6. \_\_\_\_ Work supervisor or manager
  - 7. \_\_\_\_ Co-worker(s)
  - 8. \_\_\_\_ Another social worker
  - 9. \_\_\_\_ Other (specify)
25. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. program influenced by a need to increase your income?
- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
  - 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
  - 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
  - 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all
26. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by the expectation that having an M.S.W. would lead to success in other areas of life?
- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
  - 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
  - 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
  - 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all
27. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by a desire for learning new social work skills?
- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
  - 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
  - 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
  - 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all
28. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. program influenced by a desire for recognition in the social work profession?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all

29. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by a desire to understand what it means to be a professional social worker?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all

30. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by a desire to advance your career?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all

31. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. program influenced by a desire to enhance your professional status and credibility?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all

32. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. program influenced by a desire to eventually run your own project?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all

33. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by a desire to eventually run your own private practice?

1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
  2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
  3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
  4. \_\_\_\_ Not important all
34. To what extent was your decision to attend the M.S.W. Program influenced by a desire to increase your power or influence in your employment setting?
1. \_\_\_\_ Very important factor
  2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately important
  3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat important
  4. \_\_\_\_ Not important at all
35. **Prior to attending graduate school**, what group of individuals did you most associate with?
1. \_\_\_\_ Mostly Black
  2. \_\_\_\_ Mostly White
  3. \_\_\_\_ Equally mixed
36. **Prior to attending graduate school**, what was the racial make-up most of the task groups or committees you were on as a part of your job?
1. \_\_\_\_ Mostly Black
  2. \_\_\_\_ Mostly White
  3. \_\_\_\_ Equally mixed
37. What was your job title **just prior** to entering the M.S.W. Program (specify below):  
**Note:** If you were unemployed, please write "N/A"
38. How would you classify your employment setting **just prior** to entering the M.S.W. Program?
1. \_\_\_\_ Private non-profit social welfare agency
  2. \_\_\_\_ For-profit social welfare agency
  3. \_\_\_\_ Government agency

- 4. \_\_\_\_ Educational institution
- 5. \_\_\_\_ Business
- 6. \_\_\_\_ Other (specify)
- 7. \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

39. What was your annual salary **prior** to entering the M.S.W. Program?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ 14,999 or less
- 2. \_\_\_\_ 15,000 - 19,999
- 3. \_\_\_\_ 20,000 - 24,999
- 4. \_\_\_\_ 25,000 - 29,999
- 5. \_\_\_\_ 30,000 - 34,999
- 6. \_\_\_\_ 35,000 - 39,999
- 7. \_\_\_\_ 40,000 - 49,999
- 8. \_\_\_\_ 50,000 and above
- 9. \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

40. To what extent do you feel you treated fairly and equally by your job supervisor(s) **prior** to your attending graduate school?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Very fair and equal
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately fair and equal
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat fair and equal
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Not fair and equal
- 5. \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable

**(Note: Question #41 applies only to non-White respondents)**

41. To what extent do you think your ethnicity was a factor in the treatment you identified above?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ It was a very important factor
- 2. \_\_\_\_ It was an important factor
- 3. \_\_\_\_ It was somewhat important as a factor
- 4. \_\_\_\_ It was not important as a factor

**Please indicate your feelings regarding your undergraduate education experience:**

42. I believe I received a well-rounded education (e.g., a good balance of academic demands, development of social skills, and building of self-confidence).

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Disagree

- 3.\_\_\_\_ Agree  
4.\_\_\_\_ Strongly agree
43. It prepared me for the demands of graduate school (e.g., acquired study habits, self-discipline, active participation in the learning process, and class participation).
- 1.\_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree  
2.\_\_\_\_ Disagree  
3.\_\_\_\_ Agree  
4.\_\_\_\_ Strongly agree
44. It prepared me for the demands of writing assignments and term papers at the graduate level.
- 1.\_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree  
2.\_\_\_\_ Disagree  
3.\_\_\_\_ Agree  
4.\_\_\_\_ Strongly agree
45. It prepared me well in terms of my ability to engage in the abstract reasoning, analysis, and critical thinking required for graduate study.
- 1.\_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree  
2.\_\_\_\_ Disagree  
3.\_\_\_\_ Agree  
4.\_\_\_\_ Strongly agree
46. It gave me a basis for understanding research methods and statistical analysis.
- 1.\_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree  
2.\_\_\_\_ Disagree  
3.\_\_\_\_ Agree  
4.\_\_\_\_ Strongly agree

**To what extent did you experience difficulty with the following during your graduate school experience:**

47. The process of integrating theory and practice.
- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty  
2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty  
3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty  
4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty



48. Writing skills comparable to the graduate level.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

49. Reading comprehension.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

50. Written assignments where application of theory was required.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

51. In-class essay examinations.

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

52. In-class objective examinations

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

53. Understanding and applying research methods

- 1.\_\_\_\_ No difficulty
- 2.\_\_\_\_ Minimum difficulty
- 3.\_\_\_\_ Moderate difficulty
- 4.\_\_\_\_ A great deal of difficulty

54. **How important were the following factors in your decision to attend your particular M.S.W. program? (Answer by using the following scale: 1=not important 2=somewhat important 3=important 4=very important)**

☐ Academic reputation  
☐ Amount of financial aid offered  
☐ Cost of tuition  
☐ Type of social work program  
☐ Class scheduling  
☐ Geographic location  
☐ Number of minority students  
☐ Number of minority faculty  
☐ School climate toward minorities  
☐ Recruitment efforts of the school  
☐ Recommendations from alumni, faculty and students  
☐ Other (specify)

**(Note: Questions 55 - 58 only applies to non-White respondents)**

55. While enrolled at your particular **undergraduate school**, were you aware of the existence of “institutional racism?”

1. ☐ Yes (Answer question # )  
 2. ☐ No

56. To what extent were you affected by it?

1. ☐ A great deal  
 2. ☐ Somewhat  
 3. ☐ A little  
 4. ☐ Not at all

57. While enrolled at your **graduate school**, were you aware of the existence of “institutional racism?”

1. ☐ Yes (Answer question # )  
 2. ☐ No

58. To what extent were you affected by it?

1. ☐ A great deal

2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat  
3. \_\_\_\_ A little  
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all
59. To what extent do you feel you were treated fairly and equally by **your undergraduate school administration**, in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid availability, scheduling of classes, and so forth?
1. \_\_\_\_ Very fair and equal  
2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately fair and equal  
3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat fair and equal  
4. \_\_\_\_ Not fair and equal
60. To what extent do you feel you were treated fairly and equally by **your undergraduate faculty** in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and academic problem resolution?
1. \_\_\_\_ Very fair and equal  
2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately fair and equal  
3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat fair and equal  
4. \_\_\_\_ Not fair and equal
61. To what extent do you feel you were treated fairly and equally by **your graduate school administration** in terms of admissions procedures, financial aid availability, scheduling of classes, field placement, and so forth?
1. \_\_\_\_ Very fair and equal  
2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately fair and equal  
3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat fair and equal  
4. \_\_\_\_ Not fair and equal
62. To what extent do you feel you were treated fairly and equally by **graduate faculty** in terms of grading standards, in-class interaction, and problem resolution?
1. \_\_\_\_ Very fair and equal  
2. \_\_\_\_ Moderately fair and equal  
3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat fair and equal  
4. \_\_\_\_ Not fair and equal
63. How would you rate the **academic advising** process during your graduate school experience?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Non-existent
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Not helpful
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Helpful
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Very helpful

64. During your **graduate school experience**, how would you rate the overall sensitivity of **faculty** to the concerns and needs of the general student body?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Non-existent
- 2. \_\_\_\_ A little sensitive
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat sensitive
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Very Sensitive

65. During your **graduate school** experience, how would you rate the overall sensitivity of the school **administration** to the concerns and needs of the general student body?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Non-existent
- 2. \_\_\_\_ A little sensitive
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat sensitive
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Very sensitive

66. During your **graduate school experience**, how would you rate the overall sensitivity of **faculty** to the concerns and needs of minority students?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Non-existent
- 2. \_\_\_\_ A little sensitive
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat sensitive
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Very Sensitive

67. During your **graduate school** experience, how would you rate the overall sensitivity of the school **administration** to the concerns and needs of minority students?

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Non-existent
- 2. \_\_\_\_ A little sensitive
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat sensitive
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Very sensitive

During **graduate school**, to what extent were you aware of a lack of relevancy to the experiences of minority populations as demonstrated by **faculty** in class discussions or lectures?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

(Note: Questions 69 and 70 only applies to minority respondents)

How often were you the only or one of a few minorities in a **graduate class**?

1. \_\_\_\_ Rarely
2. \_\_\_\_ Some of the time
3. \_\_\_\_ Often
4. \_\_\_\_ Always

To what extent did you experience feelings of **discomfort or isolation** in these classes?

1. \_\_\_\_ Rarely
2. \_\_\_\_ Some of the time
3. \_\_\_\_ Often
4. \_\_\_\_ Always

During **graduate school**, to what extent did you network with **minority students** regarding class assignments, term papers, exams, and so forth?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

During **graduate school**, to what extent did you network with **non-minority students** regarding class assignments, term papers, exams, and so forth?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

During **graduate school**, to what extent did you network with **minority graduates** (alumni) from the school's M.S.W. Program?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

How beneficial was this networking to your progress in the program?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

76. During **graduate school**, to what extent did you network with **graduates** (alumni) from the school's M.S.W. Program?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

77. How beneficial was this networking to your progress in the program?

1. \_\_\_\_ A great deal
2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat
3. \_\_\_\_ A little
4. \_\_\_\_ Not at all

**The next section is provided for any written comments you would like to add regarding your experiences as a graduate social work student.**

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND THOUGHTFUL RESPONSES**

**Please Mail Completed Survey to: Stan L. Bowie, Ph. D., College of Social Work, 321  
Henson Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 37996-1111**

## **Appendix B**

### **Tables**



Table 1  
Demographics

<b>Race (N=377)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
African American/Black	343	91.0%
Hispanic/Latino	20	5.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	2.4%
Native American	5	1.3%
<b>Nationality (N=373)</b>		
United States	309	82.0%
Bahamas	5	1.3%
Cuba	3	0.8%
Haiti	12	3.2%
Jamaica	15	4.0%
Trinidad-Tabago	3	0.8%
Puerto Rico	4	1.1%
Other Caribbean Nation	5	1.3%
Other Latin American Nation	3	0.8%
Asian Nation	5	1.3%
African Nation	2	0.5%
European Nation	6	1.6%
Other Nation	1	0.3%
<b>Gender (N=377)</b>		
Female	298	79.0%
Male	79	21.0%

Table 2  
Education

<b>Undergraduate Major (N=342)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Social Work	149	43.6%
Not Social Work	193	56.4%
<b>Undergrad School Primary Ethnicity (N=372)</b>		
Predominantly Black	114	30.6%
Predominantly White	219	58.9%
Equally Populated	38	10.2%
<b>Grad School Primary Ethnicity (N=134)</b>		
Predominantly Black	23	17.2%
Predominantly White	97	72.4%
Equally Populated	14	10.4%

Table 3  
Awareness of Institutional Racism & Extent Affected by It

<b>Awareness during Undergrad (N=352)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	257	73.0%
No	94	26.7%
<b>Extent Affected by It (N=322)</b>		
A great deal	63	19.6%
Somewhat	97	30.1%
A little	67	20.8%
Not at all	95	29.5%
<b>Awareness during Grad (N=350)</b>		
Yes	274	78.3%
No	75	21.4%
<b>Extent Affected by It (N=320)</b>		
A great deal	72	22.5%
Somewhat	111	34.7%
A little	63	19.7%
Not at all	74	23.1%

Table 4  
Fair & Equal Treatment – Administration

<b>Fair &amp; Equal Treatment by Undergrad Administration (N=372)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very fair and equal	192	51.6%
Moderately fair and equal	119	32.0%
Somewhat fair and equal	52	14.0%
Not fair and equal	9	2.4%
<b>Fair &amp; Equal Treatment by Grad Administration (N=373)</b>		
Very fair and equal	191	51.2%
Moderately fair and equal	108	29.0%
Somewhat fair and equal	51	13.7%
Not fair and equal	23	6.2%

Table 5  
Fair & Equal Treatment – Faculty

<b>Fair &amp; Equal Treatment by Undergrad Faculty (N=373)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Very fair and equal	190	50.9%
Moderately fair and equal	105	28.2%
Somewhat fair and equal	58	15.5%
Not fair and equal	20	5.4%
<b>Fair &amp; Equal Treatment by Grad Faculty (N=371)</b>		
Very fair and equal	164	44.2%
Moderately fair and equal	123	33.2%
Somewhat fair and equal	60	16.2%
Not fair and equal	24	6.5%

Table 6  
Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs

<b>Sensitivity of Grad Administration to Concerns of Students from URGs (N=368)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Non-existent	54	14.7%
A little sensitive	111	30.2%
Somewhat sensitive	135	36.7%
Very sensitive	68	18.5%
<b>Sensitivity of Grad Faculty to Concerns of Students from URGs (N=374)</b>		
Non-existent	50	13.4%
A little sensitive	102	27.3%
Somewhat sensitive	135	36.1%
Very sensitive	87	23.3%

Table 7  
Chi-Square Tests – Undergraduate

Variables	Pearson Chi-Square	df	p	Correlation	Type
Awareness of institutional racism					
Gender	1.83	1	.177	.113	V
Race	1.89	1	.169	.073	V
Nationality	1.08	1	.298	.056	V
Childhood SES	2.48	3	.479	.084	V
Undergrad major	.80	1	.370	.050	V
Year of graduation	.05	1	.823	.012	V
School primary ethnicity	26.58	1	.000**	.291	V
Extent affected by it					
Gender	3.26	3	.354	.101	V
Race	1.87	3	.599	.076	V
Nationality	4.95	3	.175	.125	V
Childhood SES	10.87	9	.318	.048	Tau-b
Undergrad major	4.37	3	.224	.121	V
Year of graduation	1.41	3	.375	.040	Tau-c
School primary ethnicity	5.60	3	.000**	.436	V
Fair treatment by administration					
Gender	1.50	3	.683	.063	V
Race	4.34	3	.227	.108	V
Nationality	4.44	3	.217	.110	V
Childhood SES	6.99	9	.048*	-.092	Tau-b
Undergrad major	.07	3	.832	.051	V
Year of graduation	1.57	3	.338	.015	Tau-c
School primary ethnicity	36.77	3	.000**	.333	V
Fair treatment by faulty					
Gender	1.44	3	.697	.062	V
Race	6.03	3	.110	.127	V
Nationality	.38	3	.945	.032	V
Childhood SES	16.71	9	.001**	-.151	Tau-b
Undergrad major	3.42	3	.332	.101	V
Year of graduation	2.70	3	.310	-.017	Tau-c
School primary ethnicity	55.62	3	.000**	.409	V

\*Significant at p=.05 level

\*\*Significant at p=.001 level

Table 8  
Awareness of Institutional Racism & School's Primary Ethnicity

Undergrad School Primary Ethnicity	Yes		No	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Predominantly Black	63	56.3%	49	43.8%
Predominantly White	167	83.1%	34	16.9%

Table 9  
Extent Affected by It & School's Primary Ethnicity

Undergrad School Primary Ethnicity	A great deal		Somewhat		A little		Not at all	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Predominantly Black	14	14.1%	12	12.1%	16	16.2%	57	57.6%
Predominantly White	43	22.9%	72	38.3%	42	22.3%	31	16.5%

Table 10  
Fair Treatment by Administration & Childhood SES

Childhood SES	Very fair and equal		Moderately fair and equal		Somewhat fair and equal		Not fair and equal	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Lower Class	19	43.2%	15	34.1%	8	18.2%	2	4.5%
Working Class	100	49.8%	65	32.3%	30	14.9%	6	3.0%
Middle Class	59	57.8%	32	31.4%	11	10.8%	0	0.0%
Upper Middle/Upper Class	13	54.2%	7	29.2%	3	12.5%	1	4.2%

Table 11  
Fair Treatment by Administration & School's Primary Ethnicity

<b>Undergrad School Primary Ethnicity</b>	<b>Very fair and equal</b>		<b>Moderately fair and equal</b>		<b>Somewhat fair and equal</b>		<b>Not fair and equal</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Predominantly Black	87	76.3%	18	15.8%	8	7.0%	1	0.9%
Predominantly White	90	41.5%	77	35.5%	42	19.4%	8	3.7%

Table 12  
Fair Treatment by Faculty & Childhood SES

<b>Childhood SES</b>	<b>Very fair and equal</b>		<b>Moderately fair and equal</b>		<b>Somewhat fair and equal</b>		<b>Not fair and equal</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Lower Class	21	47.7%	9	20.5%	9	20.5%	5	11.4%
Working Class	90	44.6%	65	32.2%	36	17.8%	11	5.4%
Middle Class	61	59.8%	25	24.5%	12	11.8%	4	3.9%
Upper Middle/Upper Class	17	70.8%	6	25.0%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%

Table 13  
Fair Treatment by Faculty & School's Primary Ethnicity

<b>Undergrad School Primary Ethnicity</b>	<b>Very fair and equal</b>		<b>Moderately fair and equal</b>		<b>Somewhat fair and equal</b>		<b>Not fair and equal</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Predominantly Black	91	79.8%	16	14.0%	7	6.1%	0	0.0%
Predominantly White	82	37.6%	73	33.5%	45	20.6%	18	8.3%

Table 14  
Chi-Square Tests – Graduate

Variables	Pearson Chi-Square	df	p	Correlation	Type
Awareness of institutional racism					
Gender	2.26	1	.133	.080	V
Race	6.93	1	.009*	.141	V
Nationality	4.73	1	.030*	.117	V
Childhood SES	.26	3	.968	.027	V
Year of graduation	2.81	1	.094	.089	V
Grad school primary ethnicity	31.84	1	.000**	.519	V
Extent affected by it					
Gender	.59	3	.899	.043	V
Race	3.38	3	.337	.103	V
Nationality	6.04	3	.110	.138	V
Childhood SES	6.72	9	.754	.015	Tau-b
Year of graduation	3.34	3	.778	.007	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	27.88	3	.000**	.506	V
Fair treatment by administration					
Gender	.56	3	.906	.039	V
Race	.96	3	.810	.051	V
Nationality	.85	3	.833	.048	V
Childhood SES	6.42	9	.677	-.019	Tau-b
Year of graduation	2.06	3	.282	-.010	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	5.46	3	.141	.214	V
Fair treatment by faulty					
Gender	.17	3	.983	.021	V
Race	9.90	3	.019*	.163	V
Nationality	3.07	3	.380	.092	V
Childhood SES	17.12	9	.006*	-.131	Tau-b



Table 14 (Continued)

Variables	Pearson Chi-Square	df	p	Correlation	Type
Year of graduation	4.04	3	.228	-.011	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	14.38	3	.002*	.348	V
Faculty sensitivity to concerns of URGs					
Gender	4.02	3	.178	.115	V
Race	2.43	3	.488	.081	V
Nationality	1.07	3	.784	.054	V
Childhood SES	3.49	9	.533	.029	Tau-b
Year of graduation	5.19	3	.437	.008	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	22.40	3	.000**	.432	V
Administration sensitivity to concerns of URGs					
Gender	2.12	3	.547	.076	V
Race	.20	3	.978	.023	V
Nationality	8.80	3	.032*	.155	V
Childhood SES	11.65	9	.655	-.021	Tau-b
Year of graduation	6.16	3	.500	-.008	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	24.83	3	.000**	.457	V
Lack of relevant course content					
Gender	5.75	3	.124	.126	V
Race	5.01	3	.171	.117	V
Nationality	9.05	3	.029*	.159	V
Childhood SES	5.35	9	.199	.060	Tau-b
Year of graduation	2.05	3	.370	-.021	Tau-c
Grad school primary ethnicity	29.56	3	.000**	.498	V

\*Significant at p=.05 level

\*\*Significant at p=.001 level

Table 15  
Awareness of Institutional Racism & Race

<b>Race</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Black	265	79.8%	67	20.2%
Other People of Color	9	52.9%	8	47.1%

Table 16  
Awareness of Institutional Racism & Nationality

<b>Nationality</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
United States	236	80.3%	58	19.7%
Other Nations	34	66.7%	17	33.3%

Table 17  
Awareness of Institutional Racism & School's Primary Ethnicity

<b>Grad School Primary Ethnicity</b>	<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Predominantly Black	9	42.9%	12	57.1%
Predominantly White	89	92.7%	7	7.3%

Table 18  
Extent Affected by It & School's Primary Ethnicity

<b>Grad School Primary Ethnicity</b>	<b>A great deal</b>		<b>Somewhat</b>		<b>A little</b>		<b>Not at all</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Predominantly Black	4	22.2%	1	5.6%	3	16.7%	10	55.6%
Predominantly White	33	36.3%	35	38.5%	16	17.6%	7	7.7%

Table 19  
Fair Treatment by Faculty & Race

Race	Very fair and equal		Moderately fair and equal		Somewhat fair and equal		Not fair and equal	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Black	141	41.7%	118	34.9%	56	16.6%	23	6.8%
Other People of Color	23	69.7%	5	15.2%	4	12.1%	1	3.0%

Table 20  
Fair Treatment by Faculty & Childhood SES

Childhood SES	Very fair and equal		Moderately fair and equal		Somewhat fair and equal		Not fair and equal	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Lower Class	14	31.8%	13	29.5%	14	31.8%	3	6.8%
Working Class	82	41.0%	74	37.0%	32	16.0%	12	6.0%
Middle Class	53	52.0%	31	30.4%	12	11.8%	6	5.9%
Upper Middle/Upper Class	14	58.3%	5	20.8%	2	8.3%	3	12.5%

Table 21  
Fair Treatment by Faculty & School's Primary Ethnicity

Grad School Primary Ethnicity	Very fair and equal		Moderately fair and equal		Somewhat fair and equal		Not fair and equal	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Predominantly Black	16	72.7%	5	22.7%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%
Predominantly White	30	30.9%	35	36.1%	22	22.7%	10	10.3%

Table 22  
Faculty Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & School's Primary Ethnicity

Grad School Primary Ethnicity	Very sensitive		Somewhat sensitive		A little sensitive		Non-existent	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Predominantly Black	13	56.5%	6	26.1%	4	17.4%	0	0.0%
Predominantly White	13	13.4%	35	36.1%	28	28.9%	21	21.6%

Table 23  
Administration Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & Nationality

Nationality	Very sensitive		Somewhat sensitive		A little sensitive		Non-existent	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
United States	61	20.2%	116	38.4%	83	27.5%	42	13.9%
Other Nations	7	11.3%	17	27.4%	27	43.5%	11	17.7%

Table 24  
Administration Sensitivity to Concerns of URGs & School's Primary Ethnicity

Grad School Primary Ethnicity	Very sensitive		Somewhat sensitive		A little sensitive		Non-existent	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Predominantly Black	14	60.9%	5	21.7%	4	17.4%	0	0.0%
Predominantly White	13	13.5%	35	36.5%	33	34.4%	15	15.6%

Table 25  
Awareness of Lack of Relevant Course Content & Nationality

Nationality	A great deal		Somewhat		A little		Not at all	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
United States	91	30.5%	89	29.9%	66	22.1%	52	17.4%
Other Nations	12	19.4%	13	21.0%	23	37.1%	14	22.6%

Table 26  
Awareness of Lack of Relevant Course Content & School's Primary Ethnicity

<b>Grad School Primary Ethnicity</b>	<b>A great deal</b>		<b>Somewhat</b>		<b>A little</b>		<b>Not at all</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Predominantly Black	3	13.0%	4	17.4%	2	8.7%	14	60.9%
Predominantly White	35	36.5%	29	30.2%	22	22.9%	10	10.4%

**Vita**

Mira Hanna was born in Egypt on November 2, 1991. She was raised there until immigrating to the United States with her family in 2004 and settling in Nashville, TN. Mira earned a BSSW from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in May, 2013. She is currently pursuing her Master's degree in Social Work at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.