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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Despite suggestions of commentators who argue that the level and quality of education are insignificant in determining one's success in life, most educated blacks would claim that education has been significant to their achievements—and successes. Many blacks, irregardless of their education, have this view because, traditionally, they have believed that equal access to educational opportunity is the key to upward mobility as well as an entre to the benefits of freedom. Put in terms of the black vernacular, education has meant the difference between obtaining a "slice" of the "Big American Apple" and not getting a "slice" at all.¹

One of the central institutions in the provision of equality of educational opportunity² for blacks in higher education has been the black college. These colleges were established in the hope that former slaves, properly educated, would eventually integrate freely into the mainstream of American society. The early adherence and commitment to this mission molded the development of the black colleges as centers of black education. No other higher education institution made this kind of blanket commitment then, and few do now.³

While the development of higher education for blacks resulted from the establishment and historic growth of the


²See Amicus Curiae brief filed by The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education in Adams v. Richardson, 482 F. 2d 1159. This brief explains that the opportunity of an education means nothing if it does not mean the equality of educational attainment in higher education.

black private college, the public black college has also made significant contributions in providing access for blacks to qualitative and meaningful higher education. Though long considered the stepchild of public higher education, these institutions have been one of the major forces in the higher education of blacks, and in their struggle for social justice and human dignity.

The ability and capacity of these colleges to continue serving the higher education needs of blacks now depends upon their ability and willingness to survive under a set of rather unique circumstances caused by receiving federal support. Because traditional black colleges, particularly the public ones, receive a substantial amount of federal financial support, they are also subject to the constitutional

---


5 See again Bowles and DeCosta, Between Two Worlds.

6 See e.g., Andrew F. Brimmer, "The Economic Outlook and the Future of the Negro College," Daedalus, Vol. 100, No. 3, 1971. On page 556 Brimmer points out that federal funds account for up to 40% of the current receipts of these institutions. See also Federal Agencies and Black Colleges: A
requirement barring racial segregation. Their fight for survival, then, centers around desegregation. This kind of fight is somewhat different from the struggles of other higher education institutions, because black colleges are now faced with the difficult task of complying with the national goal of integration, as it applies to them, a goal they helped sponsor and have traditionally supported.

The issue of desegregation within the traditional black college is most visible in the public ones. Although the charters of most of these institutions do not explicitly exclude whites, all were founded at a time when laws in most states required racial segregation in public schools and in other areas. This policy was reinforced in public higher education by the federal government which sanctioned segregation early in this sector with the creation of separate but equal public land-grant colleges in the Second Morrill Report Prepared by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971). This report points out the importance of federal funds to these institutions.


8Ibid., p. 773.
Act of 1890. Consequently, the result during their establishment, and even today, was that a majority of public black colleges had almost all black student bodies, faculty, and administrations.⁹

Now, a decade after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which required the government to insure that no federally funded programs practice discrimination, the Federal government, as a result of Adams v. Richardson (1973), is still struggling with the question of racial segregation in higher education. The Federal Court in the Adams' case ordered the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (D-HEW) to begin enforcement proceedings (termination of federal aid to the public institution in question) against those states that refused to submit acceptable desegregation plans. These plans are intended to eliminate, finally, the vestiges of dual systems of publicly supported higher education.¹⁰

---

⁹Today the 34 public black colleges and universities listed in Appendix A serve students of all races, enrolling more than 3/5 of all black students in traditionally black senior institutions and providing educational opportunities for more than 1/4 of all black students in colleges today. Nearly 120,779 students are currently enrolled. Of the 34, 15 are land-grant institutions and 19 have graduate and professional schools. Herman Smith, A Factbook: Historically Black Public Colleges (Atlanta: Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, 1973). Hereafter cited as A Factbook.

¹⁰Until the Adams case no court, agency, or state had enforced the desegregation of an entire statewide system of higher education, despite several court cases challenging admissions policies at individual institutions. See The Chronicle, Vol. VIII, No. 34, May 28, 1974, pp. 1, 6.
While the decision of the *Adams* case has immediate application to public institutions that are predominantly white, its specific thrust has been directed towards the public black colleges located in the South and in the Border states.¹¹ The attention given to public black colleges, as a result of *Adams*, can largely be attributed to the fact that the public black college most represents the legacy of legalized segregation—a legacy built on the principle that the state was obliged to support something for blacks which it also supported for whites, but with the understanding that whatever it supported for blacks would be inferior to that which it supported for whites.¹²

Because the states involved are cognizant of this legacy, and are also conscious of the necessary massive moral and financial commitment that it would take to equalize the disparities and discrepancies that exist between their black and white public colleges, they have tended to express the view that any attempts to comply with the D-HEW mandates ought to be done at the expense of the public black colleges.¹³

---


However, the question of the public black college's survival as perceived by their publics (e.g., black community, alumni) transcends state insinuations of institutional inferiority. The central question raised by the black community concerns not the claims of inferiority but rather what can be done about the continued existence of these institutions as viable public alternatives of higher education for blacks and for their continued existence as credible models for the black community.

In a recent factbook published by the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges Herman Smith points out how important public black colleges have been to the black community:

These 34 institutions have special significance because of their traditional and continuing role in educating minority group students for full and productive participation in American life. During the past century, the public black colleges have served as "opportunity colleges," providing education otherwise unavailable to thousands of able and deserving youths. Their alumni are in virtually every walk of life, and serve in a wide variety of responsible positions throughout the nation....Service to the community has long been a high ideal at the public black colleges. Though in the past this service was often limited by society at large to the black community, today the historically black colleges are being recognized increasingly as resources for the entire community and they eagerly are accepting the commitment to service to the community as a whole.14

14 See again A Factbook.
Thus, in spite of chronic shortages of funds and other resources public black colleges have become a source of pride for many blacks who attended them as well as a source of hope for black families who want the benefits of higher learning for their children. Moreover, these colleges have provided effective leadership in the promotion and development of educational opportunities for blacks at all levels of instruction. This has been especially true in the South, where public black colleges are regarded as essential to the enhancement of the general quality of life for black Americans.

The crucial subject of the continued existence of public black colleges has finally gained attention in the literature on higher education. Although most of the studies have treated public black colleges in general, few have concentrated specifically on critical issues facing these institutions, like desegregation. The studies that deal with desegregation and public black colleges tend to provide a

---

general overview\textsuperscript{16} rather than the specifics of the problem, such as the perceptions of chief executive administrators. These perceptions by institutional officials (e.g., presidents, vice presidents of academic affairs), tend to be overlooked as they relate to the issue.

It is assumed here that the perceptions of chief executive administrators of public black colleges are important because they are the persons who are most responsible for seeing that the missions and goals of the institutions are reached and implemented.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, on an issue confronting the institution, such as desegregation, their reactions to the issue and its proposed implementation would, no doubt, certainly be regarded as critical. Moreover, because of the leadership roles which they fulfill for both their institutions and the black community, the perceptions of chief executive administrators on issues like desegregation are in large measure, representative of the institution itself.\textsuperscript{18}

As public black colleges confront desegregation the perceptions of their chief executive administrators, as they relate to the issue, merit additional investigation since

\textsuperscript{16}See again A Factbook; and Ending Discrimination.

\textsuperscript{17}See again the forceful argument, based on research, in the Amicus Curiae brief filed by The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (this Association represents the presidents of black colleges) in Adams v. Richardson, 482 F. 2d 1159.

\textsuperscript{18}Isolation to Mainstream, p. 19.
the response of these institutions to desegregation demands may be largely shaped by their chief executive administrators.19

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine what the perceived effects of the demands for desegregation have been upon public black colleges. Because of the importance of the presidents and vice-presidents for academic affairs in the shaping of institutional goals and policies that encounter and confront the desegregation efforts of their institutions, this study attempted to address the problem by investigating the following research questions:

1. Do the chief executive administrators perceive, as one of the effects of desegregation demands, that the pressures (e.g., political) from the federal level for desegregating their institutions are more influential than pressures emanating from the state level?

2. Do the chief executive administrators perceive most of the support and backing for their decisions on desegregation policy for the institution to come more from other administrators and faculty than from other university groups (students, parents, alumni)?

3. Do the chief executive administrators of public black colleges perceive20 their policy decisions

19 However, this does not deny that the response of these institutions towards desegregation has not been affected by the states in which these schools reside, or by the federal government, the courts, and other concerned publics (e.g., alumni).

20 Desegregation demands are those demands that have
to be more influenced by pressures (e.g., political) from on-campus interest organizations (other than the general categories of students and faculty groups, etc.) than from off-campus interest organizations (i.e., black state political organizations and civic groups)?

4. Do the chief executive administrators perceive the concept and effects of affirmative action as being of greater concern to their institution than desegregation itself?

5. Have the effects of desegregation stimulated or prompted the interinstitutional sharing of information on desegregation between the chief executive administrators of public black colleges?

6. What major issues have been identified to the chief executive administrators by campus constituents as a direct effect of the demands for desegregation?

7. What effects will the demands for desegregation and its implementation have upon the future of public black colleges as perceived by the chief executive administrators?

The purpose of the study was to determine, explain, and interpret the perceived effects of the demands for desegregation upon public black colleges. This was accomplished by

been made by the Federal Authorities, in particular D-HEW, for the elimination of the vestiges of the dual system of higher education that have existed historically in states where public black colleges are located. See Chapter II, pp. 30-35. Demands will mean, then, any request made by the Federal or state authorities for public black colleges to desegregate.

21 According to the research on public black colleges, the intense effort hiring and recruitment of white faculty has been a recent phenomenon as well as the recruitment of white students. See also Reginald Stuart, "We Didn't Have an Approach Before," Compact, Vol. IX, No. 5, pp. 2-4, and The White Student on the Black Campus, A Project Report by The Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1973). Hereafter cited as The White Student on the Black Campus.
using David Easton's political systems model\textsuperscript{22} as an analytical tool to assist in explaining and interpreting the results and findings of the research questions.

**Significance of the Problem**

Most of the studies that have examined public black colleges acknowledge that their most crucial time would be that period when they were asked to desegregate.\textsuperscript{23} The demands of the desegregation process that confront these institutions now are especially critical, because they affect a set of institutions that have been instrumental in providing the access and opportunity of higher education to thousands who might otherwise have been denied access to institutions of higher education.\textsuperscript{24}

\---

\textsuperscript{22} The model that was developed by David Easton is found in his *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965). Further elaboration of the model and how it was modified for use in this study is found in the Review of Literature, Part II.


\textsuperscript{24} According to the recent study by Kent G. Mommsen, a significant proportion of black Ph.D.'s receive their undergraduate degrees at public black colleges and universities. This is but another important example of the value of these institutions in raising the academic sights of a traditionally oppressed minority. See Kent G. Mommsen, "Black Ph.D.'s," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XLV, No. 4, 1974, pp. 253-267; Also see William Moore, Jr. and Lonnie H. Wagstaff *Black Educators in White Colleges*. (San
In addition, these demands are having an impact upon the image which these institutions project to the black community, an image which Tollett describes as reflected in terms of these essential services:

1. Within its institutional setting, public black colleges provide creditable models of success and achievement for aspiring black youth to emulate, while at the same time permitting black youth to exercise and develop their intellectual potential notwithstanding their oppressed and disadvantaged backgrounds.

2. They provide, in terms of cultural and psychosociality, an educational setting which many Blacks find congenial and preferable.

3. Because they are special interest group colleges, they serve as educational enclaves in which their students can prepare for the transition from underprivileged isolation to the mainstream of American society.

The commitment to equal educational attainment and an integrated society has long been supported by the public black college. However, the position they occupy now

---


suggests that, if the national policy of integration is fully applied to them, their importance as critical institutions in the black community will be jeopardized. The fact that the issue is paradoxical emphasizes and underscores its controversiality as well as its importance.

The paradox facing public black colleges is highlighted by the request by D-HEW for non-compliant states to submit desegregation plans. These plans have, according to a recent report, been viewed by public black colleges with mixed emotions. Although all of them have historically supported the practice of racial desegregation, most seem reluctant to fully implement a desegregation policy for fear that any such full compliance could very well spell their demise.26 Many who are associated with these institutions do not want to see what happened when the public schools were desegregated happen to them.27 While blacks recognize that the


justification for a dual system of public higher education no longer exists, they also recognize that full compliance with the policy of integration is not an appropriate solution for the survival of public black colleges—for this solution purports to integrate them out of existence!\textsuperscript{28}

The objective of this study was to explain and interpret what these institutions perceived as being the major impact of desegregation upon their existence and how that perception related to the issue of their survival. This study also proposed to provide additional insight into what may be the future of these institutions as they relate to the demands for desegregation. Finally, it is hoped that this study will provide additional recommendations for new kinds of responses that may be utilized by the chief executive administrators of public black colleges as they respond to the demands for desegregation and for new investigations as well.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the perceptions of only one side of this crucial and complex problem. The perceptions of both federal and state authorities, as well as those other perceptions emanating from the non-academic

\textsuperscript{28}See the concern expressed by representatives of these institutions at the 1974 NAACP's 65th Annual Convention as reported in The New York Times, July 1, 1974, Vol. CXXIII, No. 42, p. 527.
environment, were not assessed by the focus of this study because they are, for the most part, already a matter of public record.

The study was further limited because it looked mainly at the institutional response to the demands of desegregation vis-a-vis the perceptions of the chief executive officers of the institution. Thus, the response projected may not be representative of other university constituents. This suggests that the views of students, faculty, and alumni may not be represented by their respective institutional chief executives, though they very well could have been.

A third limitation involves the use of Easton's framework as a means of explaining the results of the study. As Wirt and Kirst point out, one of the limitations of Easton's analytical framework is the difficulty for any model to explain reality because, by definition, models radically simplify reality. Still another limitation of the framework is that systems analysis, for the most part, provides only a general method for analyzing the data of experience and not a specific method for demonstrating or predicting alternatives for problems like those confronting public black colleges.

A fourth limitation involves the use of survey methodology. Ideally, a case study of each institution would have been an appropriate methodology to use. However, due
to the time and other resource investments required by the case study method, this researcher found the case study approach impractical. 29

Definition of Key Terms

• Public Black Colleges and Universities

These are the thirty-four historically black colleges and universities 30 that are maintained and partially supported by state educational systems. Originally they were established primarily for blacks.

The definition of these institutions also notes the distinction between all black institutions and black institutions. The former suggests that racial exclusion is in fact being practiced, while the latter does not. This important distinction should be kept in mind.

• Chief Executive Administrators

This refers to the president or that chief executive of the college who has been appointed by a state board

29 For example, rather than use a mailed instrument to survey the administrators at each of the 34 institutions, a case study of each institution, followed by a comparative analysis of each case study might have been more appropriate. Case studies are more in-depth investigations of a given social unit resulting in a complete, well organized picture of that unit when compared to the survey study (as in this instance) which tends to examine a small number of units across a large number of variables and conditions. See Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation. (San Diego, California: Robert B. Knapp Pub., 1971).

30 A Factbook. Also see Appendix A for listing of these institutions and their 1974 enrollments).
(trustees, regents, or board of education) to preside over and manage the internal affairs of the University. The term president will also be used in place of chancellor, since some of the executives of these institutions are called chancellor and their responsibilities are the same or similar to those of a "president."

Chief executive administrators also refers to the vice-president (or dean) for academic affairs. The vice-president for academic affairs ranks second to the president in terms of importance to the institution. His major area of responsibility and authority includes university academic matters such as instruction, research, and faculty affairs. (Vice-presidents for academic affairs will be used interchangeably with deans of academic affairs since the institutions involved in the study use the titles interchangeably.)

*Desegregation

It is well established that laws, rules, or regulations governing public colleges and universities which segregate the races violate the Fourteenth Amendment. This constitutional standard is unmistakably clear. However, the precise definition of desegregation remains unclear. For example, desegregation, as Alexander and Solomon point out, has been interpreted to mean everything from a simply lowering of segregation barriers to an affirmative duty to effectuate
In practice, though, desegregation is a complex social and political process of reassigning pupils and teachers from racially isolated schools to schools that are not racially isolated in order to end racial or ethnic isolation in the public schools. Legally, desegregation is achieved when a school system no longer has schools racially identifiable as "white schools," "black schools," or "brown schools," but—in the words of the 1968 U.S. Supreme Court decision in Green v. School Board of New Kent County 391 U.S. 430 (1968)—"just schools." Complete desegregation is said to exist when the racial balance in each school matches the racial composition of the total community.

The Green definition is applied to the desegregation of public higher education in Sanders v. Ellington 288 F. Supp. 937 (M.C. Tenn. 1968). There it meant that process in which a state system of higher education no longer has racially identifiable public colleges and universities as "white state colleges" and "black state colleges" but just a "state unified system of higher education." The definition of

\[\text{---}\]

\[\text{---}\]

\[\text{---}\]


desegregation used in this study is the one defined by Sanders v. Ellington.

*Integration

There is no universal agreement on the difference between desegregation and integration: the two words are used interchangeably by many, including those in the social sciences, education and the courts. However, the consensus suggests that integration is a process that begins where desegregation ends. It seems appropriate in this instance though, to think of desegregation in public higher education as that process which is met when the conditions of integration are being applied as opposed to applying conditions of segregation. Thus, integration as applied to public higher education will indicate and signify the affirmative achievement of a unitary, system of public higher education.

---


34However it must be remembered, as Egerton argues in Adams = Equal that desegregation of public higher education, especially public black colleges, blurs the traditional meanings of Brownian application of "integration" and "disintegration."
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Public Black College: An Historical Perspective

Originally, American colleges and universities were little more than secondary schools which male children of the well-to-do attended to be trained for the clergy. However, by the early nineteenth century, the American college had blossomed into an identifiable institution of higher education making the baccalaureate degree accessible to greater numbers of people, regardless of their place on the social scale.

"Opening up" the American college and university to a greater segment of society was not as difficult a process during that early period as it is today. For example, if persons were unable to attend the more established ivy league institutions in the early 1800's, then collectively these same persons could exercise the option to set up competitive colleges of their own.¹ As Jencks and Riesman

point out, it was a common occurrence for persons to set up their own colleges, because the development of most American institutions (e.g., colleges, schools, churches) catered to the desires of various groups to perpetuate their own distinctive subculture in order to give it legitimacy.  

The development of black colleges in America, like other higher educational institutions, is also the result of a specific collectivity of persons who became interested in their socioeconomic improvement and pursued this by establishing their own institutions. Although there is no comprehensive history of the development of public black colleges, the existing histories place their early development during the mid-nineteenth century. During this period Lincoln University in Pennsylvania and Wilberforce

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{See Frederick Chambers, "Histories of Black Colleges and Universities," Journal of Negro History (July 1972), pp. 270-75.}\]


\[\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\text{It should be noted that Lincoln University (Pa.) is now a state assisted institution. It is the latest of the public black colleges, joining the other 33 in 1973 as it receives more than 50% of its support from the state.}\]
University in Ohio were established as the first colleges for blacks. The identification of these two institutions as the first black colleges is defensible, as Bowles and DeCosta suggest, because they were the first to remain in their original location. Moreover, they were also the first to award baccalaureate degrees, and to develop into degree-granting institutions. While these early institutions were mainly concerned with the education of free blacks, they also devoted a great deal of their energies and talents to the cause of abolitionism. Both Lincoln and Wilberforce, for example, were important centers of support for the abolitionist movement before the Civil War. Thus these two institutions established a precedent of community "involvement" which has continued among black colleges to the present day.

Other attempts were made during the antebellum period to establish higher educational institutions for blacks but they failed. However, one could argue that, at least in the eyes of free blacks, the interest in higher education

6 Holmes, The Negro College, p. 11.
7 Bowles and DeCosta, Between Two Worlds, p. 20.
8 See Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom.
ignited before the Civil War and the determination expressed by those few who experienced and obtained it, later paved the way for more access to higher education for blacks.

After the Civil War, America discovered that in freeing the slaves it also gained 4.5 million prospective new citizens who were basically illiterate and unemployed. Immediately after the war several attempts were made, particularly by the black church, the Freedman's Bureau, and the Missionaries, to make order out of the confusion facing the freedmen and to provide them with educational opportunities. These efforts were made despite the obvious lack of public education in the war-torn South and the adversarial relationship between blacks and southern whites which increased dramatically during that time.

The work of the Freedman's Bureau (created by President Lincoln in 1865) was particularly important during Reconstruction. In conjunction with the American Missionary Association and the black church, the Bureau accelerated the growth of public school education for blacks in the South, by helping to establish some two hundred private black colleges. Operated under the auspices of denominational and

---

10 Holmes, The Negro College, p. 11.
11 Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, "The American Negro College," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 37, No. 1,
church boards, these colleges specialized in the training of clergymen, who often served as missionaries to Africa. However, as McGrath points out, in order to survive all of these institutions found it necessary to accept non-clerics as students. The curriculum most non-clerical students took was education, thus explaining how most of these institutions tended to become defacto teachers colleges.\textsuperscript{12}

As one might expect a great deal of criticism befell the early black private college. In addition to its church emphasis, critics attacked the use of the name "college" because these institutions were not colleges in the traditional academic sense, but rather elementary and secondary training schools. Moreover, the critics (including blacks and whites) criticized the extensive control and domination of these institutions by white missionary and philanthropic agencies\textsuperscript{13} in saying that little input into the governance


\textsuperscript{13}It is well worth noting that white and black philanthropists expended great sums of money to not only support the early black colleges but also to establish and expand them. See Robert Brimmer, American Philanthropy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); and Waldemar A. Nielsen, The Big Foundations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972).
of the institution was being made by blacks, the primary clients of the institutions.\textsuperscript{14}

While the road was rocky for the black private college following the Civil War, up to the establishment of the first public black colleges, they managed to prove that institutions of higher learning did have an important role in the education of blacks, and were able to make significant contributions in the black community. Moreover, the establishment and support of the black private colleges raised the level of interests of the governments of southern and border states (Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware, Missouri, and Kentucky) to consider assuming additional responsibility for the higher education of its black citizens.

Seventeen of the 34 historically public black colleges now in existence were founded prior to 1890.\textsuperscript{15} Only two of the 17, however, were listed as colleges and universities in 1890. One had an enrollment of 4, while the other an enrollment of 86.\textsuperscript{16} The other 15 were listed as normal or industrial schools.\textsuperscript{17} Perhaps the most significant of the


\textsuperscript{15}See Appendix A for dates when these institutions were established.

\textsuperscript{16}Bowles and DeCosta, Between Two Worlds, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{17}See Hall, Black Vocational Education, pp. 91-148. Hall, more than anyone else, in capsule form accounts for
publicly supported black colleges established prior to 1890 was Alcorn A & M in Lorman, Mississippi. This institution was set up during Reconstruction, when blacks and their allies controlled the state legislature and developed early into an important center of learning for blacks in Mississippi.  

While some of the Southern and Border states attempted to establish post-secondary educational institutions for blacks, known more commonly as normal and industrial schools, but later to be public colleges, they did not attempt to establish state degree-granting colleges for blacks. Rather, these institutions were established in an attempt to train black teachers for the developing black elementary and secondary schools. The remaining public colleges for blacks were not established until the passage of the Second Morrill Act in 1890.

The first Morrill Act passed by Congress and signed by Lincoln in 1862 did not create land-grant colleges for blacks but it planted the seed for later activity. The first Morrill Act offered each state which accepted its provision 30,000 acres of land for each member of Congress from the development and significance of each of the public black colleges (both land-grant and non-land grant).

that state—to be sold to provide a permanent endowment for at least one college. In addition to establishing a pattern of Federal support without federal control, the 1862 Act broke with the European tradition of providing education for an aristocracy based on heredity, occupation, and money.

However, because of the War and Reconstruction, Southern and Border states were unable to take immediate advantage of the 1862 Act in helping blacks. During Reconstruction though, Virginia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Mississippi did make attempts under the 1862 Act to establish land-grant colleges for blacks. These colleges provided, in many instances, the only means of access to public higher education for blacks living in those areas.

---


20 Allen Nevins says the first Morrill Act was the most important single piece of Federal legislation affecting higher education passed in the nineteenth century. Allen Nevins, The State Universities and Democracy (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1962).

21 Hall, Black Vocational Education, pp. 91-95; and Jencks and Riesman, The American Negro College, pp. 55-60.

22 Franklin suggests there did exist isolated instances of blacks attending public white institutions of higher learning in the South following the Civil War. See John Hope Franklin, Reconstruction After the Civil War (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
The success of these institutions pointed the way for the establishment of other public colleges for blacks by the time of the 1890 Morrill Act. Although similar to the original Act, the 1890 Act distinguished itself by the following provisions:

That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue, for the education of colored students in agriculture and mechanic arts however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and adequate division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for colored students established as aforesaid which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and therupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of eighteen hundred and sixty-two and the fulfillment of the foregoing provision in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.²³

This Act was extremely important in the establishment of public black colleges, because it required all states to either admit blacks to their land-grant colleges or establish separate institutions for blacks if they wanted to qualify for Federal money from the Act. Because of the

prevailing sociocultural atmosphere governing race at that time, integrated public colleges were impractical and, Southern and Border states immediately embarked upon the establishment of "1890" black land-grant colleges. Altogether, these states established seventeen black land-grant colleges.  

The remaining public black colleges were not established until the twentieth century. In 1912 the state of Tennessee established, under the 1890 Morrill Act, a land-grant college for blacks, Tennessee A & I State University, at Nashville. While Texas and Mississippi later created the last public black colleges in 1947 and 1950 respectively. Although these colleges were not land-grant institutions, they too were established in order to keep blacks from going to white state colleges.

Once established, public black colleges (both land-grant and non-land-grant) ran into immediate difficulties. Much of the difficulty involved their image as bonafide institutions of higher learning. During their formative years,


\[\text{25 Ibid.}\]

most of these institutions were little more than secondary schools and few could be classified as colleges as we know them today. This was largely due, as Bullock suggests, to inadequate public schools and to the lack of interest by some blacks in the promise of access to higher educational opportunities.27 Perhaps the most difficult obstacle presented during these early years, and to some extent even today, was the racist belief of many whites, both in and out of state government, that blacks were not educable beyond the primary grades. Thus why should blacks be permitted to attend even their own colleges at the public's expense when they were not educable at all.28

Bowles and DeCosta observed that the greatest period of growth experienced by black colleges between 1919 and 1953 happened in the public black college. Much of the growth was attributed to a shift in emphasis during the Depression. For instance,

27 Bullock, Negro Education.

1) Because of the Depression, blacks who normally would have attended private black colleges found it necessary to attend the less costly public colleges.

2) Facing acute unemployment, many black youth became attracted by the student financial assistance programs that were operated for public black colleges by the National Youth Association.

3) By the close of the 1930's public black colleges had developed to the point where they were quite competitive with private black colleges in granting degrees, in enrolling mainly high school graduates, in curricular offerings, in academic respectability, as measured by accreditation, and in physical facilities.  

By 1954 the public black colleges had overtaken their private counterparts in enrollment and had developed to a point where the black community recognized them as important institutions in their system. Despite the inadequate financial backing on the part of both the state and federal governments and the inhibiting and discriminatory policies of white-controlled state boards, the black community began to rely upon these institutions to train the leadership needed to sustain their fight against racial injustice.

---


The Public Black College and Desegregation

From 1954 to the present, the public black college's development has been influenced greatly by the national response to the goals and issues of desegregation. While the goals of desegregation have received a great deal of attention since 1954, its recent development as a substantive issue for public black colleges owes its evolution to a long series of court cases which began in the late nineteenth century. 31

The key case that treated the issue of desegregation in public higher education, though somewhat tangentially, was Plessy v. Ferguson 163 U.S. 537 (1896). In that case the Supreme Court ruled racially separate but equal public facilities were not in violation of the Constitution. This decision, coupled with the reference by the 1890 Morrill Act that it was proper for states to establish black land-grant colleges, legitimized all defacto segregated public educational institutions in America. Later in 1908, the year of the first significant race riot of the twentieth century (Springfield, Illinois), the Supreme Court sustained a Kentucky statute forbidding colleges from simultaneously offering education to blacks and whites in the same institution.

31An early case involving racial segregation in public education took place in 1850: Roberts v. City of Boston, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 198 (1850).
This ruling reaffirmed the Plessy doctrine being applied to public higher education and led states to neglect public black colleges for their white state institutions, thereby insuring their separate and unequal status.

However, in a series of decisions from 1938-1950, the Supreme Court modified the harsh implications of Plessy as applied to blacks and public higher education. Summarized these decisions by the Supreme Court held that (1) blacks had to be admitted to white state graduate schools if there were none immediately available black colleges in the state; (2) upon admission to white graduate schools blacks could not be segregated; and (3) all aspects of education, including intangibles, were to be equal in racially separate institutions.

The attacks on Plessy culminated in the Brown decisions of 1954-55. In attacking segregation of the public schools, the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in public

---


education, thus reversing completely the Plessy doctrine. The Brown decision though it applied to the public schools also had implications for public higher education, particularly for dual systems of public higher education that were based on race. Thus the Brown decision had made one thing clear—race was no longer to be the organizing principle of public higher education. The implementation of that legal proposition under all deliberate speed has, however, yet to be realized either in the public schools or in public higher education.

Bullock suggests that the 1954-55 decisions were especially important to the public black college, because they affected not only the definition of these institutions but also the way in which they operated. In making this assessment he cited the example of Texas Southern University:

The instance of Texas Southern University is made dramatically significant not because of its number of white students—indeed the number is relatively small—but because it is the only formerly all-black college in Texas that is desegregated; one of the few state's colleges with a desegregated faculty and probably the only institution of higher learning in the nation before which white students demonstrated for admission on the ground that their constitutional rights were being violated....Wherever student desegregation has occurred in previously all-black colleges, faculty desegregation has accompanied it.

As Bullock points out, some of the public black

institutions were affected by the Brown decisions, even though the implementation of desegregation was not as "speedy" as the Court suggested. The lack of an immediate response by public higher education to the demands for desegregation in the South, has not been "speedy" because the courts have not resolved what constitutes an acceptable plan of desegregating systems of public higher education that have been distinguished on the basis of race.\(^{36}\)

That the courts have experienced difficulty in resolving the crucial issue of what constitutes an acceptable plan for desegregating higher education institutions is most evident in the recent cases of Adams v. Richardson.\(^{37}\) The

\(^{36}\)In 1968 the first of a series of federal district court cases addressed the issue of dualism (desegregating racially identifiable systems of public higher education) in higher education. In Geier v. Dunn 288 F. Supp. 937 the court held that Tennessee had to submit a plan to desegregate the state's higher education system; the state had an affirmative duty to dismantle the dual system of higher education. Hereafter cited as Geier v. Dunn. However, a federal district court in Alabama State Teachers Association v. Public School and College Authority held that while the state was under an affirmative duty to dismantle its dual enrollment system at the elementary and secondary level, it was under no such obligation in higher education. This decision was affirmed by the Supreme Court. 393 U.S. 400, 89 S. Ct. 681 (1969).

\(^{37}\)356 F. Supp. 92 (1973) and 480 F. 2d 1159 (1973). Case cited as Adams v. Weinberger in Court of Appeals. The Adams case is also noteworthy because it was a comprehensive class action suit against the federal government, rather than a suit by individuals against a single state or school. It also attacked segregation and discrimination at all levels of public education, and it cited violations of the law in a number of states, North as well as South.
federal courts in those cases held ten states in non-compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which forbids federal support from going to public institutions which practice segregation or discrimination. (The states cited were not the only ones known to be practicing discrimination; they were merely the ones in which federal officials had completed field investigations and site visits.)

Although the courts did not provide the ten non-compliance states with specific guidelines to follow, they did require them to submit "acceptable" plans with the D-HEW office or else face termination of federal funds. Thus the Adams' rulings, as the Southern Education Foundation states dispelled the conventional wisdom that the nation's public colleges and universities were desegregated long ago. Rather, what still exists is the peculiar condition of public colleges and universities being viewed by whites and blacks

---

38 See Ending Discrimination, p. 7.

as "ours" and "theirs." *40*

While recent decisions, especially Geier v. Dunn and Adams have finally called attention to the issue of desegregation in public higher education. These decisions also tend to support the findings of Wiggins and Egerton who suggest implementing desegregation in public black colleges will not be easy. *41* This fact can largely be attributed to the complexities of the various parties who have to be consulted in constructing meaningful and viable solutions. *42* Perhaps the party most central to the construction of any solution is the federal government, but historically they have lacked consistency in dealings with matters involving race. *43*

--------

*40* Ending Discrimination, p. 8.

*41* See Wiggins, The Desegregation Era in Higher Education; and Egerton, Adams = Equal.

*42* Ending Discrimination (See p. 8); notes it was the Adams ruling that finally brought together for the first time, the federal courts, D-HEW, Plaintiffs, higher education officials (especially the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education) and public leaders of 10 states to a serious and comprehensive consideration of the entire range of issues affecting desegregation in tax-supported colleges and universities.

Contemporary Studies and the Public Black College

Several contemporary studies have dealt with the black colleges, but few have addressed the public black college. McGrath's study mentioned little about public black colleges. His research did suggest that the integration of public educational institutions would affect the fate of public black colleges more than other public colleges. McGrath reasoned that when a state decided to integrate its public institutions it would be more inclined to dismantle its public black institutions or merge them with white ones than vice versa, because the public black institutions were recognized as inferior.44

The study by Jencks and Riesman was also critical of public black colleges as well as black colleges in general. Without substantial documentary evidence, they argued that public black colleges were "academic disaster areas" and thus could never measure up to even the worst white institutions of comparable size.45 The impact of this study prompted a strong fact-based rebuttal by the representatives of the black higher educational establishment. This rebuttal implied that, given sufficient financial and moral


44 See McGrath, Transition.

45 See Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution.
support, all black colleges could be improved. They further noted that the black community could ill-afford to lose these colleges, because they had been one of the few committed to the black community's quest for social justice. 46

Despite their adamant tone, the Jencks and Riesman study held out hope for black colleges, particularly the public ones. The fact that public black colleges tended to be in better financial condition than their counterparts, coupled with the perceived need by blacks to support and continue to enroll in those institutions, prompted Jencks and Riesman to suggest the need to continue support for them. However, in this regard, they foresaw integration of these institutions as the only logical step towards enhancing and enriching their future development.

The questioning of the future and the raison d'être of public black colleges is also raised in studies by the Carnegie Commission. Bowles and DeCosta argue that, because of Brown, public black colleges no longer have a hold on the "market" of black students. They attributed this to

increased competition with other institutions who are actively and recruiting minority students and minority faculty. Bowles and DeCosta admit, though, that in this competition public black colleges are operating at a disadvantage. They further admit that much more needed to be done if public black colleges were to be able to compete with other colleges on an equal basis.\textsuperscript{47}

In the study \textit{From Isolation to Mainstream} (a follow-up study to Bowles and DeCosta) a note of optimism was expressed about the future of black colleges, particularly the public ones. This study recommended that the problems and issues facing these institutions needed additional investigation if solutions were to be properly constructed.

Few institutions of higher education today face both deeper challenges to their survival and greater opportunities for service than the colleges founded for Negroes....Today, despite their history of isolation, society now expects these institutions to meet stern competition within the broad spectrum of higher education generally. Neither the older separation nor the new competition is easy. The new prospect, however, carries the greater hope in the long run. It will take the best of leadership, the best of ideas, and the best of support to solve the problems and realize the hope.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47}See again Bowles and DeCosta, \textit{Between Two Worlds}, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{48}Isolation to Mainstream, p. 4. See also other studies calling for additional explanation and investigation of black colleges--e.g., Lewis B. Mayhew, "Black and White Colleges: A Study in Waste," \textit{Educational Record}, Vol. 52, No. 2, 1971, pp. 159-164; Herman H. Long, "The Negro College:
The idea of a university as a formal, organized institution, having an administration, is a medieval innovation. The development of American higher education owes practically everything to the medieval university—from the idea of formal courses to student violence.

Although the American university owes a great deal of its historical development to European traditions, the development of the contemporary college president and central administration (e.g., vice presidents for academic affairs) has been almost entirely of American origin. Often chosen by the local boards of trustees or state boards to serve as chief executive of the institution, the American college president has developed as a central figure of authority in the university. Rudolph suggests that:


without a president the organization (university), depending on other factors as well, could for a time get along reasonably well, but on the president depended the degree to which the institution transcended the grip of organization and found expression in some vibrant living purpose.  

Contemporary studies suggest that within the organization of the American university, the fate and direction of the university, particularly as it relates to institutional missions and goals resides in the office of the presidency and central administration. The position of central administration in university governance structures suggests that it is the most influential branch of the academic community.  

Like most American colleges and universities, public black colleges have been also dominated by the president and central administration. Although much of the literature on the governance of black colleges has not been well grounded empirically, it does reinforce and extend the notion that black college presidents and other central administrators

\[51\text{Rudolph, The American College, p. 423.}\]

(e.g., vice-presidents for academic affairs) have exercised considerable authority over the internal decision-making processes of these colleges. In addition these same actors have maintained considerable responsibility for representing the interests of the institution to various publics (e.g., boards, fund raisers, alumni, government officials) outside the institution.\footnote{See again Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution, pp. 406-478; McGrath, Transition, pp. 107-127; Tilden J. LeMelle and Wilbert J. LeMelle, The Black College: A Strategy for Relevancy (New York: Praeger, 1969); hereafter cited as LeMelle, A Strategy for Relevancy; and The Negro and Higher Education in the South, A Statement by the Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity in the South (Atlanta: published by Southern Regional Education Board, 1967), pp. 19-21.}

The Carnegie Commission, in both of its reports on black colleges supports the argument that the central administration of the black college, especially in the person of the president, represents in many respects the "institutional pulse." The Commission attributed this to the historical role of black college administrators. For example, the president had to serve as an ambassador to the white community because of their reluctance to accord full recognition to black institutions. The black college president, then, even more than his white counterpart, has had to divide his attention between school and community, often requiring his administration be extremely strong.\footnote{See again McGrath, Transition and LeMelle, A Strategy for Relevancy.}
In contrast to the studies that have tagged both the black college president and his central administration as "authoritarian," "autocratic," and "domineering," Johnson suggests the exhibition of autocratic tendencies by the black college president and central administration have been very effective in the governance of these institutions:

...since black colleges from their inception have always been confronted by a hostile or nonsupportive environment, it can be argued that strong personal authority was essential to their survival. This, perhaps would be even more true in the case of the state universities where the president (and other central administrators) found it necessary constantly to reassure the often bigoted legislators and boards of regents that the institution, under his steadying stewardship, was immune to unsettling social and economic views and activities. Symbolically, this was the meaning of the behavior of one black state college president, who, as late as 1962, continued to maintain a secret dining room on his campus for white regents and legislators, with whom he never dined.

Although the studies do not all agree as to whether or not the central administrators of black colleges exhibit effective leadership in management functions, they do imply that central administration, particularly the president and his immediate staff, have represented the general views of


\[^{56}\text{Ibid.}\]
the institutions more than any other sector, including the
general black community. Thus, if one were to ascertain
the perceptions of the presidents and other key central ad-
ministrators of public black colleges on issues of sub-
stance, like desegregation, one would be obtaining a view
that closely represents the perceptions of other institu-
tional sectors (i.e., students, faculty, and black com-
munity).

Analytical Framework

The massive amount of data (i.e., type of institution, size, mission) collected on the American university and col-
lege, as well as information relating to the dynamics of academic governance suggest that higher education is one of America's most diversified and complex institutions. Yet within this complexity and diversity, American higher edu-
cation organizations are remarkably similar.

The complexity and diversity of American higher edu-
cation are well documented. For example, four-year colleges

57 See again From Isolation to Mainstream, p. 64 and Wiggins, The Desegregation Era in Higher Education, pp. pp. 49-58 in addressing the college administrator as forces for change and Thompson, The Crossroads where Thompson notes the perceptions of central administration in the person of the president and other high level administrators (i.e., vice-president for academic affairs) are more often than not fairly representative of the institution itself. See Chap-
ter IX on "Governance," pp. 221-243.
offering the baccalaureate degree can be private liberal arts colleges or military academies, as well as public institutions that emphasize teacher training. Moreover, the degree-granting process occurs in institutions that are subject to a variety of controls (e.g., public, private, federal, and municipal) and different organizational structures (e.g., centralized v. decentralized).  

However diverse in size, control, governance, and structure, there are similarities among these institutions. For example, most, if not all, of American higher education offers similar degrees (i.e., bachelors, masters, doctorate). The main similarity, however, is its support for the philosophy of meritocracy: merit advances those who achieve and demotes those who do not. This support has been a tremendous influence upon the development and maintenance of the American socialization process.


59 See Oscar and Mary Handlin, The American College and American Culture (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970). The Handlins make the point that socialization in America, to a large extent, has traditionally been the primary function of higher education.
Although higher education has been well described, it has not always been well explained or logically ordered via the use of analytical schemes. A scheme that has the capacity to provide an adequate explanation of the work of higher education is that developed by David Easton.\textsuperscript{60} Essentially, Easton attempts to provide a framework from which to view the critical social processes of life and to place them in an order that is comprehensible.

Wirt and Kirst responded in this fashion to the merits and utility of Easton's political process model as a tool for analysis in education:

Educational journals are filled with descriptions of the operations of school systems and subsystems, of their actors and agents, of their laws and regulations. Further, this purported reality is invariably accomplished by recommendations to change or retain the observed reality. Further description and evaluation merge indefensibly into prescription recommendations on how to change reality so as to achieve normative objectives, how to close the gap between the real and the ideal. What is least found is explanation—suppositions and supporting evidence about the causes, consequences, and interrelationships of what is found in reality.\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{60}David Easton, \textit{A Framework for Political Analysis} (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965). Hereafter cited as Easton, \textit{A Framework}.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Thus it seems appropriate that a political systems analysis, such as Easton's, can be applied as a means of explaining not only the political process of party politics, but also educational or, more specifically, higher educational processes, such as the effects of desegregation upon public black colleges.

While not using the specific framework developed by Easton, scholars writing in the area of higher education have utilized various aspects of the systems analysis approach. Parsons and Platt utilized an "action" system approach to explain the ideal type of the American university. Essentially, Parsons and Platt drew upon the general theory of action that was developed earlier by Parsons and others, described as follows:

In the theory of action the point of reference of all terms is the action of an individual actor or of a collectivity of actors....The interest of the theory of action, however, is directed not to the physiological processes internal to the organism but rather to the organization of the actors' orientation to a situation.

In describing the American university Parsons and Platt utilize "action" symbolically to represent the behavior of

---


the organized university. Moreover, "action" analysis assumes that any attempt to comprehend the ordering of behavior has to account for the nature of systems of action and their component parts, the nature of their environments and their component parts, and the relation of systems and environments to each other.\(^{64}\)

Baldridge (1971) utilized systems analysis to explain the internal decision-making process in a case study of New York University. In sum, Baldridge used a political model (which he suggests was not a formal model or an elegant theory) that depicted the University as a complex social structure involved in conflict. Within the structure are generated multiple pressures, in which many forms of power and pressure impinge upon decision-makers. A legislative stage translates these pressures into policy, and a policy execution finally generates feedback in the form of new conflicts.\(^{65}\)

\(^{64}\) Parsons, The American University, pp. 1-30.

Edward Gross attempted to test the usefulness of an organizational model in accounting for structural variables in universities. Adopting lines similar to Parsons, Gross argued that the university as an organization distinguishes itself from other social systems in that the problem of goal attainment has primacy over all other problems.

Gross also suggested that if the goal of the university is not attained then the whole system is jeopardized. In relating goal attainment to the systems approach he notes:

Of course the use of a systems approach hardly implies any lesser centrality of organizational goals, for it is through goal attainment (or the claim that such is its intent) that the organization translates its inputs into outputs, or at least legitimizes its right to operate and to call on the society for its inputs.

In an approach similar to system analysis, Stroup applied a bureaucratic model in his treatment of the university. This bureaucratic model, as Stroup argues, is most applicable in explaining the administrative structure of an institution, because within higher education there exists the same degree of specialization, delegation of authority and imputed status that also exists in the modern, industrial state.

---


67 Ibid., p. 519.

The framework of analysis utilized here and developed by David Easton is a political systems model, one that Easton has devoted some time in developing\(^69\) as a viable behavioral approach which weaves together the results of theory and empirical research. Easton acknowledges, however, that his research into the viability of this model is not entirely new as other scholars have worked on the development of similar models.\(^70\)

Essentially, system analysis, as conceived by Easton, has several theoretical imperatives. One relates to the definition of a system itself. As Easton argues, a system is any set of variables regardless of the degree of interrelationship among them. The only question of importance about a set selected as a system to be analyzed, he insists, is whether this set constitutes an interesting one, as in the case of public black colleges.\(^71\)


\(^70\) In this area note the work of Harold Lasswell's Who Gets What, When, How (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936) in which Lasswell studies politics vis-a-vis a theory on elites and Herbert Simon's classic, Administrative Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1945), in which Simon utilizes the "decision" as his unit of analysis for explaining organizational behavior.

\(^71\) Easton, A Systems Analysis, p. 21.
More specifically, Easton argues that a political system can be designated as those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated for a society; this is what distinguishes a political system from other systems that may be interpreted as lying in its environment.\(^{72}\) The environment, notes Easton, is divided into two parts, the intra-societal and the extra-societal. The first consists of those systems in the same society as the political system but excluded from the latter. Intra-societal systems would include such sets of behavior, attitudes and ideas as the economy, culture, social structure or personalities; they are, as Easton suggests, the functional segments of the society with respect to which the political system at the focus of attention is itself a component.\(^{73}\)

The second part of the environment, designated by Easton as the extra-societal, includes all those systems that lie outside the given society itself (e.g., the international political system). Easton argues, however, that even though this environment is considered external, in that

---

\(^{72}\) *Ibid.* Easton says the environment is the boundary of a political system. He defines the boundary of a system as all those actions which more or less are directly related to the making of binding decisions for a society; every social action that does not partake of this characteristic is excluded from the system and is automatically viewed as an external variable in the environment.

it lies outside the society of which the political system itself is a social sub-system, it may have important consequences for the persistence or change of a political system. 74

Two other imperatives (or premises) are also important for understanding Easton's use of systems analysis. One relates to the notion that responses in terms of the variations in the structures and processes within a system may usefully be interpreted as constructive or positive alternative efforts by members of a system to regulate or cope with stress flowing from environmental as well as internal (sub-system) sources. The other imperative relates to the notion that the capacity of a system to persist in the face of stress is a function of the presence and nature of the information and other influences that return to its actors and decision-makers. 75

Easton argues that the concept of "authorities" (i.e., government of occupants of leadership roles like president, prime minister, or in the case of public black colleges, State Board, D-HEW and the Federal Courts) are central to the analysis of the political system. For Easton argues that it is upon the authorities that the final responsibility falls for matching or balancing outputs of decision

---

74 Easton, A Framework, p. 73.
75 Easton, A Framework, pp. 24-25.
versus inputs of demands and supports. "Authorities" are important because they are recognized by most members of the system as being responsible for the allocation of scarce resources. Members of the system also tend to accept the decisions of the authorities as binding most of the time as long as the authorities act within the limits of their differentiated roles. 76

Although the political system is highly influenced by elaborate environmental influences, Easton suggests that system assessment and appraisal is not an elaborate process; rather it hinges on some key conceptual indicators that are described and defined as:

Demands -- inputs or expressions of opinion that an authoritative allocation with regard to a particular subject matter should or should not be made by those responsible for doing so (e.g., the perception of public black administrators suggest that they are not

76 See Ibid., pp. 49-54. Easton insists the authorities have differentiated roles through which the major responsibilities for managing the political affairs of the groups are exercised. This differentiation exists by virtue of the special capabilities that they possess in order to mobilize the resources and energies of the members of the system and to bring them to bear upon broad or specified objectives. If the authorities violate this sense of legitimacy, as in the case of George III and Colonial America, then they would be subjecting themselves to a change in their role, or as in George's case--Revolution. The authorities, however, need not meet all the demands of even its most influential and ardent supporters.
overly enthused with the federal demands for desegregation). Demands constitute a significant part of the material upon which a system operates, and whatever form they take (i.e., narrow, specific, or simple in nature) demands are generally directed toward the authorities. Easton maintains that the reason why a political system emerges in a society at all—that is, why men engage in political activity—is that demands are being made by persons or groups in the society that cannot be fully satisfied.  

**Supports** -- inputs that can either be symbolic or material which exhibit the willingness of the members to accept the decisions of the system or the system itself (e.g., the efforts on the parts of public black colleges to increase their white student enrollment in order to meet the demands of desegregation). As Wirt and Kirst argue, "a steady flow of supports is necessary if any political system is long to maintain its legitimacy." Without support, demands could not be

---

77 At this juncture, it is important to point out that Easton's analysis views an issue as a demand that the political system members are prepared to address as a significant item for discussion vis-a-vis the channels of the system. Easton, *A Framework*.

satisfied or conflict in goals composed. For, if demands are to be acted upon, the members of a system (i.e., constituents of public black colleges) undertaking to pilot the demands through to their transformation into binding decisions and those who seek to influence the relevant processes in any way must be able to count on support from others in the system. 79

Easton argues that Demands and Supports are Inputs (any event external to the system that alters, modifies, or affects the system in any way) which are to be interpreted in their broadest sense. These are perhaps one of the system's most powerful analytical tools because through them (demands and supports) a wide range of activities in the environment can be channeled, mirrored, summarized, and brought to bear upon the system's life. Moreover, these inputs (demands and supports) are eventually converted by the processes of the system into new outputs and these, in turn, have consequences for both the system and for the environment in which the system exists.

Other key conceptual indicators Easton points out are:

Withinputs — Although this term suggests a cumbersome neologism, it speaks to the things that are happening within a system (i.e., the supports that are given by

79 See again, Easton, A Systems Analysis.
the faculty of the public black college to their chief executive administrators) which helps to shape its destiny as a system of interaction. The focus here is internal rather than external. 80

Outputs — the decisions and actions of the authorities, through which one is able to trace out the consequences of behavior within a political system for its environment (e.g., the D-HEW mandates for desegregation). 81

Feedback — the flow of information back to the authorities (decision-makers) which shows the effects of the outputs moving directly back to the environment (e.g., the response of the chief executive administrators of public black colleges to the implementation of desegregation plans on their institutions). 82

Figure 1 is a simplified model of a political system. It serves to dramatize the point that, after all, a political system is just a means whereby certain kinds of inputs are converted into outputs, or a way of translating


81 Easton distinguishes outcome from output. Outcomes are the consequences of outputs that are produced and carried through to its end. A Systems Analysis, pp. 351-352.

82 Easton, A Framework, p. 110.
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DAVID EASTON'S POLITICAL SYSTEM MODEL
demands and support for a system into authoritative allocations of decisions and actions.  

Perhaps the most important indicator in the model is feedback. The presence or absence of feedback provides the system with the capacity to act or react to what the situation requires. Easton argues that no system (like public black colleges) can survive (persist) long without it, except by accident.

Because public black colleges represent a unique and important part of American higher education, and to some degree are themselves diverse, much can be gained by attempting to explain their responses to the effects of the stressful demands of desegregation by using a political systems analytical framework. For as the literature suggests, whether public black colleges are able to respond effectively to the demands for desegregation has important consequences not only for the higher education of blacks but society as well, especially the authoritative decisions that are to be made. Although attempts have been made already to systematically analyze the black college in general, and to describe in general the state university as a political system, to date there have not been any specific attempts to explain public black colleges by using systems analysis.

---

83 Easton, A Framework, p. 112.

84 See again Johnson, System, in which Johnson attempts to interpret the internal processes of the black college. The
The utility and capability of the Eastonian model is such that it can be used in providing a framework in which to explain the perceptions of chief executive administrators of public black colleges inputs in ascertaining how their institutions are reacting to the effects of the stressful demands caused by the policy of desegregation. This can be done by simply positing the aggregate perceptions of these administrators as representative of the institutional feedback to the output (desegregation decisions affecting public black colleges) rendered by the authorities (D-HEW, Federal Courts, and state boards) that have been designated as an outcome, even though this outcome remains to be fully implemented. It is important that the feedback emanating major parts of his system are the administration, faculty, and students who interact, primarily around the curriculum, to produce the graduate, pp. 798-799; and also Gladys M. Kammerer, "The State University as a Political System," Journal of Politics, Vol. 31, May 1969, pp. 289-311, in which she advocates the use of systems analysis to explain the relationship of the state university to itself and to its publics (e.g., state board, alumni, federal government).

Easton says outputs may be positive or negative. Where the output is considered to be somewhat negative, as the case of public black colleges reacting to the demands for desegregation, they threaten the members (i.e., public black colleges) with various kinds of sanctions (i.e., termination of federal aid). See Easton, A Framework.

For example, according to an unpublished 1974 dissertation by James E. Lyons entitled "The Admission of Non-Black Students as an Indicator of a Potential Shift in the Traditional Role of the Black Public Supported Colleges and University," the conclusion is that the enrollment of non-black students is not significant, at this time, as an
from public black colleges on their response to the effects of the demands for desegregation be explained because in doing so it may be possible to ascertain whether the feedback as new inputs (demands and supports) will permit public black colleges to survive at all.

Summary

As the review of the related literature indicates, the public black college and university has been an important force in the higher education of blacks. While its history has been marked by frustrations and disappointments, its future is filled with promise, even under the demands for desegregation.

The foremost question raised for the black public college now concerns what is their role to be in the current era? Should they endeavor to become institutions serving fully integrated student bodies and offering the best in liberal education, or should they continue as racially identifiable institutions endeavoring to meet the particular needs of a disadvantaged minority? Either role demands that the public black college be able to reassess, to re-evaluate, and to recommit itself to the pursuit of "equal educational indicator of a potential shift in the role of the traditionally black institution. See also Freddie W. Nicholas, "The Black Land Grant Colleges: An Assessment of the Major Changes Between 1965-66 and 1970-71," unpublished dissertation 1973.
attainment," or else it will not persist or perhaps more precisely, survive.

To accomplish this end, the pursuit of additional descriptive data through qualitative research efforts on the conditions of these institutions is imperative. However, what is needed even more than mere descriptions are additional explanations as to how these institutions view and intend to react to the changes and effects demanded by the national goal of integration. One of the most expedient ways to fulfill this kind of explanation was to survey the perceptions of the chief executive administrators of these institutions as they react to the effects of the demands for desegregation; it was to this end the study was focused.

87 See again, Thompson, The Crossroads.

88 See again the findings of some of more recent studies, all of which insist that more analyses of the institutional responses, especially those of the public black college, are needed: Ending Discrimination and Alan Pifer, "What Future for the Black Public College," Compact, IX, No. 6, 1974, p. 8.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive Survey as a Methodological Framework

Descriptive surveys are designed to measure as accurately as possible one or more dependent variables in either a defined population or sample of that population.¹ Thus, the methodology of the descriptive survey seeks to provide the researcher with the most accurate descriptions and assessment of the characteristics of whole populations of people.

Generally, descriptive surveys study populations by drawing samples from defined populations; from these samples inferences are drawn as to the characteristics and descriptions of the population not sampled. There are, however, those rare occasions where the population to be surveyed is small enough that sampling is unnecessary (as in this study).²


²For this study, all public black colleges currently recognized by the Office for the Advancement of Public Black
As Kerlinger notes, there are many kinds of different survey designs. Most surveys, though, are recognizable by the method which is being employed by the researcher conducting the research. Thus there can be descriptive surveys conducted by the use of personal interviews as well as by mailed questionnaires.\(^3\) More often than not, survey research tends to utilize more than one kind of method in order to increase the reliability and validity of the data collected.\(^4\)

Descriptive surveys, like other kinds of research designs, have their methodological weaknesses. One of the key weaknesses in the survey design is that the information generated often lacks sufficient depth. Consequently, the description obtained from the method employed tends to be circumscribed to its temporal location and thus lacks the strengths that accompany protracted observations.\(^5\)

********

Colleges were surveyed. This is a key point for this fact forms the basis for analyzing the data obtained. See again Appendix A for a list of the 34 institutions, their location, and their current enrollments.


\(^4\)Because of this reason, the primary methods of collecting data here included both a mailed questionnaire, as well as selected follow-up interviews by actual visitation or by telephone.

\(^5\)Hyman argues that the inherent limitation of any survey research involves its insufficient depth and its being
Although the descriptive survey has its methodological limitations, there are several advantages to its use that tend to outweigh its disadvantages. These advantages enable the researcher:

1. to collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena about a population;
2. to identify problems or justify current conditions and practices that are occurring within a population;
3. to make the comparisons and evaluations of a population; and
4. to determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and thus benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions.°

In sum, as Hyman notes, the methodology of descriptive research, like that employed in this study, can be conceived of as an inquiry into the uniformity or regularity of some phenomena. The use of this methodology (survey design) conducted over a narrow range of time. Hyman, Survey Design, pp. 110-111.

°It must be noted, though, that descriptive research demands the researcher pay particular attention to possible bias at every stage of the design, whether it be in designing the methods of data collection or in the reporting of the findings. See Claire Selltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951), pp. 65-78. See also Kerlinger in Foundations where he describes the merits of doing survey research (pp. 422-423).

°Hyman, Survey Design, p. 78.
provided the most effective, efficient, and economical means for studying the effects of the demands of desegregation upon public black colleges.

The Design of the Study

This study consisted of three phases: (1) the construction and validation of a survey instrument;\(^8\) (2) the mailing of the instrument to the chief executive administrators of the nation's 34 public black colleges for their completion and return; and (3) conducting follow-up interviews with several chief executive administrators at selected institutions. The chief executive administrators who were chosen to participate in the study were the presidents and vice-presidents for academic affairs from each institution.\(^9\)

Selection of the Population

In this study all thirty-four of the public black colleges currently recognized by the Office for the Advancement

\(^8\)Also note that the construction of the instrument was influenced by the one constructed by J. Victor Baldridge in Power and Conflict in the University (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971). The questionnaire of Baldridge, while it reinforced his case study interviews, was designed to meet the requirements of his political systems model.

\(^9\)See again Chapter II, the section on central administration for the rationale in choosing these two chief executive administrators as survey participants.
of Public Negro Colleges (OAPNC is located in Atlanta, Georgia) were surveyed. Although Federal City College in Washington, D.C., the recent addition to the land-grant colleges of the nation, has a predominantly black enrollment and administration, it has not yet been recognized as being a public black college by the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges.

In order to ascertain and describe systematically their perceptions of the effects of the demands for desegregation upon their institutions, the chief executive officers of each institution were mailed a copy of the developed survey instrument for their completion and return. The selection of institutions for participation in the follow-up phase of the study was done on the basis of accessibility and economy. In that regard, of the thirty-four institutions involved in the study, the chief executives of seven different institutions participated\textsuperscript{10} in the follow-up phase of the study, or 20.5\% of the population.

The Research Instrument

A questionnaire was employed in this study as the

\textsuperscript{10} In the case of Southern University, one of the participants was not the president but rather the president emeritus. He was asked to be interviewed not only because of his accessibility but also because he had just left the presidency and was president of Southern up to July 1, 1974, thus qualifying him to adequately address the subject of this study.
primary tool for data collecting. At the time the study was being conceptualized, instruments did not exist which would systematically ascertain the perceptions of the chief executive administrators with respect to how their institutions were responding to the effects of the demands for desegregation both before 1972 and since 1972.

After the questionnaire had been constructed, it was sent out to judges for comments, criticisms, and validation. Once the questionnaire had been validated by the judges as being a reliable instrument for use in this study, a field test of the instrument was conducted. Participating in the conduct of the field test were the chief executive administrators from two of the institutions in the selected population. Both types of chief executive administrators (one president and one vice-president for academic affairs) were involved in the field test of the instrument. In

---

11 Appendix C includes complete copies of both the Presidents' and Vice-Presidents' questionnaires.

12 See the memorandum (Appendix B) sent to the researcher's dissertation committee which designates the names, positions, and institutions of the judges. Every attempt was made to have judges who would closely approximate the positions of the study's respondents and who would be representative of the kinds of institutions involved in the study.

13 The institutions involved in the field test of the instrument were Southern University and Central State University.
addition to completing the field test of the instrument, both respondents attached additional comments and criticisms of the instrument, all of which were addressed prior to the initial mailing to the institutions in the survey.

Although the final version of the questionnaire was divided into two parts for all respondents, the presidents and vice-presidents for academic affairs were asked to respond to several different questions. These differences occurred because the researcher felt that in some instances the presidents were better able to respond to some questions as opposed to the vice-presidents for academic affairs. For example, the researcher made the assumption that presidents would have better access to alumni information while vice-presidents for academic affairs would have better access to information of inter-institutional cooperation. However, it is possible that either could have responded adequately to all questions.\(^{14}\)

On the one hand, Part I of the questionnaire mailed to the presidents consisted of eighteen background information questions. Questions one through twelve sought such data as age, sex, race, undergraduate alma mater, number of years in present position, and current size (actual "headcount") of the institution. Question thirteen sought data on the

\(^{14}\)See Appendix C for both questionnaires.
relative number (more, about the same, fewer) of the past and present changes in racial composition within the following general categories of the institution. These categories were divided into faculty, students, administrators, cabinet, and staff. Questions fourteen through sixteen sought data on the composition of the institution's state board and whether or not the institution had more than one board.

Part II of the presidents' questionnaire consisted of thirty-three questions (both the "open" and "closed" variety). These questions were designed to collect data on the president perceptions of the effects of the demands of desegregation upon their institutions both before and since 1972. These questions ranged from whether or not the institutions had had policies on desegregation to what the presidents saw as being the future impact of desegregation upon their institution.

On the other hand, in Part I of the questionnaire for the vice-presidents for academic affairs there were fifteen questions rather than the sixteen to which the presidents were asked to respond. In addition to the questions on race, sex, the vice-presidents were also asked about their faculty rank (questions 8 and 9), their teaching status (question 10), and whether or not their institution had engaged in collective bargaining (question 15).  

Again see Appendix C for copies of both the presidents' and vice-presidents' questionnaires.
Part II of the vice-president's questionnaire was longer than the president's. The difference involved the questions on interinstitutional cooperation (questions 26 and 27). These questions were not asked on the presidents' instrument; rather the presidents were asked about the geographic dispersal and number of the institution alumni, and which group (if any) had had the most input on the development of the institution's response to desegregation.

Data Collection Techniques

The presidents and vice presidents for academic affairs of each of the thirty-four institutions in the population were mailed an envelope containing the appropriate coded questionnaire, a cover letter, and a letter of endorsement. The questionnaire mailed to the presidents also included an appendix depicting a regional breakdown of the United States (e.g., the Southeast included Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, etc.).

Two weeks after the mailing of the questionnaire, appointments were arranged and scheduled for this researcher to meet with the chief executive administrators of four of the institutions involved in the study in order to initiate

---

16 These documents, the cover letter, the letter of endorsement, and in the case of the presidents, the appendix mailed specifying the geographic regions of the country appear in Appendix C along with copies of the questionnaire.
the follow-up interview phase of the study. The data from these interviews were collected before the mailing of the first follow-up questionnaire which occurred some three weeks later.

The first follow-up mailing of the questionnaire was to the presidents and vice-presidents who had not responded to the initial mailing and to those who had not participated in the follow-up interviews. The enclosures of the first follow-up consisted of a memorandum (reminding the chief executive administrators of the study's purpose and stating that their participation in the study was of the utmost importance), the letter of endorsement, and the questionnaire. One week after the first follow-up had been mailed, additional follow-up interviews were conducted with the chief executive administrators of three other institutions involved in the study. Again, as in the first series of interviews, these interviews were designed to collect questionnaires not completed and to obtain more complete data on how the respondents' institutions were responding to the

17 These interviews were designed to provide greater depth to the questionnaire and to provide the researcher to not only collect some of the mailed questionnaires, but also to obtain more complete data. In addition, it provided a means of checking and assuring the effectiveness of the communication between the respondent and the reviewer on the purposes of the study.

18 See again Appendix C.
demands of desegregation upon their institutions.

A second follow-up was conducted approximately three weeks after the first follow-up. The second follow-up involved the telephoning of selected institutions in the population from which there had been no response. In this regard, this researcher was assisted by the president of one of the participating institutions. Two weeks after the second follow-up the collection of data for the study was concluded.

Record definitions and coding sheets were then developed for tabulating and processing the data collected from both the instrument and follow-up interviews. All data collected were recorded on the coding sheets and then key punched onto cards. The cards were then submitted to a computer for statistical analyses.

---

19 This president, widely respected among his fellow colleagues within the public black colleges, made personal appeals by phone and letter to several of these institutions that had not responded. I remain in his debt for this effort and his generous support. See Appendix C for the letter written on this researcher's behalf by this president.

20 The follow-up interviews paralleled, where possible, the questions asked by the mailed instrument. In some instances, though, it was necessary to utilize content analysis in order to place the interviewee's responses into categories that were also found in the mailed questionnaire, thus permitting their responses to also be coded, key punched, and fed into the computer for statistical analysis.
Analysis of Data

The data for the study were analyzed and interpreted with the use of descriptive statistics and the nonparametric measure, $X^2$ (Chi Square). Because the data were to be described in the aggregate, the main statistical tools utilized were frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, measures of variability, percentages, and cross-breaks.

Chi Square was used to test whether or not there existed any statistical differences between the responses of the presidents and vice presidents on substantive questions which both had to answer. The significance level for the $X^2$ test (two-tailed) was set at .05 level. To fully

---

21 This researcher used a program from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970). This program provides the following statistics: the mean, the mode, the skewness, standard error, standard deviations, frequency distribution, the median, the variance, and the range. The same program also has the capacity to give the $X^2$ and Pearson's correlation.

22 Kerlinger, in Foundations, defines crosstabs or cross-breaks as a numerical tabular presentation of data, usually in frequency or percentage form, in which variables are cross-partitioned in order to study the relation between them. Crossbreaks are particularly helpful (as used in this study's analyses) in describing the way a situation exists. See pp. 159-166.

23 $X^2$ as a nonparametric test is designed to 1) determine if a certain distribution differs from some predetermined theoretical distribution, 2) in testing hypotheses concerning the significances of the differences of the responses of two or more groups to a stimulus of one type or another, and 3) in testing a goodness of fit. See William
explain and describe how the data for the study were analyzed in the aggregate and to answer the 7 stated research questions, the analysis was subdivided into four sections.

The first section of the analysis describes the response rates of both the mailed questionnaires and the number of institutions that participated in the selected follow-up interviews. These data are explained and reported in the form of frequencies and percentages.

The second section of the analysis describes in the aggregate the demographic profile of the chief executive administrators of public black colleges and selected characteristics of their institutions. These data are ordinal in nature and were analyzed using the descriptive statistics of frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, and percentages. The characteristics described were obtained from Part I of both the presidents' and vice-presidents' questionnaires. These data are presented in the form of tables and written explanations.


Correlations were computed to ascertain the significance and non-significance of the interrelatedness of the instrument's substantive questions. These correlations were also used to assist in organizing the data for explanation within the analytical framework.
The third section utilizes the analytical framework to describe the perceptions of the chief executive administrators with respect to what their impact has been and what it is now on the formulation of university policy in general and policy that relates to desegregation in particular. In addition, this section also describes the extent to which the chief executives have been supported in their efforts and what other university constituents they view as being significant within their institution's policy-making process. This section contains both ordinal and nominal data, discontinuously scaled, which were analyzed through the use of frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, percentages, and the nonparametric measure of $X^2$. These data are presented in the form of tables and written explanations.

In addition, the third section of the analysis also considers the results and findings in relation to the specific research questions. This consideration is presented in tabular form and written explanations. The results and findings with respect to the research questions were also organized for presentation by using the analytical framework developed by Easton for further explanation and interpretation.\(^{25}\)

\(^{25}\)See again pp. 53-54 of Chapter II.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Chapter IV is divided into three sections. The first section describes the response rate for the mailed questionnaires and the institutions visited in the selected follow-up interviews. The second section presents a demographic profile of the respondents who participated in the study and some selective characteristics about their institutions.

The third section analyzes the data gathered in terms of the analytical framework discussed in Chapter II. In this regard, data are presented that relate to the seven research questions and which are also designed to describe the effects of desegregation upon public black colleges both prior to the 1972 Adams v. Richardson decision and afterwards. In order to enhance the discussion in this section, the data are presented in tabular form.

Again, the principal function of the analytical framework utilized here was to provide an effective mechanism for examining and explained the chief executive administrators' perceptions of the effects of desegregation demands on their
institutions.

The Response Rate

Of the 68 total questionnaires mailed, 41 were completed and returned for a total response rate of 60.2%. All 41 of the returned questionnaires were used in the computation of the results.¹

Twenty of the 34 presidents completed the questionnaire, for a response rate of 58.5%. At the time the study was being conducted three of the institutions in the survey were without presidents,² and one president formally declined to participate in the study.³ In addition, two other presidents, both at public black colleges that are entirely desegregated,⁴ did not respond. Thus, if these non-respondents are taken into account, the response rate for the presidents is 68.9% (or 20 of 28 presidents).

Of the 34 vice-presidents who were mailed questionnaires, 21 (or 61.1%) completed and returned them. However, _———_

¹Five of the 41 questionnaires were collected by the researcher at the conclusion of the follow-up interview.²

²Norfolk State University, Langston University, and Virginia State University.

³This respondent's institution was located on the Eastern Seaboard.

⁴Both of these institutions, for example, have full-time white student enrollments of more than 50% and administrations that are integrated. See _A Factbook_.
as in the case of the presidents, no responses were received from the vice-presidents for academic affairs in the two institutions that were considered desegregated. A revision of the computation, then, shows that 21 of 32 of the vice-presidents completed and returned their questionnaires, for a total response of 64%. Thus, although questionnaires were mailed to the chief executives of 34 institutions, only 32 institutions were actually used in tabulating the total response for the chief executive administrators.  

The revised response rate computation indicates that 28 colleges had both presidents and vice-presidents available to respond. Of that number, the president and vice-president of 15 institutions completed and returned instruments for an institutional response rate of 53.5%.

The chief executive administrators who participated in the study represent 26 of the original 34 public black colleges (or 76.4%) included in this study. Because the final response rate was computed on the basis of a revised list of 32 institutions, 81.2% of the public black colleges facing the effects of the demands for desegregation are represented in this study.

---

5 Please see the previous page

6 These 26 institutions are located in 16 states, and had it not been for the exclusion of Lincoln University of Missouri and West Virginia State College, all states having public black colleges would have been represented except
One other point about the study's response rate concerns the respondents in the follow-up interviews. The respondents who participated in the interview phase of the study represented seven institutions (or 21.8% of the total) located in five states or 29.4% of the total states represented.

Because of the relatively high rate of response to the survey, and since the known population of public black colleges was surveyed, the 41 responses were considered as representing collectively the sum perceptions of public black college chief executive administrators. Where it was appropriate, however, the aggregate responses of both presidents and vice-presidents were considered separately.

Demographic Profile of the Chief Executive Administrators and Selected Characteristics of Their Institutions

The demographic data were computed from Part I of the mailed questionnaires received from both the presidents and vice-presidents for academic affairs (N = 41). The average

Oklahoma. Oklahoma, the only state not represented in the survey of public black colleges, enjoys a common bond with the states that are represented, as it was one of the ten states named in the Adams' decision for non-compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The other nine states represented in this study are Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Thus, this study generalized to those institutions where no response was received.

7For the questions that were asked by Part I of the presidents' and vice-presidents' questionnaire see Appendix C.
age of the respondents was between 50 and 59. Six (or 15%) of the total indicated that they were over 60 years of age. All 41 respondents noted they were black; and with the exception of one executive, \(^8\) all respondents were male. Twenty-five (or 65%) of the respondents reported their highest academic degree was the Ph.D.

Most of the respondents had been in their present position for an average of 6 years (median = 5.2 years). \(^9\) Eleven of the respondents (or 26.8%) indicated they had held their present position for three years or less. Most of these 11 respondents indicated on their questionnaires that they were unable to respond to some of the questions that requested information based on pre-1972 information because they were not in their present positions during that time. This point is important because many of the questions in Part II (and question 13 for the presidents in Part I) were designed to collect data that would describe what the effects of desegregation were before the Adams v. Richardson decision of 1972 as well as what the effects are perceived to be now.

Table I indicates that 37 (or 90.2%) of the respondents said they had graduated from traditionally black undergraduate

\(^8\) The one female respondent was a vice-president for academic affairs.

\(^9\) The range was 37 years, from 1 to 38.
Table 1

UNDERGRADUATE ALMA MATERS OF THE RESPONDENTS
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF COLLEGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public black college</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private black college</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

institutions. Four (or 9.8%) of the chief executives responded they had graduated from predominantly white undergraduate colleges. Thirty-one (or 75.6%) of the respondents said their previous academic positions, whether the same or not, had been in black colleges. Six (or 31.6%) of the presidents indicated that they had also served as presidents of other black colleges, while four (or 22.2%) of the vice-presidents indicated that they had once served in their same position at other black colleges. While not true for all, it seems that the career patterns of many of the chief executives were largely confined to black institutions of higher education. In one sense this is a strength, as one can infer that these executives have had a great deal of experience with defining and solving problems in the black college setting. However, it is also a weakness as their
almost total immersion within black colleges can color their views and perceptions of the relationship of their institution to other kinds of higher education. Of the 31, 26 (or 63.4%) had held their prior academic positions in public black colleges.\textsuperscript{10}

The 26 institutions in the survey represent some of the largest of the public black colleges and some of the smallest. The combined enrollment of these 26 institutions is 99,346 accounting for over 75% of the total number of students in public black colleges.\textsuperscript{11}

The 26 institutions represented in the survey reflect the diversity of institutional purposes among public black colleges. For example, some of the institutions are teacher training institutions and some are liberal arts oriented.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10}In addition, of the 20 vice-presidents who responded to whether they also taught in their present institutions, 12 (or 60%) said yes. Because of this, one may assume that most of the vice-presidents are in relatively close contact with the faculty and students of their institutions. That most respondents suggested they had spent a great deal of time within public black colleges was important, since the implication was the respondents were very knowledgeable about the past and current status of their institutions.

\textsuperscript{11}The median enrollment of the 26 institutions was 3,450 students. See Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{12}In the follow-up interview held at one of the institutions, the respondent emphasized that it was the first public black college founded specifically to teach the liberal arts.
Still others are considered quite comprehensive for their size, as they offered a wide variety of academic programs. There are institutions represented that continue to carry the land-grant function given them by the 1890 Morrill Land Grant Act, as well as an institution which grants the doctorate.  

In order to ascertain what some of the more "visible" effects of desegregation have been within their institutions, the presidents were asked to indicate if their colleges had experienced significant changes in the racial composition of its constituents (students, faculty, other administrators and staff). As Table 2 indicates, most of the presidents suggest that on the average the racial composition within their institutions had changed very little, particularly with regard to the enrollment of white students. The presidents did suggest, however, that they were now losing more black faculty and staff than before.

---


14 See Question 13 in Part I of the presidents' questionnaire in Appendix C. The question solicited data on the situation both before and after 1972.

15 The presidents' perceptions strongly support the findings of The Southern Regional Education Board in The White Student at the Black College which says it has been difficult for black colleges to attract white students.
### Table 2

**THE VISIBLE EFFECTS OF DESEGREGATION UPON PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR PRESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION CONSTITUENT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  S  F</td>
<td>M  S  F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>5  3  10</td>
<td>27.8 16.7 55.6 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1  3  14</td>
<td>5.6 16.7 77.8 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>0  7  11</td>
<td>0 38.9 61.1 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2  9  7</td>
<td>11.1 50.0 38.9 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1  6  10</td>
<td>5.9 35.3 58.8 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>3  8  6</td>
<td>17.6 47.1 35.3 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>5  4  9</td>
<td>27.8 22.2 50.0 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>2  1  15</td>
<td>11.1 5.6 83.3 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>0  8  10</td>
<td>0 44.4 55.6 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1  5  12</td>
<td>5.6 27.8 66.7 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>3  14  0</td>
<td>17.6 82.4 0 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>1  11  4</td>
<td>6.3 68.8 25 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Cabinet</strong> (Vice Pres. etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1  10  7</td>
<td>5.6 55.6 38.9 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>2  8  8</td>
<td>11.1 44.4 44.4 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>1  10  4</td>
<td>6.7 66.7 26.7 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> (e.g., Registrar, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2  7  9</td>
<td>11.1 38.9 50.0 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>2  1  15</td>
<td>11.1 5.6 83.3 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td>3  8  4</td>
<td>20.0 53.9 26.7 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M = more; S = about the same; F = fewer; N = total number of presidents who responded*
the Adams decision was rendered in 1972. Failure to retain black faculty and staff as well as the inability to retain more black and white students can be viewed as one of the more "visible" effects of the demands for desegregation on public black colleges.

In response to questions about their institutions' boards, the presidents noted that the average number of persons serving on their state boards was 16 (median = 13.5). The average number of blacks serving on the board was 3.5 (median = 2.8) or 21.2% of the average state board's membership (N = 18). Insofar as black representation on the institutional (local) boards of those colleges that have them, the presidents of these institutions reported that more blacks served on these boards than on the state boards (see Table 3). Moreover, black members of institutional boards tended to have longer terms than the terms of other state board members (21.1 years to 7 years respectively). These points suggest that public black colleges having institutional boards as well as a state board may have a greater

\[\text{Table 2 represents only 18 (or 56.2%) of the institutions in the survey because only the presidents were asked this particular question (N = 20). The data support current studies which demonstrate that since the mid 1960's black colleges in general have been losing black faculty and students to predominantly white colleges. See again Bowles and DeCosta, Between Two Worlds; William Moore and Lonnie Wagstaff, Black Educators in White Colleges (San Francisco: Joseey-Bass, 1974); and McGrath, In Transition.}\]
Table 3\textsuperscript{17}

BLACK REPRESENTATION ON INSTITUTIONAL BOARDS
(N = 9)

| Size of Institutional Board | Median = 13.25 | Range = 21 from 9 to 30 |
| Number of Blacks            | Median = 6.25  | Range = 13 from 1 to 14 |

These points suggest that public black colleges having institutional boards as well as a state board may have a greater voice in influencing their "local" boards than in those of their state boards.\textsuperscript{18}

The Setting Reintroduced

As the literature and public record indicate, public black colleges have historically been influenced by the

\textsuperscript{17} These data apply only to those presidents who indicated that, in addition to having a state governing board (e.g., state board of trustees), their colleges also had their own board; 9 of 18 presidents who considered this question responded that their institutions had such boards.

\textsuperscript{18} Several of the interviews took place at institutions which had both boards. One of the positive aspects of desegregation demands indicated the interviewees had been their success in making their "local" board more "representative" and responsive to the needs of their institutions. This was accomplished, they argued, by more blacks being placed on the board. The same respondents also noted they were beginning to have the same kind of success with their state boards, thereby increasing their input at another level in the making of policy for their institutions.
actions and decisions (output) of the authorities (federal and state) in the political system. Most of this influence can be attributed to the enormous amount of control which these authorities have exercised, particularly in the allocation of scarce resources (e.g., "dollars" and political support) over these institutions. In many respects the exercise of this control not only determined whether public black colleges survived, but also whether they were permitted to survive. Thus, these institutions early on became very dependent upon the authorities of the political system, as well as their colleagues in the intra-societal environment (e.g., philanthropy and corporate support) for survival, and as a consequence could ill afford to deny requests or demands imposed by them.

The fact the authorities of the political system have been able to exercise over these institutions is evident most recently in the public black colleges' responses to the demands of the political system requiring them to develop a policy (output) to comply with the desegregation mandates. Indeed, the study of this example further emphasizes the dependency of these institutions upon the demands and constraints imposed by the political system.

As Chapter II suggested, some explanation of the effects of the demands of desegregation upon public black colleges may be accomplished through the collection of the perceptions of their chief executive administrators who,
reputedly, argue that they do represent the views of their institution. Thus, this study sought to examine the perceptions of the chief executive administrators in order to determine the response of these institutions to the desegregation mandate.

The data analyzed in the succeeding sections were obtained from the responses to items in Part II of the survey instrument and from the persons interviewed later in the study. Both chief executives responded to survey items designed to obtain data which would describe and explain, before and after the Adams' decision, the perceived effects of the demands for desegregation upon public black colleges.

Inputs

The findings for this section focus on the external demands and supports which public black colleges have received from the political system relative to the mandate for desegregation. Simply stated: "Do the chief executive administrators perceive, as one of the effects of desegregation

19 The reader is reminded that the questions asked in the interviews closely followed the questions asked in the mailed instrument. The researcher did, however, vary some of the questions in order to permit the respondent to provide greater detail and to elaborate....In addition, some questions were also asked to permit the researcher to explore areas not covered by the survey instrument.
demands, pressures (e.g., political) from the federal level for desegregating their institutions more than pressures emanating from the state level?" (Research Question 1)

A key question of the questionnaire asked whether or not public black colleges had developed outputs (policies) directed towards the alleviation of stress caused by the demands for desegregation. Table 4 indicates that although 70% of the respondents noted their institutions had had policies on desegregation, 30% indicated they had not made internal efforts to formulate such policies. Since the Adams decision, 81.1% of the respondents (an increase of 11.1%) noted their institutions were making efforts to formulate policies to relieve the stress of desegregation demands.

Most (54.9%) of the respondents indicated that the input of the federal authorities (D-HEW, Federal Courts) had been a significant factor in influencing their institutions to initiate and develop policies on desegregation. Thus confirming that the federal government ever since the Brown case has been the main authority in motivating educational institutions to desegregate.

However, only 35.5% of the respondents thought the input of state authorities (state board, legislature, etc.)

\[20\] This increase was largely attributed to the effects of responding to the Adams decision.
Table 4

EFFORTS MADE BY PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES TO FORMULATE DESEGREGATION POLICIES
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFORTS TO FORMULATE POLICY</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = total number of presidents and vice-presidents who responded
had been an influential factor. A few respondents (9.7%) noted that because their colleges had historically maintained and supported a commitment to equal educational opportunity by encouraging the enrollment of white students and the employment of non-black faculty, there was no need to develop a specific policy for institutional desegregation, since they have not considered themselves threatened by the desegregation demands that many other public black colleges faced.

In addition to being asked whether or not the federal and state authorities had been important factors in influencing the development of their institutions' desegregation policy, the respondents were asked to indicate what had been the relative effects of each authority's demand on the institution's attempt to convert the mandate of desegregation into an outcome. The respondents who had local boards were also asked to indicate the effect of that board's input in influencing the development of their institutions' desegregation policies. The responses of the chief executives, relative to before and since 1972 are presented in Table 5.

When asked to specify which authority input has had the most effect in getting their institutions to devise desegregation policies both before 1972 and now, the chief executives responded as shown in Table 6. Based upon their response as seen in Table 6, the authority having had the most effect when compared with the effect of state and local
### Table 5

**THE EFFECT OF THE AUTHORITIES IN GETTING PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES TO DEVISE DESEGREGATION POLICIES**

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of the Authority Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor and State Agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Effect of the Authority Post-1972 |             |             |                 |          |
| Federal Authorities (HEW, etc.) | 3   | 7.5  | 5   | 12.5 | 4   | 10.0 | 28  | 70.0 | 40 |
| State Board         | 4   | 10.3 | 7   | 17.9 | 5   | 12.8 | 23  | 59.0 | 39 |
| State Legislature   | 7   | 17.9 | 13  | 33.3 | 8   | 20.5 | 11  | 28.2 | 39 |
| State Governor and State Agencies | 6   | 15.9 | 14  | 35.9 | 8   | 20.9 | 11  | 28.2 | 39 |
| Local Board (if it applies) | 5   | 26.3 | 6   | 31.6 | 8   | 42.1 |     |      | 19 |

F = Frequency  

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
### Table 6

**AUTHORITIES WHO HAVE HAD THE MOST EFFECT ON THE FORMULATION OF DESEGREGATION POLICIES AT PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES**

*(N = 41)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect Pre-1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor and State Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>n = 37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Effect Post-1972**                            |           |          |
| Federal Authorities (HEW, etc.)                 | 24        | 64.9     |
| State Board                                     | 5         | 13.5     |
| State Legislature                               | 4         | 10.8     |
| State Governor and State Agencies               | 3         | 8.1      |
| Local Board                                     | 1         | 2.7      |
| **TOTALS**                                      | n = 37    | 100.0    |

*n* = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
authorities both before the Adams decision and since then has been the federal government. Asked to explain why the federal authorities have had the most effect in getting their institutions to devise desegregation policies, the respondents (30, or 73.3%) said that federal authorities (especially D-HEW) have the power to regulate and to even terminate federal funds if desegregation efforts are not developed and implemented by the appropriate institutional and state authorities. (The state authorities were charged after Adams with the development of specific plans to implement desegregation within their state systems of higher education.)

As Table 5 indicates, the effect of the federal authorities' input upon the internal institutional conversion processes was greater than the input provided by the state authorities. A closer examination of Table 5 reveals that the state board, has had considerable effect ("moderate" to "very much") in influencing public black colleges to implement board policy on desegregation. The same examination suggests that, for those institutions which had local boards, they too have had considerable effect in influencing desegregation policy.

After the Adams decision the respondents indicated the amount of effect from the input of federal authorities increased considerably. For example, the effect of the input of federal authorities rose from 43.2% for "very much"
effect before 1972 to 70% "very much" effect since 1972, an increase of 26.8%. This increase was largely attributable, of course, to D-HEW being ordered by the federal government in *Adams* to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits federal funds from being used in segregated institutions.

State authorities also increased their effects on the public black colleges' conversion processes during this time. Most of this increase was due to the states' response to the *Adams* decision. Several of the interviewees, for example, explained that the *Adams* decision had led their state governors and legislatures to a rediscovery of their institutions. In all 5 states where interviews were conducted, the executives perceived their state governor had a high influence on public higher education. One respondent even suggested that the governor of the state was "preoccupied too much with public higher education" and was being perceived by the constituents of the respondent's institution as a nuisance beyond control.

Those chief executives who indicated their institutions had local boards, noted their effect upon desegregation policy was greater now than before 1972. One of the interviewees attributed the increase to the addition of more black board members. He further explained that the addition of more blacks to the board had been very effective in making the local board give attention to the concerns of the
institution as they face desegregation issues.

Therefore, the external inputs which public black colleges have received relative to the mandate for desegregation have been stimulated by the Adams decision. The respondents explained their decisions on desegregation had been most influenced by the federal authorities (primarily D-HEW) and by their state boards. Because of the power of this influence, public black colleges have historically directed feedback to these authorities of the political system on outputs regarding desegregation as well as on other issues. For it is these authorities who make the ultimate policy decisions on issues like desegregation.

**Withinputs**

Although desegregation policies within public black colleges have been greatly influenced by the external inputs of the authorities of the political system, the inputs within these institutions, or "withinputs," have also played an important role in the conversion processes related to desegregation. For, when the external demands for desegregation permeate the institution, they in turn stimulate the internal feedback transmission of inputs between the component parts within the institution (e.g., the campus constituency and the chief executives) that become converted into institutional output (or responses) which then are transmitted vis-a-vis the feedback loop as new inputs to
the authorities of the political system for their conversion into new outputs. Therefore, because public black colleges are subsystems of the political system, one can expect the conversion processes of both to be similar. The most significant similarity between the conversion processes of the political system and the public black colleges has been the dependency of each upon the authorities. As the public black college has been dependent upon the authorities (federal and state) of the political system, so, too, within public black colleges, the constituents (i.e., faculty, students, etc.) have been dependent upon the authorities (the chief executive administrators), especially with regard to the formulation and implementation of desegregation policies. 21

To establish whether or not the respondents perceived themselves as the authorities within their institutions, the respondents were asked to indicate how much effect they have when their decisions and actions (output) are accepted and supported by the institution's on campus constituents. Most

21 See again Chapter II where the literature suggests that because the chief executives are empowered by the authorities of the political system (in this case, the state board) to allocate the scarce resources (i.e., money, promotion, etc.) within the institution, the tendency has been to view these executives as either autocratic or very authoritarian. See too LeMelle, A Strategy for Relevancy.
of the respondents (authorities) indicated they have had "very much" effect on the allocation of resources and the formulation and implementation of university policy, both in general (e.g., budget, academic administration) and with respect to desegregation policies. (See Table 7)

In general, Table 7 indicates the presidents perceived themselves to have more effect with respect to their input in the overall policy-making process than do the vice-presidents. This finding, however, is not unique because the presidents of most academic institutions, whether black or white, have generally been recognized as the primary authority within the institution. Thus, it was expected that the presidents in this study were likely to perceive themselves as having more effect on the policy-making process within their institutions than other university constituents, especially since presidents are empowered by the political system's authorities (i.e., state board) to control the allocation of critical scarce resources within their institutions.

---

22 It ought to be clarified that effect is an outcome that is traceable to an input. Thus, the amount of effect is directly related to the amount of input. As input rises, the more likely it is for the impact of the effect to increase as well.

23 See again Chapter II
Table 7

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES AS TO HOW MUCH EFFECT THEY HAVE ON THE POLICY-MAKING WHEN COMPARED WITH OTHER UNIVERSITY CONSTITUENTS

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Effects on Overall Policy-Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Presidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Pre-1972 Effect on Desegregation Policies** |             |             |                 |           |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Presidents              | 1           | 5.9         | 4               | 23.5      | 12  | 70.6| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 |
| Vice-Presidents         | 5           | 29.4        | 6               | 35.3      | 6   | 35.3| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 |

| **Post-1972 Effect on Desegregation Policies** |             |             |                 |           |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Presidents              | 1           | 5.9         | 7               | 41.2      | 9   | 52.9| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 | 100| 17 |
| Vice-Presidents         | 3           | 14.3        | 7               | 33.3      | 11  | 55.0| 21 | 100| 21 | 100| 21 | 100| 21 |

F = Frequency

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
With respect to the amount of effect which presidents and vice-presidents have had on the conversion of inputs within the institution to outputs (policies) on desegregation both before 1972 and since 1972, Table 7 shows that presidents have had more input in this area, too. Both presidents and vice-presidents, though, reiterated their impact on policy-making with respect to desegregation tended to be greater than other university constituents because: 1) as the authorities within their institutions, they assume the leadership roles in responding to other inputs and in stimulating the creation of new inputs, and 2) the formal operation of the conversion processes (the transmission of inputs into political issues for resolution) that culminate in internal decisions begins and ends with them.24

Both presidents and vice-presidents were also asked to indicate what has been the relative impact of the effect of input from their institution's constituency (other administrators, faculty, students, etc.) on the formulation of policy in general and with respect to desegregation.25 (See Table 8)

--------

24 Most of the presidents and vice-presidents (54.5%) listed direct leadership as their explanation while 42.4% listed dependence upon the formal operation of decision-making processes.

25 See Questions 9, 10, 11 on both instruments in Appendix C.
Table 8
THE AMOUNT OF EFFECT THAT GENERAL UNIVERSITY CONSTITUENTS HAVE HAD AS A GROUP ON THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS OF PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Post-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Frequency
n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded to each category
The respondents noted, in comparing the relative impact of inputs their campus constituents have had as groups, that other administrators (line and staff) and faculty appear to have had more effect than students, parents, and alumni. When the perceptions of both presidents and vice-presidents were examined, however, there were at least two different opinions about the relative impact of campus constituents input to the policy-making process.

Although not depicted in Table 8, the presidents and vice-presidents expressed somewhat different opinions over the relative effects of the inputs of students and parents in various areas of the policy-making process. With respect to the effect of the input of students as a group within the institution, 77.8% of the presidents (N = 18) perceived student input has been very influential. The vice-presidents, on the other hand, are less convinced students make a difference since only 52.4% (N = 21) indicated student inputs had been important.

To examine such differences more closely, some $X^2$'s were computed. In this case, the results indicate that reliance upon these statistics should, however, be approached cautiously. Even though a difference does exist, the direction of response was the same and the magnitude of difference was not that great.

The chief executives explained in the interviews that students as a group tend to make more demands (e.g., better living facilities, food, and parking) than other groups within the institution. Moreover, they noted most student demands are brought to the attention of the president rather
The respondents, as Table 8 indicates, did agree, with respect to the relative effect of the input of general university groups on the formulation of policy in general and on desegregation in particular, that other administrators (line and staff) and faculty have had the most effect. This perception, no doubt, can be largely attributed to the fact that public black colleges are very formal organizations. As a result, where policy is concerned, the "rules of the game," insist inputs be communicated to the authorities via established channels or within the formal chain of command. For example, students often communicate their input to faculty, who in turn communicate it to lower echelon administrators, who in turn relay it to the chief executives. Because these channels have been more or less recognized as part of the "rules of the game" under which the withinputs of students are transmitted to the authorities, it is appropriate to assume the university groups which would have the greatest access to the channels of communication within the institution would be other administrators and faculty.

Although the data up to this point established the chief executives as the authorities within public black
colleges, it did not assess the amount of support and backing chief executives received from constituencies within their institutions on decisions relative to desegregation. The next question needed to be addressed, then, was "Do the chief executive administrators perceive most of their support and backing for their decisions on desegregation policies for the institution to come more from other administrators and faculty than from students, parents, and alumni" (research question 2)?

The findings for this question are presented in Table 9. As the reader will note, these findings focus on the withinputs that deal specifically with the supports given to chief executives by the constituents of the institution, especially as it affects the conversion processes within the institution.

The data in Table 9 show other administrators (line and staff) as a general university group have given the chief executives the most support and backing (94.7%). In general faculty, students, parents, and alumni groups have also been moderately to very supportive. However, of these groups, 54.6% of the respondents perceived that faculty had given

The interviews revealed that in general parents have supported the public black college both materially and symbolically. The respondents related that the symbolic support of parents had been most important, since parents have respected the legitimate authority of the respondents to make the decision that determine the internal policies of the institution.
Table 9
THE SUPPORT AND BACKING OF GENERAL UNIVERSITY CONSTITUENTS
OF THE DECISIONS MADE BY THE RESPONDENTS
(N = 41)

Response Categories | None at all | Very Little | Moderate Amount | Very Much | n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support and Backing Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Backing on Pre-1972 Desegregation Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Backing on Post-1972 Desegregation Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Frequency
n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded to each category
the most support and backing for their policy-making decisions on university policies in general.

Presidents and vice-presidents, however, disagreed in their perception of the amount of support by parents for their decisions. The presidents (or 58.8%, N = 17) indicated that in general, parents of students have been very supportive of their decisions relating to university policies. On the other hand, only 28.8% (N = 18) of the vice-presidents perceived parents to be supportive of their decisions. This was probably attributed to the fact that parents of students have been more prone to communicate their support to the academic head rather than to perceived lower-level executives.

Before the Adams v. Richardson (1972) decision, 84.4% of the respondents explained other administrators (line and staff) had been their greatest supporters within the institution. Other constituent groups were also perceived to be very supportive for that period, though parents were perceived to be less supportive than faculty, students, and alumni. Perhaps the perceived lack of support of parents by the chief executives can be attributed to parents’ not having been directly affected by the stress caused by desegregation demands.

Since the Adams decision, 88.6% of the respondents indicated most of their support on decisions relating to desegregation with the institution had come from other
administrators (line and staff). Sixty per cent of the faculty have also been very supportive of the respondents' decisions, while the perceived amount of "very much" support of students had declined by 4.3% from the pre-1972 era. Alumni and parents continued to provide the chief executive with moderate to a great deal of support and backing for his decisions on desegregation. The interviewees, for example, praised the support and backing of their alumni and parent groups. They attributed this to the fact that many of their alumni have children now attending their alma maters.

In addition to the withinputs (supports and demands) that have been transmitted to the authorities within public black colleges in relation to desegregation, the authorities have also received withinputs from on-campus interest organizations (i.e., Faculty Senate and Student Government Association, etc.) and from off-campus interest organizations and civic groups.29 Because of the importance of these groups, one of the research questions addressed "what has been the relative effect of on-campus and off-campus interest organizations upon the policy-making processes with public black colleges?" Another part of the same question

29 Though off-campus interest organizations are located in the adjacent intra-societal environment, their intense interest in the welfare of public black colleges justifies their consideration here as interest organizations that have had an effect on the development of desegregation policies within public black colleges.
asked, "which interest organization had had the most effect on the decisions made within the institution relative to desegregation." (Research question 3).

The findings for these questions focused on the relative effect of the inputs on the conversion processes of public black colleges that have been transmitted by interest organizations within the institution and by interests in the adjacent intra-societal environment. The assumption was made, in the examination of these questions, that both interests felt threatened by the demands for desegregation.

Table 10 indicates, in general, that the input of off-campus interest groups had only a moderate amount of effect on the policy-making process in public black colleges before 1972. The chief executives indicated, though, that the input of off-campus interest groups such as black civil rights organizations (e.g., NAACP, SCLC, PUSH) and black state political organizations (e.g., Black Tennesseans for Higher Education) has had more effect in influencing the policies of public black colleges that relate to desegregation and its implementation, than have local and civic groups.30

Since 1972, however, the respondents note that, in

30 However, one of the interviewees noted most of the off-campus groups have traditionally devoted their efforts and energies in the field of public school desegregation and discrimination in public accommodations. Moreover, he added these efforts had always been supported by public black colleges.
Table 10

THE PERCEIVED EFFECT OF OFF-CAMPUS INTEREST GROUPS

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Org. (e.g., NAACP, PUSH)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black State Political Org.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Civic/Social Org.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Org. (e.g., NAACP, PUSH)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black State Political Org.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Civic/Social Org.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Frequency

n = total number of presidents and vice-presidents who responded to each category
general, off-campus organizations increased the amount of their input in influencing the development of desegregation policies at public black colleges. The greatest increase since 1972, indicated the respondents, came from Black Civil Rights Organizations (NAACP, SCLS, PUSH, etc.). The amount of their effect increased by 9.4%.

When asked to explain how these off-campus organizations had made their effect felt, 83.3% of the chief executives said it had been by direct participation, even though they had not requested it. The participation of off-campus groups in the internal conversion process on desegregation has been mainly in assisting these institutions to deal with the external political pressures that arise because of desegregation. Another group of respondents (or 16.7%) explained that off-campus had not played a direct part in their institution's policy-making process on desegregation; rather, their input had been in the form of monitoring and assessing the mood of other members of the intra-societal

31 The chief executives interviewed at two of the institutions surveyed explained that, because of the present threat to the survival of their institutions, the NAACP has come out stronger than ever in support of their institutions. One of the respondents did express serious reservation about the effect of the NAACP support because in his state this organization has always stood for total integration of all public institutions, even if it means the closing of black institutions to achieve it!
environment (i.e., the "power structure of the institution's community and its relationship to the state authorities) on the impact of the national and state mandates to desegregate.32

When compared with the amount of effect which the input of off-campus organizations had on the formulation of desegregation policies before 1972, the input of on-campus interest organizations (i.e., faculty senate and student government association) was perceived by the respondents to have had the most effect. No doubt this had been because traditionally on-campus input has been given priority over the input of off-campus groups. If the comparison is drawn between the two interest organizations (see Tables 10 and 11), a review of their relative effect on the formulation of desegregation policy before 1972 portrays the supports and demands (inputs) made by on-campus organizations as having more effect.33

32Since the Adams decision, more off-campus organizations, especially newly formed black state political groups, have mobilized support on behalf of the public black college. The Southern Education Foundation in its 1974 report Ending Discrimination maintains that the work of these organizations have been important resources of support for public black colleges. (pp. 18-20)

33See Appendix C and refer to question 18 in Part II of the survey instruments. Also note question 18 differed from questions 16 and 17, thus the difference in tabular presentation.
Table 11.34
THE EFFECT OF ON-CAMPUS INTEREST ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PAST
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Effect Pre-1972</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded

Since on-campus interest organizations are within the institution, they are better able to influence the policy-making process than off-campus interests because their demands and supports are viewed by the chief executives as part of the withinputs of the institution. Thus, they are more likely to receive greater attention than inputs coming from interests outside of the institution.
The respondents (N = 28) listed the following on-campus organizations (in Table 12) when asked to name the organization that had had the most effect on their desegregation policies in the past. The on-campus interest organizations whose input has had the most effect prior to 1972 and since 1972 have been faculty and student government groups (over 60% of the respondents noted this). Although public black colleges have long been centers of fermentation for social movements, the respondents suggest student activist groups have not had as much effect on the desegregation policies in public black colleges as one might expect. The effect of the demands and supports of on-campus organizations is now considered to be from moderate to very much.

Therefore, while all of the campus constituents both within and adjacent to the institution have transmitted their withinputs to the internal authorities, the withinputs having the most overall effect with respect to the internal conversion processes desegregation policies has been within the institution. Within the institution the authorities seem to react more to the input of other administrators, 

---

35This supports the interviewees' contention that students are inclined to work within (or support) the traditional policy-making processes. There are, as one of the executives pointed out, that fringe who persist "operating" outside of the process. This has often lead to violent confrontations which have produced few positive results.
Table 12
ON-CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS HAVING THE MOST EFFECT IN THE PAST AND THEIR RELATIVE EFFECT ON THE DESEGREGATION POLICIES OF PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES NOW

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Campus Organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty Senate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Government Assn.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Both 1 and 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Activist Groups and Greeks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Campus Effect (see the org. Post 1972 above)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
faculty, and on-campus interest groups than other constituents that relate to desegregation. These groups also served as the authorities' primary sources of feedback.

Since 1972, however, off-campus groups have been able to make the effect of their input felt within the institution, thereby suggesting that this part of the intra-societal environment is seeking a greater voice in the conversion processes of the institution in an attempt to have their feedback acted upon.

Outcomes

As a direct result of the external demands precipitated by desegregation, one of the outcomes experienced within the public black college has been the implementation of affirmative action programs designed to help the institutions achieve integration. The impact of affirmative action has received the same amount of concern as desegregation itself. Thus, the focus here now turns to whether or not the chief executive administrators perceive the concept and effects of affirmative action as being of greater concern to their institution than desegregation itself (Research question 4).  

At this juncture, it is important to reemphasize that Easton's analysis views an issue (i.e., affirmative action) as being a demand members of a political system (e.g., public black colleges) are prepared to deal with as a significant item for discussion vis-a-vis system channels. See again Easton, A Framework.
The findings of the fourth research question were divided into two segments. The first segment examined what had been the relative impact of affirmative action within public black colleges as they deal with the more pressing mandate to desegregate. The second segment considered whether or not affirmative action was a significant issue among the constituents of these institutions.

Most of the respondents, as Table 13 shows, generally agreed meeting the demands of affirmative action has been viewed within their institutions as important as responding to the demands for desegregation. Before 1972 only 33.3% of the respondents felt that way.37

In terms of whether affirmative action was considered a key issue by the constituents of public black colleges, the respondents report that it was. According to most of the respondents (N = 34), their faculties are concerned about the role affirmative action will play in the formulation of policies on desegregation. Much of the concern expressed by faculty (black faculty), noted the respondents, relates to the threat which desegregation poses to job

37Before the Adams decision the thrust of affirmative action was directed almost entirely at predominantly white institutions and black colleges perhaps felt that it did not really apply to them. Since 1972, however, affirmative action programs have been successfully implemented in black colleges in order to hire whites as well as women.
Table 13
THE EXTENT TO WHICH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IS BEING VIEWED AS IMPORTANT AS DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES
(N = 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent Pre-1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent Post-1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
security. Because of these concerns, one of the respondents explained his administration has refused to provide persons with data on race unless it is authorized. When asked why the issue was considered serious, the executive responded the previous release of such data had led to undue intrusion by federal authorities into the internal administration of the institution. In this regard he made specific reference to the HEW teams which had visited the institution and upon completion of their visit, delivered what he felt were biased and inaccurate reports to their superiors as to how the institution was meeting the affirmative action mandate.

Black faculty, explained the respondents, have been especially alarmed over the desire of authorities (federal and state) to use affirmative action as a tool of desegregation, because it encourages whites to compete with blacks for the same positions. This kind of competition, explained the respondents, has placed black faculty at a disadvantage, because the pool of qualified whites has traditionally been larger than the pool of qualified blacks. In addition to the fear of potential competition from qualified whites, some of the interviewees expressed concern that affirmative action was being used by the authorities in order to have them hire unqualified whites, thus sabotaging any plans for faculty development rather than enhancing them.

The problem of meeting the demands for affirmative action led one respondent to lament his institution tenuring
faculty in the 50's and 60's when maybe they should not have. He argued many of these faculty had not completed terminal degrees, nor had they kept up with their respective fields. However, because of their being tenured, he said it would be extremely difficult to retire them despite the pressures of affirmative action and the demands to desegregate.

The outcome of affirmative action applied to public black colleges has increased the skepticism among the campus constituents over the pronouncements of the authorities that implementing desegregation will be beneficial to the institution. Based upon the feedback which has been received from within the institutions by the respondents, the outcome of affirmative action has not been well received.

Another outcome experienced by public black colleges, because of desegregation, has been the increase in the inter-institutional sharing of information on desegregation policies. This finding was arrived at after examining data used to examine the fifth research question. ("Have the effects of desegregation stimulated or prompted the inter-institutional sharing of information on desegregation between the chief executive administrators of public black colleges?")

Table 14 presents the findings to the fifth research question by indicating the extent to which the chief executives of public black colleges perceive not only the importance of inter-institutional sharing of information on
Table 14

EXTENT AND AMOUNT OF EFFECT OF INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATION AMONG PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS ON THEIR INSTITUTION'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to Share Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Sharing Pre-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to Share Post-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Sharing Post-1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
desegregation but its effect on their respective internal conversion processes as well.

Most of the chief executives (or 53.7%) reported they shared information on desegregation with other administrators of public black colleges before 1972. Eleven (or 40%) of the chief executives said they felt inter-institutional communications on desegregation had taken place because it was important to their institution to share this information. Two respondents, both from institutions considered desegregated, indicated they shared because it was important that other public black colleges know about how their institutions were desegregated.

Ten respondents (or 39%) said they shared information on institutional desegregation only for the sake of general knowledge. Four respondents (or 14.8%) indicated they shared information because it was a policy of either their state board or of a interest group association located in the intra-societal environment (e.g., National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges).

Most of the respondents (17, or 68%; N = 25) explained they had shared information on desegregation policies with administrators of other public black colleges before 1972. This had been accomplished by both formal and informal means. Most (or 54.6%) of the respondents regarded the information obtained from this process as helpful in the
construction of their own policies on desegregation.

Since the Adams decision, the respondents note that communication among public black college chief executives has increased. As Table 14 shows, the respondents indicated the sharing of information was up 24.1% over the level shared before 1972.

Although Table 14 does not directly show it, a closer examination of this table reveals most of the sharing of information on desegregation that took place among public black colleges was initiated and conducted by the presidents. For example, on the one hand seventeen (or 94.4%; N = 18) of the presidents indicated they participated in the inter-institutional sharing of information or desegregation policies. However, on the other hand, only 11 (or 61.9%; N = 18) of the vice-presidents indicated they participated in the exchange of information on desegregation. 38

Most of the respondents (or 42.3%) explained they shared information on desegregation for general knowledge (i.e., exchange of information of state plans on desegregation that were filed with D-HEW). Other respondents (or

38 Further explanation of this difference suggests that because of their positions as academic heads, presidents are more likely to control not only the information on their institution's desegregation policies, but they are also more likely to have greater access to the communication network existing between public black colleges.
34.6% indicated they shared information because it was important for public black colleges to communicate with each other. Still another group of respondents (or 15.4%) related they shared information because of a state board or interest group policy that required them to do so. While two respondents indicated they shared information only upon request.

The respondents (72.7%) noted they utilized both informal and formal means as their mode of communicating desegregation information with each other. Although the data in Table 15 suggest a decline in the perceptions of the respondents as to how helpful this sharing of information has been, most of the executives felt it important to continue inter-institutional cooperation.

Most of the interviewees, with the exception of one, felt the increase in inter-institution cooperation a benefit of desegregation, as it has led to the development of a sense of "community" among public black colleges. For example, one of the respondents explained that desegregation had done more to break the "isolationism" of public black colleges than any other event.

The one exception, argued his institution felt no need to share information on desegregation with other public black colleges, because this had been a traditional stance of his institution. For example, he even pointed out that even though his was one of two public black colleges in that
## Table 15

MAJOR ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES BY THEIR CONSTITUENTS BECAUSE OF THE DEMANDS FOR DESEGREGATION

(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Constituents</th>
<th>The Most Important Issues in Order of Importance</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Chief Executives as a Group (Respondents Themselves)</strong></td>
<td>1. How to effectively desegregate without diminishing the heritage of the institution.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How to increase financial support, especially for faculty development and non-black student recruitment.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Whether their institutions will survive as viable institutions of higher education.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the issues listed are important to the chief executives</td>
<td>These issues relate to the survival of the institution and their immediate resolution is critical to that end.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Faculty as a Group</strong></td>
<td>1. Job Security and affirmative action</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How to increase financial support for faculty salaries and academic programs.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Whether whites can relate and adjust to the missions and goals of a traditional black college.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the issues listed are important to the faculty</td>
<td>These issues relate to the survival of the institution and their resolution is important.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Students as a Group</strong></td>
<td>1. Whether their institutions will survive as viable institutions of higher learning.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How to increase the financial support for academic programs and student services.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Constituents</th>
<th>The Most Important Issues in Order of Importance</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Whether whites can relate and adjust to the missions and goals of a traditional black college.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the issues listed are important to students</td>
<td>Students feel that these issues are critical as they relate to the survival of the institution.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Alumni as a Group</td>
<td>1. Whether desegregation is detrimental to the traditional missions and purposes of their institution.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Whether their institution is in fact doomed because of the demands for desegregation.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No Issue Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why the issues listed are important to Alumni</td>
<td>Alumni are most concerned that their institutions continue their existence and the issues above relate to that concern.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state, his college had never tried to share information on
desegregation nor even exchange each other's presidents as
commencement speakers.

When asked to describe the ways in which the sharing of
information on desegregation had been important between in­
stitutions, the respondents' (N = 23) answers tended to fall
into two categories. Some (36.6% of the respondents) ex­
plained they used the information obtained to develop plans
for faculty development and for non-black student recruit­
ment. The other respondents (or 43.9%) felt were not yet
able to determine in what ways, if any, the inter-institu­
tional sharing of information had been important. These
respondents, though, felt the sharing of information should
continue.

Feedback

Internal Feedback

The findings related to the sixth research question
("what major issues have been identified to the chief execu­
tive administrators by campus constituents at public black
colleges as a direct effect of the demands for desegrega­
tion")\textsuperscript{39} constitutes the internal feedback transmitted to

\textsuperscript{39}See Appendix C for Part II of the presidents' ques­
tionnaire, questions 28, 29, 30 and 31; also see Part II of
the vice-presidents' questionnaires, questions 29, 30, 31,
and 32. The frequencies reported indicate the exact number
of times that that response appeared as a choice of the chief
executives.
the chief executives within the institution. Moreover, the findings related to this particular question focus on the process in which internal withinputs are transformed into institutional output.

Data for the sixth research question were sought by asking the respondents to list the issues raised by their constituents because of desegregation. Table 15 presents the findings for that question by placing in the order of highest frequency reported, the issues raised most often by the constituents of public black colleges.40

As Table 15 indicates, the issues identified to the chief executives by their constituents (and by themselves) because of desegregation demands touch on two areas: (1) what happens to public black colleges once desegregation is fully implemented and becomes an outcome; and (2) whether public black colleges will survive at all under the demands to desegregate. There were, though, two other exceptions of concern to the areas mentioned. One of the concerns was expressed by the faculty over the impact of affirmative action. 

---

40 Although the respondents were given an opportunity to list as many as three issues (in their order of importance) and provide an explanation as to why the issues listed were important, many did not list three. There were, however, reported responses that represented at least 38 different chief executives or 87.8% of the total (N = 41), who responded to the instrument.
The other issue, concerned whether or not whites are able to support and relate to the missions and goals of traditional black institutions.

One of the interviewees noted, for example, his institution does not welcome whites, whether qualified or not, who are unconcerned with promoting and supporting the heritage of his institution. Thus, in order to insure some sense of "quality control," this executive said he personally participates in the screening of all white candidates for faculty positions. When asked whether he did the same for white students, he said he did not because the white student coming to his institution wants to come and recognizes the special place which it holds in the higher education of blacks.

It is interesting that several of the interviewees expressed their black faculty and students are also very concerned about the attempts to increase the numbers of whites within their institutions. As one respondent put it, this concern is attributed to the fact that black faculty and students perceive whites are intent on subverting the traditional missions and purposes of black institutions. Moreover, they also fear the drive to attract more whites is part of a larger conspiracy perpetrated by the political system authorities to dissolve public black colleges.

While most of the issues presented in Table 15 seem general in scope, they signify the seriousness of the stress
which has affected the constituents of public black colleges because of desegregation. The presence of this issue, however, has not necessarily prompted the respondents to resolve them with any sense of urgency. History has shown, as evidenced by the literature, that many of the demands which have been brought to the attention of these authorities (chief executives) have either died at birth or lingered on with the support of only an insignificant fraction of the total constituency. Because of this, these demands have never been raised to "the level" where, as issues, they would warrant a decision on the part of the authorities.

External Feedback

Although the seventh research question ("what effects will the demands for desegregation and its implementation have upon the future of public black colleges as perceived by the chief executive administrators?") was speculative in nature, it does relate to the critical feedback which these institutions are transmitting through the environment to the political system's authorities as the demands for

41 The interviewees acknowledged that perhaps the issues raised could go unresolved, but at least for the moment, they insisted that their administrations intended to act on them.

42 This refers to the institutional feedback that is being transmitted to the authorities of the political system.
desegregation become implemented into outcomes.

The communication of this feedback to the authorities of the political system is crucial, for as Easton argues, no system persists for long unless it is able to communicate the inputs of its members to the authorities who govern that system. Thus the findings presented in Table 16 reflect primarily what the respondents feel will be the future inputs (demands and supports) transmitted to the authorities of the political system because of desegregation. Once received, these inputs, or feedback, may, or may not be converted into the policies (output) that will either alter, sustain, or modify the demands for desegregation.\footnote{See again the discussion on how demands become issues that are converted into outputs, Chapter II}

Internal Governance:

As Table 16 shows, the effects of implementing desegregation will have only a moderate impact upon the internal governance of their institutions. The data collected in the interviews indicated that though the chief executives expected some change within their internal administration, they felt that it would only be minor. The interviewed executives felt that most of the changes would occur in the area of fiscal management.
Table 16
THE EFFECTS OF DESEGREGATION UPON THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES IN KEY AREAS OF INSTITUTIONAL LIFE
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution's Internal Governance</td>
<td>2 5.6</td>
<td>7 19.4</td>
<td>17 47.2</td>
<td>10 27.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 8.6</td>
<td>5 14.3</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
<td>14 40.0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>15 42.9</td>
<td>16 45.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td>3 8.3</td>
<td>6 16.7</td>
<td>12 33.3</td>
<td>15 41.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Programs</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>12 34.3</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Relationships (HEW)</td>
<td>3 8.6</td>
<td>6 17.1</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Relationships (Board)</td>
<td>2 6.3</td>
<td>5 15.6</td>
<td>9 28.1</td>
<td>16 50.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td>2 18.2</td>
<td>3 27.3</td>
<td>2 18.2</td>
<td>4 36.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Relations</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>10 29.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support (including Foundation and philanthropy)</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>11 30.6</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>11 30.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Frequency

n = total number of both presidents and vice-presidents who responded
On the other hand, the executives interviewed did not feel the positions they held would be affected either by desegregation or by affirmative action demands. Although one admitted, some of his institution's white faculty had begun to ask to be assigned greater administrative responsibility within the institution, he reaffirmed that the reins of administrative leadership within his institution would not be turned over to whites. Most of the other interviewees express this, too. However, they insisted their institutions would not make specific policies that would exclude whites from administrative posts. At several of the institutions it was pointed out to this researcher that a few whites had been selected for middle management positions (e.g., dean, chairpersons). Their selection, though, had been based strictly on the basis of merit.

Faculty:

The future effects of desegregation will have a greater impact on faculty than on the internal governance of public black colleges. (See again Table 16). Several reasons may account for this, some of which have already been discussed. The impact of affirmative action, for example, will continue to be a sensitive area where key decisions will be made. For not only will public black colleges be under pressure from the authorities of the political system to hire whites, but they may also lose, because of affirmative
action, qualified black faculty to white institutions facing similar pressures. 44

Another reason that may account for the expected effects of desegregation being felt in the area of faculty will be salaries. Public black colleges have traditionally paid the lowest salaries within their respective state systems. If strategies are to be utilized which will help attract and retain more qualified faculty, however, then the salaries of public black colleges will have to become more competitive if these strategies are to be viable.

Although not alluded to, several of the interviewees seem concerned over whether, under desegregation, their faculties can continue to meet the educational needs of a rapidly changing clientele. This is a great challenge for their faculties and one that must be met. Meeting this challenge will require the executives insist a commitment on the part of their faculties to work with an increasing variety of students as well as with traditionally high risk students.

Students:

Most of the respondents (or 88.6%) indicated another future effect of the demands for desegregation will be in

44See Moore and Wagstaff, Black Educators in White Colleges.
the area of student enrollments. The interviewees maintained that student enrollment changes would produce desegregation's most lasting and "visible" effect.

Based upon current feedback transmitted to respondents from within and outside of their institutions, one of the most important tasks the respondents face concerns how to attract more white students. To a great extent, the respondents argued, unless they can come up with the outputs to attract more white students, their institutions may not be permitted by the authorities of the political system to survive at all.

In this regard, the interviewees related they have developed new programs to attract majority or white students. For example, one of the executives said his admissions office was making every effort to establish communication with counselors of predominantly white high schools in the state to inform them about the benefits of his institution. Another executive said his institution, in an attempt to attract white commuters, was establishing a commuter center on campus, since many whites would prefer to commute than to stay on campus. Other respondents, whose institutions were located near federal installations (e.g., army bases), explained they were attracting white students by offering programs not offered by the installation.

Although the focus of the respondents was on the attraction of white students, the respondents also indicated
their institutions were in need of more highly motivated and qualified black students. One of the executives, in this regard, was concerned that his institution's current freshman class (95% black) had the lowest reading scores for a class ever admitted to the institution. He reported that the better educated black student is now opting in many cases to attend public, predominantly white, institutions. Though there are certainly some changes on the horizon for the student population, most of the respondents reiterated their institutions would probably continue to serve a traditional clientele.45

Academic Programs:

As Table 16 indicates, most of the chief executives perceived the future of their institutions' academic programs would be affected by desegregation. This perception relates to that held by the respondents on the effect of desegregation on the future of faculty and students at public black colleges. Data taken during the interviews suggest improving academic programs and creating new ones will be a significant thrust in the policy development by public black colleges.45

college administrators during the desegregation era. One of the current outputs to improve academic programs has been through the development of cooperative arrangements with primarily predominantly white four-year institutions. However, when the vice-presidents in the survey (see Appendix C for Part II of the vice-presidents' questionnaires, questions 26, 27, 28) were asked how much effect cooperative arrangements (program sharing, faculty exchange, etc.) were having on the desegregation efforts of their institutions, they indicated in general, these arrangements were having very little effect. (See Table 17)

Non-Academic Programs:

As Table 16 shows, the chief executives did not perceive any marked changes for the future of non-academic programs (i.e., inter-collegiate athletics) because of the demands for desegregation. Most of the public black college athletic teams, for example, remain black, though some institutions have been actively recruiting white athletes.

---

Creating new programs, said the respondents, means getting the kind of programs that will attract qualified white and black students. New thrusts in this area for public black colleges are in the allied health fields (e.g., nursing) and in the part-time and evening areas. Most of the respondents interviewed indicated that they have recently instituted such programs, particularly programs in allied health and criminal justice. These programs are designed to primarily attract the enrollment of white students.
Table 17
THE EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS UPON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DESEGREGATION AT PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES
(N = 41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects Pre-1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects Post-1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = total number of vice presidents who responded
One of the interviewees of the colleges, which also happens to be a noted athletic power in small college football, reported his institution was actively recruiting white athletes. He further explained that his institution athletic teams were now successfully competing with predominantly white college teams because of desegregation and has led to his institution receiving national attention. Another executive remarked that if it had not been for the traveling bands (i.e., Grambling State, Florida A & M and Southern, etc.) and public black college athletic teams getting national exposure because of their athletes, few Americans would know that these institutions even existed.

The interviewees also expressed they would try to develop programs that would enhance their relationship with their respective communities. One respondent pointed out his institution's 10,000 seat convocation center, in addition to serving as the new basketball arena, would also serve as a place where community functions could be held. Other interviewees mentioned they too were designing plans to improve community relations by encouraging their academic departments to increase their consultative services in the area of tutoring and serving as resource persons for various community projects (i.e., voter awareness), for example.47

47 One of the executives explained that, to a degree, public black colleges were often "isolated" from their
Alumni Relations:

The demands of desegregation upon the future of alumni relations for public black colleges will only have a moderate amount of effect. According to the presidents (N = 16), the demands of desegregation have already affected alumni relations. They note this is particularly true with respect to alumni groups geographically located near their institutions. When asked what the future effect of alumni inputs would be, 60% of the presidents said their institutions' alumni would be making stronger demands for participation in the overall policy-making process affecting the institution. The other presidents (33%) said they expected new alumni group inputs to be increasingly supportive, especially in important fund-raising efforts.

Several of the executives pointed out that, because of the potential threat posed by the demands of desegregation on their institutions, their alumni groups have sought greater participation in the policy-making processes affecting their institutions. At one institution, for example, alumni have gone out into the state and developed an communities unless a "game" was going on. While games (e.g., football) helped relations, he felt that it was time for the institution to get involved with the "games" being conducted in the community (i.e., war on poverty, etc.) for they are in need of expertise.

48 See Appendix C, Part II of presidents' questionnaire, questions 26 and 27.
82-county network designed to cultivate political and economic support for the institution. The executives of this particular institution explained this kind of participation was welcomed at their institution, as it has been successful in exerting influence on state authorities to support the institution.

Federal and State Relations:

Most of the respondents perceived their future relationships with both authorities of the political system will be greatly affected by the implementation of desegregation. (See Table 16) That federal relations will be affected is understood, as the federal government has the primary responsibility of overseeing the implementation of desegregation as an outcome. On the other side, public black colleges, will no doubt, continue to press the federal government for relief from undue pressures and for their (financial) assistance in helping them to achieve the outcome.

With respect to state relations half of the respondents suggest the future effect will be significant. Most of the significance, of course, can be attributed to the state's "rediscovery" of public black colleges because of desegregation. For example, thirty (or 73.1%) of the respondents

---

49 Table 16 also shows those respondents, who had local boards, felt the implementation of desegregation will affect their future relations.
agreed that one of the most important effects of desegregation has been the recognition by state authorities that their public black institutions are indeed important to the general welfare of the state. The interviewees also noted their institutions had rediscovered the state as a potential friend rather than a long-feared adversary. Especially did they feel this true with respect to their state boards. One respondent expressed his institution's rediscovery by relating how desegregation demands had promoted a new sense of political awareness which has carried the expression "who are we" to "what ought we do and be" within the framework of a state's system of public higher education.

Financial Support:

Finally, Table 16 shows the implementation of desegregation decisions will only moderately affect the future financial support of public black colleges. The interviewees explain this somewhat pessimistic outlook, by pointing out that promises have been made before by the political system but were not kept. Until, as they insisted, the political system backs its promise with deeds, then the institutions will remain underfunded thereby inhibiting the implementation of any plans to develop and improve themselves.  

50 One of the executives related that the legislation passed to help public black colleges (i.e., Title II -- Strengthening Developing Institutions, Pub. Law 92-318)
All of the respondents maintained the future of their institutions, to a great degree, will depend upon their ability to increase financial support, as well as upon their ability to attract white students. These two factors are not mutually exclusive, rather, they are interdependent. Without additional funds, public black colleges will not be able to afford the programs geared toward attracting white students. In addition, unless white students are attracted, the political system may deem these institutions unworthy of support because they will be in non-compliance with the demands for desegregation.

Summary

Analytically, one can examine the public black college as a political system involving several sub-systems as components (i.e., chief executives, faculty, students, parents, alumni, etc.) which interact to convert inputs into outputs. In the presentation of the findings of this study the focus has been on the kinds of responses (or output) that will eventually, in the form of feedback, be transmitted to the authorities (federal and state) because of the effects of have only scratched the surface towards fulfilling some of the basic concerns which these institutions have (e.g., Capital improvements and student financial aids).
desegregation upon public black colleges. It is this output that, in effect, will determine whether or not the mandated policy of desegregation becomes a national and state accepted outcome.

The quality of the conversion process within public black colleges, especially with regard to the development of outputs to the demands for desegregation, is, as the findings suggest, a function of a number of factors. One of the factors relates to the extent to which the constituents within the public black colleges are acting in concert in responding to the demands for desegregation. The data examining the withinputs suggested that the constituents of public black colleges are now acting in a spirit of togetherness in reacting to desegregation demands.

Another factor which must be understood in considering the conversion processes within the public black college relates to their dependency upon the authorities in the larger political system. Indeed, these institutions have largely been a product of the constraints (e.g., socioeconomic and political) historically imposed upon the higher education of blacks by federal and state authorities. Perhaps even more striking, as the literature suggest, has been that the support of these constraints by the environment (society) in which public black colleges exist. The data suggest that the dependent relationship which has existed between the public black colleges and authorities remains
intact and to a certain extent (as the findings indicated) has solidified.

The dependent relationship of public black colleges with the authorities of the political system may also explain why within these institutions there exists a similar relationship between the chief executives (authorities) and the institutions' constituents. The findings suggest the chief executives perceive themselves as not only the authorities within their institution, but also as representative of the views of their institutions as well. The respondents' perceptions support that part of the literature which argues that the chief executives of black colleges, in general, think of themselves as being the only ones with the experience and capability to make the basic and critical decisions affecting their institutions.

The data call attention to the fact that most of the respondents have spent a great deal of their academic lives in black colleges. This suggests the respondents have presumed to know more about their institution than anyone else and that they are the only ones who effectively relates the concerns of the institutions to the authorities in the political system. This supports that part of the literature which maintains that academic heads of black colleges regard themselves as liaisons between their institutions and the authorities of the political system.

That the chief executives perceive themselves to be
the authorities is consistent with a general proposition (though unsubstantiated by the data in this study) which states that the more hostile and threatening the stress of the environment, the easier it is to legitimate the centralization of power within a threatened institution.\textsuperscript{51}

And, since public black colleges are now confronted with the task of implementing a policy that may cost the institution its existence, it can be argued that the apparent strong exercise of leadership by the respondents has been and continues to be essential.

The major task now confronting public black colleges attempting to convert viable outputs on desegregation involves securing adequate financial resources. Because of desegregation demands this task has been responsible for the critical stresses placed upon these institutions. For the respondents argue that the authorities of the political system have not allocated the financial resources needed to successfully cope with desegregation demands. The central question remains then, as to whether the political system authorities or intra-societal benefactors (e.g., philanthropy) deem these institutions worthy of support. As long as this question remains unanswered the needed financial support will not be forthcoming.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{51}See Johnson, \textit{System}.

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid.
Because of the way in which the conversion processes are conducted within public black colleges and their relationship to the conversions of the political system, the findings of this study suggest these institutions are transmitting the following feedback (as new input) to the system's authorities. Part of the input (feedback) transmitted as output has essentially been accepted, despite the unwillingness of various constituent groups (i.e., faculty, students) to fully accept and support desegregation as an outcome.\footnote{The respondents (73.1\%) maintained that another of the important effects of desegregation has been the fear on the part of their constituents that meeting desegregation demands may be at the expense of the historical traditions of these institutions.}

The other part of the feedback being transmitted to the system's authorities expresses the willingness of these institutions to maintain their support of the authorities' outputs, because the options to do otherwise are limited. At the moment the only other option available to public black colleges has been to not support the desegregation decisions. The assumption of this option, though, invites the exercise of punitive action by the authorities (e.g., the termination of federal funds by D-HEW, if done, would immediately close most public black colleges). For
example, the interviewees confirmed how it would be folly for them to resist decisions made by the authorities on desegregation. Rather than resist, they wanted to work within the political system for a solution to this crucial problem.

Although this continued expression of support by public black colleges of the political system has been symbolic, the system has not rewarded them for it. These institutions are now asking for fair and equal treatment for their support because others in the system have not given it. The support of these institutions by the political system now needs to be materially and symbolically acknowledged because the demands that desegregation becomes an outcome mandates this attention.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter V is divided into four sections. The first section is a summary of the first three chapters and a brief review of the findings portion of Chapter IV. The second section provides a discussion of the conclusions within the context of the analytical framework used herein. Finally, the third and fourth sections present the study's implications and recommendations.

Summary

The need to explain the effects of demands for desegregation upon public black colleges is apparent. Chapter I contended that perceptions of chief executives about the issue of desegregation directly relates to the more important issue of whether public black colleges can survive at all.

Chapter II stressed that while numerous studies had been conducted on black colleges in general, few studies
concentrated specifically on the problems facing public black colleges. Perhaps even more revealing, and discouraging, is that most of studies of public black colleges deal with them only tangentially and, more often than not, reflect anecdotal and often unsubstantiated research.

Lack of information relating to public black colleges is evident in the literature review of Chapter II. However, the purpose of this study, was to provide information on public black colleges by describing and analyzing their reaction to the effects of desegregation demands. More specifically, the study attempted to determine, the effects of desegregation upon these institutions as perceived by their chief executive administrators. This was accomplished by surveying these institutions and adopting the analytical framework formulated by David Easton as a tool to explain data elicited by the seven research questions.

The study was initiated by developing a survey instrument designed to collect data that would describe and systematically explain the perceptions of chief executive administrators on the institutional consequences of desegregation. In this regard, a two part questionnaire was subsequently developed for presidents and vice-presidents of public black colleges. Part I of the questionnaire sought selective demographic data on both respondents and their colleges. Part II was designed to solicit data describing the effects of desegregation demands upon public black
colleges.

Questionnaires were mailed to presidents and vice-presidents of public black colleges (34) for their completion and return. In addition, selected follow-up interviews were conducted with chief executives of seven public black colleges located in five states. Forty-one usable questionnaires and interviews were returned, equivalent to a 64 percent response from the sample. From the usable questionnaires and interviews data were coded, tabulated, and submitted to the computer for machine analysis.¹

Summary of Findings

In describing the effects of demands for desegregation it was necessary to collect demographic data on both respondents, (presidents and vice-presidents) and their institutions in Part I of the questionnaires. These data were used to describe the characteristics of both respondents and their institutions. Another function of collecting demographic data was to ascertain whether the effects of desegregation had made any significant change in the racial composition of the institutions' on-campus constituency (i.e.,

¹Again, although the study surveyed the chief executive administrators, the level of analysis focused on respondents as representing views of their institutions.
other administrators, faculty, etc.).

The demographic data revealed that all current chief executives (presidents and vice-presidents for academic affairs) of public black colleges were black. Thirty-seven (37) of the forty-one (or 92.5%) respondents had graduated from traditional black colleges. Of the 37 respondents who graduated from traditional black colleges, 25 (or 66.4%) indicated that their alma maters had been public black colleges. Moreover, most of the respondents (63.4%) noted that their previous academic positions had been in public black colleges, supporting the assumption that the respondents were very knowledgeable about past and present problems and issues facing public black colleges.

The respondents (presidents and vice-presidents) represented 26 of the 32 public black colleges surveyed.² Demographic data were collected on all 26 of the institutions. These data were obtained to get some sense of the more "visible" effects of demands for desegregation upon these institutions.

The respondents, (presidents only) indicated the demands for desegregation had not yet made a significant change in the racial composition of their institutions. For example, despite the Adams decision of 1972 the data indicated that

²Recall that of the 34 original institutions surveyed, two were eliminated because they were considered entirely desegregated.
these institutions still had not experienced any appreciable increase in their numbers of white students. What the data did reveal though was a slight decline in the number of full-time black faculty members and black students since 1972. These findings suggest that, at least in terms of white students attracted to public black colleges, desegregation has not yet become a "visible" outcome. On the other hand, the decline in the number of black faculty and students, suggest that public black colleges are now competing with other institutions for what was once considered an "airtight market." The concept of an "airtight market" is no longer true, because it is now a matter of public record that black faculty and students have been leaving black colleges for predominantly white institutions.3

Part II of the survey instrument collected data describing the effects of desegregation demands. These data were used to answer the seven research questions restated below:

1. Do the chief executive administrators perceive as one of the effects of desegregation demands that the pressures (e.g., political) from the federal level for desegregating their institutions are more influential than pressures (e.g., political) emanating from the state level?

3Again, see Moore and Wagstaff, Black Educators in White Colleges.
2. Do the chief executive administrators perceive that most of the support and backing for their decisions on desegregation policies for the institution to come more from other administrators and faculty than from students, parents, and alumni?

3. Do the chief executive administrators perceive as one of the effects of desegregation demands, that their policy decisions will be more influenced by pressures (e.g., political) from on-campus interest organizations than from off-campus interest organizations (i.e., black state political organizations and civic groups)?

4. Do the chief executive administrators perceive the concept and effects of affirmative action as being of greater concern to their institutions than desegregation itself?

5. Have the effects of desegregation stimulated or prompted the inter-institutional sharing of information on desegregation between the chief executive administrators of public black colleges?

6. What major issues have been identified to the chief executive administrators by campus constituents at public black colleges as a direct effect of the demands for desegregation?

7. What effects will the demands for desegregation and its implementation have upon the future of public
black colleges as perceived by the chief executives?

Before the research questions were addressed, data were collected in order to ascertain what inputs and outputs had stimulated the development of desegregation policies within public black colleges. In that regard, a majority of the respondents indicated they had developed specific policies on desegregation. Many had done this in response to historical pressures (dating back to the Brown decision of 1954) emanating from the federal government. Those institutions which had no policies on desegregation prior to 1972, but which do now, also admitted that the development of these internal policies was a direct result of federal demands to desegregate.

Most chief executives, as authorities within their colleges, had assumed responsibility for formulating desegregation policies for their institutions. Respondents believed they had more input and effect on institutional policymaking than any other on-campus constituency, (faculty as a group, etc.). This was particularly evident in the case of the formulation of desegregation policy. The on-campus constituencies having the most effect (and input) on policymaking after the respondents, particularly as it related to desegregation policy were other administrators (line and staff) and faculty.

Whereas chief executives are supported as the reigning
authorities within their institutions, data does reveal that internal governance structures permit considerable constituent participation. Chief executives insisted that campus constituents have enjoyed a great deal of participation in the conversion of the withinputs into internal institutional policies, particularly as the conversion related to relieving the stress of desegregation.

Respondents reported that a majority of campus constituents have supported their policy decisions both on general matters (e.g., budget) and with respect to desegregation. They did indicate, however, that other administrators (line and staff) and faculty tended to provide more support and backing than had students, parents, and alumni. This also suggests that the former play by the "rules of the game" while the latter do not. For it is not enough for the campus constituents to support their own demands; rather, they must be able to demonstrate that they support the authority (chief executives) and play by the "rules of the game" (e.g., control over the allocation of resources within the institution).

Since the Adams decision, both on-campus interest organizations (i.e., faculty senate and student government association) and off-campus organizations (i.e., black state political organizations) have exerted considerable pressure (e.g., political) on policy-making processes of public black colleges. On-campus interest organizations however
have proved most effective, according to survey data. With inputs of on-campus interest organizations, according to respondents have traditionally had great influence on institutions' policy-making processes, particularly with regard to desegregation. Respondents (especially those who were interviewed) commented that since the Adams decision their institutions' conversion processes dealing with desegregation had begun to be affected more by the pressures from off-campus interest organizations. 4

Most respondents asserted that federal authorities (D-HEW especially) were the strongest advocates for implementation of desegregation plans. This is understandable, since the federal authorities (e.g., federal courts) have mandated the desegregation of public higher education.

The state authorities (i.e., state boards, legislature, etc.), reportedly have also been instrumental in getting institutions to develop and implement a desegregation policy. Since 1972, however, state authorities, operating under pressure from D-HEW, are now making more demands for their public black colleges to implement than they had in the past. 5

---------

4 Off-campus interest organizations (i.e., black state political organizations), though located outside of public black colleges, are the closest of the intra-societal environment of these institutions. Like alumni groups, these interest organizations are sometimes considered as being within the institution, though they really are not.

5 Again, the decision by the court in Adams instructed
The findings suggest most respondents (53.8%) regarded demands for affirmative action as important as demands for desegregation. It was the perception of chief executives for example that faculties of public black colleges regard the concept and effect of affirmative action as one of the more significant aspects of responding to desegregation demands. In this regard, the respondents (N = 31) agreed that implementation of an affirmative action program and its impact on faculty job security was an issue of great and immediate concern to the institution.

The chief executives acknowledged one of the more positive effects of desegregation was an increase in the amount of inter-institutional sharing and communication between public black colleges on matters related to desegregation. The respondents noted increased sharing of information on desegregation policies and practices has been very helpful and has served to strengthen the communitive bonds between public black colleges. More specifically, increased inter-institutional communication has enabled institutions to develop better recruitment techniques to attract qualified white students and faculty. Moreover, this communication has helped public black colleges develop better strategies

D-HEW to terminate all federal aid to a state system of public higher education if that state refused to take immediate steps to eliminate the vestiges of segregation in its system of public higher education.
for directing their institutions into the desegregation era. One of the strategies evolving from this communication has been a new sense of awareness of how to influence the authorities while at the same time acceding to their demands.

Although the respondents listed several issues raised most often by their campus constituency (e.g., faculty, students) because of the stress imposed by desegregation, the issues listed were more similar than different. The issue of most concern to the administrators involved whether public black colleges can make an effective response to the demands for desegregation without diminishing their commitment to the black community and to equal educational opportunity. Another important issue involved the faculty's anxiety over the methods that may be used by the authorities to implement affirmative action. On the other hand, the issue most students and alumni of public black colleges were concerned about involved whether their institutions would survive at all in responding to demands for desegregation.

The respondents said they considered issues raised by their on-campus constituents to be most important because they relate to the crucial issue of the survival of public black colleges as viable public institutions of higher learning. Without exception, the chief executives stressed the theme of institutional survival as the basis for issues raised by themselves and their campus constituencies.
When asked about their assessment of the most important demands of desegregation upon the future of public black colleges, the chief executives cited several major effects. First, the demand for desegregation would not create any major changes in internal governance structures of institutions. As one interviewee noted, not only would basic decision-making processes within his institution remain unchanged, but the same black administrators would remain as institutional leaders.

The respondents also indicated that demands for and implementation of desegregation would greatly affect their institutions' faculties and student bodies. Most of the effect, as noted in the interviews, would result in an increase of non-blacks attending public black colleges. This in turn would greatly affect academic programs. For example, the interviewees argued that additional academic programs (i.e., allied health) would have to be included in curriculum while more traditional programs (e.g., liberal arts) would have to be improved if demands for desegregation were to be adequately met by public black colleges. In this regard, vice-presidents cited as one of the more important developments, an increase in cooperative academic arrangements with other institutions (especially predominantly white colleges). These arrangements have helped public black colleges develop new programs as well as to broaden the base of academic services to their communities. In addition, these arrangements
have helped in improving the quality of academic offerings by drawing upon segments of the intra-societal environment (i.e., black political leaders), and to some extent the extra-societal environment (e.g., several of the institutions are now in contact with countries beyond the political system), for human and material resources previously unavailable to public black colleges.

The respondents anticipated that future modification of institutional relations would continue with federal and state authorities as public black colleges meet desegregation demands. For example, the conversion of the withinputs that affect the implementation of desegregation into outputs within public black colleges will be closely monitored by authorities, especially federal authorities. According to the respondents, there is more concern within their institutions over the decisions of federal authorities than those of the state because the mandate for desegregation is primarily a federal demand rather than a state demand.

Although the respondents expect a change in the future relationships of their institutions with authorities, they anticipate that the current levels of financial support for public black colleges from both the public and private sectors, will remain constant. The respondents seemed to suggest that the authorities of the political system remain unconvinced that the financial demands of public black colleges need to be met and converted into positive outputs (e.g.,
increase funding). In this context what appears to be at issue, argued the interviewees, is whether public black colleges under stress of desegregation can convince authorities they are worthy of support, and whether authorities will permit themselves to be convinced.

In addition to foreseeing no appreciable change in the level of financial support, the respondents indicated they foresaw no significant changes in non-academic programs (i.e., inter-collegiate athletics). Neither did they expect any notable changes in the future of alumni relations. The respondents contended that demands for desegregation had not had impact in these areas. Thus, any decisions affect these areas will be determined mainly by conversion processes controlled by the authorities, (the respondents) within the institution and not outside.

In making their final comments, the chief executives maintained that the greatest effect of demands for desegregation and for its implementation has been the revelation to all of the members of the political system that public black colleges have done creditable jobs in providing access to higher education for blacks of their respective states and across the nation, as well. Moreover, the respondents also acknowledged that for the first time (as a direct effect of the demands for desegregation) their institutions are receiving the long over-due recognition that they are important and necessary components of their state systems of higher
education, because of their genuine commitment to equal educational opportunity.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, are drawn as a result of the related literature, the public record, and findings of this study. It has been suggested in this study that public black colleges are a subsystem of a larger political system. As a subsystem, these institutions since 1972 have been seriously affected by the demands for desegregation. These demands have been designed to eliminate the last vestiges of segregated systems of public higher education and make desegregation an outcome.

The literature review in Chapter II indicated very little was known about public black colleges; more specifically, very little was known about the internal response of these institutions to desegregation. In addition, even less was known about feedback transmitted to authorities within and without the institutions because of desegregation. It was the purpose of this study to describe the effects of demands for desegregation upon public black colleges by examining the perceptions of chief executive administrators, as representing the views of their institutions. Furthermore, the assumption was made that such a description was needed, especially since the desegregation of public black colleges, though mandated, had not yet been accomplished.
Several conclusions can now be drawn from the findings of this study about the effects of desegregation demands upon public black colleges. First, the findings suggest that public black colleges have continued to support the policy of desegregation. In no instance did the respondents suggest or imply that their institutions would profit by supporting a policy of segregation. Instead, the findings suggested that public black colleges have consistently supported equal educational opportunity and the goal of integration even though other members of the political system have not. On this basis, it seems safe to conclude that even if there had been no Adams decisions, these institutions would maintain their support of the political system's outputs related to the philosophy of equal educational opportunity and integration, though perhaps not as "radically" as they have been forced to do now.

Another conclusion from the findings concerns the internal dynamics of public black colleges with respect to the effects of desegregation. The chief executives seem to concur that within their institutions they are looked to for leadership, especially in the formulation of institutional policies on desegregation. This has resulted in strengthening the claim of the respondents that, as the authorities within their institutions, they do represent the views of the institutions and are sought out for those views by the members of the political system.
The data also suggest that there now appears to be a move towards the collective mobilization of support on an inner-institutional basis between and among public black colleges. Respondents related that they were making greater efforts to share issues and problems raised by desegregation -- thus alluding to an old axiom that the threat of adversity tends to draw those with common interests together. This may also be viewed as an attempt by public black colleges to develop a "community of institutions" based upon a common past and present.

Based upon these findings, it can be concluded that public black colleges are not yet clear as to when authorities expect the output of desegregation to be fully implemented; nor, indeed, are they sure when desegregation will become an actual outcome. The public record on the experience of desegregating public schools suggests that the process of implementing integration is often a slow and painful one and it has yet to be proven that this will not occur to public black colleges. Perhaps the overriding concern, though, relates to the logical conclusion that in achieving the outcome implementing desegregation may mean the end of these institutions.6

---

6A majority of the respondents insisted that one of the majority effects of desegregation has been an attempt to overthrow their institution's traditional identity. They further expressed that if their identity is lost, so too are their institutions.
That the proposed outcome of complete desegregation might mean the "disintegration" of public black colleges has been discussed in the literature. Arguments have been presented that suggest if the authorities are given a choice between supporting the demands of institutions (i.e., public black colleges) which they and other members of the political system (intra-societal environment) consider weak and those institutions which they consider strong and superior (i.e., predominantly white public colleges), the authorities will help convert outputs supporting the latter. It is already a matter of public record, for example, that the authorities' pattern of support of public higher education has consistently been skewed towards predominantly white colleges much to the detriment of public black colleges. Thus, while both white and black public colleges purport to offer a quality education, public black colleges, as the literature reviewed so aptly explained, have not had the non-support from the authorities which other public colleges have had.

The effects of the demands for desegregation, as the findings suggest, have also to a certain degree produced an air of uncertainty within the public black colleges. While one of the effects of desegregation has meant the "discovery" of these colleges by the system, the respondents expressed that they hoped this sudden interest was genuine
and not an expression of romantic paternalism. Much of the uncertainty that exists about the implementation of desegregation involves the level of financial support that public black colleges require. All the respondents contended that if financial resources are not committed by the system's authorities to their institutions, then the implementation of desegregation may really mean the implementation of their disintegration; because without an increase in financial resources, they can no longer function as viable alternative institutions of higher learning.

The interviewees expressed, however, with some sense of optimism, that they expected the federal and state authorities to take a more active posture in responding to the needs of public black colleges. They attributed their optimism largely to the D-HEW requirement of having states formulate plans to improve all of their state institutions. Each interviewee felt that since 1972 their state authorities have been making greater efforts in allocating state resources to their institutions. Though state output has increased over what it once was before 1972, it is still not sufficient, since the respondents suggested that a full and

7 The respondents strongly argued that they hoped a future effect of desegregation would be the realization by the system's authorities that the outcome will not be obtained unless the concerted and conscious efforts of both the institutions and the state combine in harmony to achieve it.
unqualified commitment for financial assistance from the state and federal levels is needed if total improvements are to be made.

The effects of desegregation have also fostered an atmosphere of uncertainty among the institutions' constituents. The data disclosed how faculty (demands) are particularly concerned with the implementation of desegregation because it carries along with it the outcome of affirmative action, or more succinctly, the probable loss of black faculty jobs to whites. Without question the mandate of affirmative action is regarded by public black colleges as a very serious issue that merits full attention of both the authorities within the institution and outside of the institution.

Based upon the withinputs transmitted by the students and alumni to the chief executives, the conclusion can be drawn that they too are concerned over the uncertainty that desegregation proposes. Much of their uncertainty, the respondents noted, is attributed to the need to attract more white students to the institution. At issue is not necessarily the attraction of more whites per se, but the idea that whites are going to find it difficult to adjust to the missions and goals of a traditional black institution. The respondents feel if whites are unable to adjust to the missions and goals of public black colleges, then they may try to change them more to their liking. The danger exists
that they would be supported in their efforts by a system that historically has not been able either to address or to meet the needs of this nation's minorities. It is the nature of this problem that forms the basis for the uncertainties of the students and alumni of public black colleges.

Although the demands for desegregation have mobilized the full support of the public black college's on-campus constituency, the demands have not mobilized the same support from the black community at large. The respondents indicated, though, that off-campus interest organizations (i.e., black state political groups) are now taking a more active role in supporting the demands made by these institutions of the authorities in the political system. The interviewees hoped the general black community would join in the efforts of off-campus interests, to support public black colleges. In this regard they emphasized that the black community will have to realize that unless they support the public black colleges of their state, they will lose one of the few institutions that have devoted their total attention to the development of the black community.

This study also makes it appropriate to conclude that, though the effects of the demands for desegregation have a certain "doomsdayism" about them, public black colleges remain optimistic about their continued existence. For example, in no instance did a respondent suggest, or lead
this researcher to believe, that his institution, as he knew it, would be closed or merged (with a public white institution) because of desegregation. This optimism may not be completely unwarranted, because of the D-HEW demands that states must show in their plans exactly how they intend to upgrade and improve the public black colleges within their systems of public higher education.\(^8\) What public black colleges seem to be feeding back to the authorities of the political system is the message that regardless of how the system reacts to its inputs, they will continue to provide those who enter their doors with access to an equal educational opportunity.

**Implications**

The present study has provided a description of the effects of the demands for desegregation upon public black colleges. It has also sought answers to specific questions, as well as to provide interpretations and explanations of those answers via the use of an analytical framework. The focus of the study was such that the stated problem and research questions could be analyzed with some degree of clarity. The following implications are several of the more important ones that are projected from the findings and conclusions of the study.

\(^8\)See again the *Adams* decision.
Public black college authorities will continue to receive pressing withinputs from their constituents. Faculty, for example, will press for clarity on the role of affirmative action under desegregation. Moreover, they may also demand a greater voice in decisions relating to the application of affirmative action to faculty positions.

By the same token, as white faculty increase within these institutions, they too are going to demand more administrative responsibility. This request may prove to be one of the more difficult demands that the institutions' authorities will have to resolve. If the authorities within cannot successfully resolve these issues themselves, they may seek help from the political system through new institutional demands. This may prove unsuccessful though, because affirmative action plans is one of the main outcomes of desegregation.

The findings tend to suggest that off-campus interest organizations, especially black state political organizations are going to be a force that all authorities (both within and without the institutions) will have to reckon with. The natural inclination, as the data suggest, will be a move on the part of these organizations to seek greater input in the decisions made at the state level. This will be done because these organizations are saying that members of the intra-societal environment (i.e., black community) do, in fact, have a heavy investment, in terms of social and
economic capital, in how public black colleges fare in responding to desegregation demands. Some of the respondents even explained that it may very well be the off-campus interest organizations that mobilizes the "sleeping" black community to the support of public black colleges.⁹

In the drive to attract white students public black colleges may become islands of innovation, especially in the area of academic programs and relating them to community needs. For example, these institutions may become educational proving grounds for new approaches to race relations, for new inquiries into black intellectual development within American society, and for the development of new curricula which geared towards understanding the problems of the black and rural communities.¹⁰

Public black colleges, if they are to survive, will have to continue playing by "the rules of the game" dictated by the authorities and the present "rules" dictate they support the system. The prospects are dim that public black colleges either collectively or individually have the

---

⁹ Operation PUSH entitled a recent Black Expo, held annually in Chicago, Ill., "SAVE OUR BLACK COLLEGES." Also note the increase political activity of off-campus interest organizations in Ending Discrimination.

¹⁰ One executive indicated that because of desegregation, his institution has developed a successful program in developing rural leadership among blacks and whites.
capacity to either change the "rules" or replace the authorities who make the rules. The prospects are not dim, though, that public black colleges will not be able to develop new inputs (plans and strategies) which will either demand that the authorities of the political system respond more affirmatively or that they change the "rules of the game."

The chief executive administrators of public black colleges do not intend to relinquish the roles as the authorities within their institutions. Perhaps this is a function of the traditional assumption that no other person or group within the public black colleges is capable of making the key decisions except the chief executive. Moreover, as the respondents implied, because they are authorities within, only they are capable of dealing with the authorities in the political system.

Public black colleges will need the symbolic support, as well as the financial support, of the authorities of the political system, if they are going to 1) attract white students and 2) improve their faculties. Money alone will not accomplish this task, as what public black colleges also need is the expression of a moral commitment to their survival by the authorities (federal and state). This expression has to be communicated to the environment of the system, if the society is going to understand why these institutions need to survive.
Unless the "rules of the game" (i.e., the way in which demands are converted into outputs) are changed, it appears that the authorities of the political system will not be concerned about the how demands of desegregation will affect the non-academic programs within public black colleges. Rather, according to the respondents, the authorities will be most concerned of about the effect in academic programs and related areas, thereby suggesting that the demands for desegregation will continue to be focused on the most critical areas of the institution.

The indication that the public black colleges are beginning collectively to pull together may mean that eventually they will pool their inputs and submit them in total to the federal authorities, the ones who have orchestrated the demands for public black colleges to desegregate. One of the organizations that will certainly benefit from this new sense of inter-institutional awareness will be the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges. Since 1972, they have labored to break the pattern of isolationism that has traditionally existed among public black colleges and they have been in need of support. The development of this new sense of community will enable them to develop the necessary strategies designed to make foundations and corporations aware that public black colleges are in need of their support.¹¹

¹¹See again A Factbook.
Recommendations

In order to extend and maximize the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further study and consideration are made below.

1. The process by which the demands of public black colleges are transformed into political issues in the political system merits additional research, if one is to achieve a more in-depth understanding of the process through which the demands of public black colleges become transformed into issues. For example, we need to know more about a) the relationship between the demands of public black colleges and the location of its supporters in the power structure (i.e., the authorities) of the society; b) the importance of public black colleges presenting their demand in a public forum as opposed to one that escapes public scrutiny (closed board sessions); c) the importance that timing and events (e.g., post-Watergate era, the recessionary period of the 70's and higher education) play in presenting the demands of public black colleges to the authorities of the system.

2. That a study be designed to investigate the degree to which desegregation has benefited the development of public black colleges.

3. That a study be conducted which would describe the perceptions of faculty, students, and alumni on their attitudes towards the implementation of desegregation.
4. That a study be designed which would describe how non-blacks are adjusting to life in the public black college.

5. That a more systematic study be designed which will assess the relative effects of federal and state pressures on the governance of public black colleges since 1972.

6. That a complete history be written of public black colleges, which would include their early beginnings to their current status. Particular emphasis should be devoted to the contemporary period, a period totally devoid of information on these institutions.

7. That a study be conducted to see whether public black land-grant colleges have been more affected by desegregation than other public black colleges.

8. That a case study of desegregation of a public black college be conducted to systematically describe the detailed responses of an institution to desegregation.

9. That a study be done which would compare and contrast the governance structure of public black colleges in order to ascertain whether there have been any major changes since the implementation of desegregation.

10. That a study be conducted which would provide an in-depth analysis of the state plans accepted by D-HEW to see whether or not the public black colleges affected are benefiting such plans.

11. That a study be designed which would measure the effect of affirmative action at public black colleges and relate
it to the effect which affirmative action has had at predominantly public white institutions.

12. That a study be conducted which would investigate, in greater detail, whether or not presidents of black colleges have, because of their positions, control over the communications of the institution transmitted throughout the political system. Such a study, if conducted, would warrant investigating whether or not the chief executive of black colleges do, in fact, represent the total views of their institutions.

13. The problems facing public black colleges are indeed critical, but they are not beyond resolution and neither are these institutions about to be "phased out" of American higher education. Again, the key to the salvation of public black colleges rests in the ability of Americans to recommit themselves to a more meaningful and constructive pursuit of equal educational opportunity. For in the final analysis, this recommitment will not only constitute the first step towards the alleviation of the inequities which have historically plagued these institutions, but it will also be a giant step towards the solving of what DuBois saw as the problem of the twentieth century...the color line.
APPENDIX A

The Nation's Black Public Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
<th>1974 Fall Enrollment</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A &amp; M University Normal, Alabama</td>
<td>4046</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State College Montgomery, Alabama</td>
<td>3879</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State College Albany, Georgia</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn A &amp; M College Lorman, Mississippi</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie State College Bowie, Maryland</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University Wilberforce, Ohio</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cheyney State College Cheyney, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin State College Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Delaware State College Dover, Delaware</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City State University Elizabeth, North Carolina</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State University Fayetteville, North Carolina</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution and Location</td>
<td>1974 Fall Enrollment</td>
<td>Year Founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A &amp; M University, Tallahassee, Florida</td>
<td>4871</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Valley State College, Ft. Valley, Georgia</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Kentucky</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Lincoln University, Lincoln, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley State College, Itta Bena, Mississippi</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>5619</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A &amp; T State University, Greensboro, North Carolina</td>
<td>4971</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina</td>
<td>4028</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution and Location</td>
<td>1974 Fall Enrollment</td>
<td>Year Founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A &amp; M College, Prairie View, Texas</td>
<td>4870</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, South Carolina</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University, Baton Rouge (main campus), New Orleans (branch), Shreveport (branch)</td>
<td>12226</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td>4977</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas</td>
<td>7145</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Pine Bluff, Arkansas</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*West Virginia State College, Institute, West Virginia</td>
<td>3473</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This listing was compiled by the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, Atlanta, Georgia.

*These schools have significant white enrollments, West Virginia State having 75% white.

**Lincoln University in Pennsylvania is the most recent addition to the black public college list (1973). It now receives state support.
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The Independent Judges who Validated the Questionnaire and the Respondents that Participated in the Field Test of the Instrument
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Dr. Henry E. Cobb, Dean
The Graduate School
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. E. C. Harrison, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. John King, President
Huston-Tillotson College
Austin, Texas

Dr. G. L. Netterville
President Emeritus
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Lionel Newsom, President
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio

Dr. Gus T. Ridgel, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio

Dr. Granville Sawyer, President
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

Dr. Herman Smith, Chancellor
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Dr. Daniel C. Thompson, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Walter Washington, President
Alcorn State University
Lorman, Mississippi
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President, Central State University

Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Southern University
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A Questionnaire on the Effects of Desegregation upon Public Black Colleges
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Statement of Endorsement

First Follow-up Letter

Second Follow-up Letter
A QUESTIONNAIRE ON
THE EFFECTS OF DESEGREGATION
UPON PUBLIC BLACK COLLEGES

Prepared by
Leonard L. Haynes III
The Ohio State University
Presidents' Questionnaire

Part I Background Information

**Please check the appropriate space or provide information where necessary.**

1. Age: 30-39  40-49  50-59  60 or over
2. Sex: Male  Female
3. Race: Black  White  Other (please specify)
4. Please indicate your highest academic degree:
   - Bachelor's
   - Ph. D.
   - J. D.
   - Master's
   - Ed. D.
   - Other (specify)
5. In what academic area is your highest academic degree?
   - Education
   - Natural Sciences
   - Business
   - Humanities
   - Theology
   - Law
   - Social Sciences
   - Fine Arts
   - Other (specify)
6. Are you published? Yes  No  If "yes," please indicate the actual number of publications (e.g., books, articles, monographs) bearing your name
7. Did you graduate from a traditionally black undergraduate college? Yes  No
   - If "yes," please state the name of the institution
   - If "no," please state the name of the institution graduated from
8. Number of years in present position
9. Have you previously held the academic presidency at another post-secondary institution? Yes  No
   - If "yes," was the institution four-year or two-year?
10. If you answered "yes" to question 9, please indicate:
    - Name of institution
    - Its size: Under 1000  1001-3000  3001-5000  Over 5000
11. If you answered "no" to question 9, please indicate:
    - The position (title) held prior to your current post
    - If former position was in a post-secondary institution, please indicate:
    - Name of institution
    - Its size: Under 1000  1001-3000  3001-5000  Over 5000
12. Number of "headcount" students enrolled in your present institution, 1973-74 year:
13. Are there "more," "about the same," or "fewer" faculty, students, administrative cabinet members (vice presidents, provost, etc.) and staff members (registrar, dean of students, etc.) now in your present institution than in the past (pre-1972) in the following categories? Please check below one space per category per item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Fewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Administrative Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (e.g., African, Indian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. At the state level your institution is governed by a
   - State Board of Education
   - State Board of Trustees
   - State Board of Regents
   - State Board of Curators

15. In regard to 14, how many members (actual numbers) comprise your institution's State Board? ____________________
   Of that number, how many are black? ____________________
   The average length of term (years) for members of your state governing body ________
   Are the members of the state governing body elected ___ or appointed ____?

16. Does your institution have its own local board of trustees? Yes ___ No ___
   If "yes," how many members (actual numbers) make up the board? ____________________
   If "yes," of that number how many members are black? ____________________
   If "yes," what is the average length of term for members of your local board? ________

   If "yes," are the local board members elected ____ or appointed ____?

17. For a copy of an abstract, please check ____ , and provide your name and address:
   Name: ____________________________________________
   Address: __________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
Part II Effects of Desegregation

The second part of this questionnaire is designed to solicit responses which will help describe demands for desegregation upon public black colleges.

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate space for each question or item below.

1. Has your institution made any effort in the past (pre-1972) to formulate a policy on desegregation? Yes ___ No ___

2. Has your institution made any effort since 1972 to formulate a policy on desegregation? Yes ___ No ___

3. If you answered "yes" to 1 or 2, what do you feel have been the factors which prompted this policy? Please explain or state: ____________________________________________

4. If you answered "no" to 1 or 2, what do you feel have been the factors which have not prompted this policy? Please explain or state: ____________________________________________

In the following series of questions, please circle an appropriate response:
1 = none at all; 2 = very little; 3 = moderate amount; 4 = very much.

5. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect do you feel you have on the formulation of university policies in general?

6. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect have you had in the past (pre-1972) in formulating the university policy that relates to desegregation?

7. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect do you feel that you now (post-1972) have on formulating university policy that relates to desegregation?

8. As to your response given in 5, 6, and 7 would you please briefly describe how you have effected the formulation of university policy relating to desegregation? ____________________________________________

In the following series of questions please provide an appropriate response for each group (i.e., faculty through alumni).

9. How much effect do the following general university constituents have as a group on overall university-wide policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other administrators</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None At all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How much effect have the following general university constituents had as a group on university policies in the past (pre-1972) that related to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How much effect do the following general university constituents now (post-1972) have on university-wide policies that directly relate to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To what extent are your decisions in general on university matters backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. To what extent have your decisions in the past (pre-1972) relating to desegregation policies been backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. To what extent are your decisions relating to the effects of desegregation upon the institution now (post-1972) backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. There are many off-campus interest organizations which try to effect the development of policies relating to the demands of desegregation upon an institution (e.g., NAACP, CORE). How much effect have these interest organizations had in the past (pre-1972) on university policies that relate directly to desegregation? Please check an appropriate response for each organization listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Organizations (e.g., NAACP, SCLC, PUSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black state political organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic/social organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How much effect do you feel these off-campus interest organizations now (post-1972) have on university policies that relate directly to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Organizations (e.g., NAACP, SCLC, PUSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black state political organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic/social organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Please briefly describe the way(s) in which these off-campus interest organizations have made their effect(s) felt ______________________________________________

18. There are many on-campus organizations (organized interest groups other than general categories such as faculty, students, etc.) which try to effect university policies relating to desegregation and its implementation (e.g., student government ass'n, faculty senate). How much effect have these organizations had in the past (pre-1972) on university policies that relate directly to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Please list the on-campus organization(s) that you feel have had the most effect in the past (pre-1972) on your institution's desegregation policies. __________________________________________

b. How much effect do you feel that the on-campus organizations listed in (a) now (post-1972) have on university policies relating to desegregation and its implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Have you ever attempted in the past to alter or change the institution's desegregation policy by appealing to outside groups for assistance (other than off-campus interest groups already listed)? Yes ______ No ______
19. (continued)

   a. If "yes," in order of importance (1 being the most important) please rank in terms of frequency used both pre-1972 and post-1972 the following activities from 1 to 10. You may list and rank accordingly any other groups that do not appear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-1972</th>
<th>Post-1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters to newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV or radio reports addressed to desegregation policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to accrediting agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to influential governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine or newspaper articles addressed to desegregation policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to influential alumni groups or benefactors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to influence foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony about the university before government committees and agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. How much effect do you feel the activities checked above in (a) have had on formulating and implementing desegregation policies in your institution?

   Very much   Moderate amount   Very little   None at all

20. How much effect have the following authorities had in the past (pre-1972) in getting your institution to devise desegregation policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State governor or state agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How much effect do the following authorities now have (post-1972) on getting your institution to devise desegregation policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State governor or state agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Of the five authorities listed in 20 and 21 (Federal, State, and local [if it applies]), which one has had the most effect in the past (pre-1972)?

   and which one now (post-1972) has the most effect?

   Please explain briefly why the authorities stated above had the most effect in getting your institution to devise desegregation policies:

   ________________________________
23. Have you shared information on your desegregation policies with other administrators of public black colleges in the past (pre-1972)? Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," why was this information shared? ____________________________________________________________

If "yes," how was this information shared? ____________________________________________________________

If "yes," to what extent was the sharing of this information helpful?
Very much ___ Moderate amount ___ Very little ___ None at all ___

24. Do you now (post-1972) share information on your desegregation policies with other administrators of public black colleges? Yes ___ No ___

If "yes," why is this information shared? ____________________________________________________________

If "yes," how is this information shared? ____________________________________________________________

If "yes," to what extent has the sharing of this information been helpful?
Very much ___ Moderate amount ___ Very little ___ None at all ___

25. In the following questions please circle an appropriate response:
   1 = None at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Moderate amount; 4 = Very much

a. To what extent has the implementation of affirmative action in the past (pre-1972) in terms of personnel policy been of equal concern as the desegregation of the student body?
   1 2 3 4

b. To what extent do you now (post-1972) consider affirmative action in terms of personnel policy to be of equal concern as the desegregation of the student body?
   1 2 3 4

26. Estimated or known number of your institution's alumni ______________________

27. What percentage of your major alumni groups are found in the following areas (please note the attached appendix which lists the states in the suggested areas)?

Southeast ___ Northeast ___ Middle-West ___ Southwest ___

Far West ___ Other (e.g., Canada, Mexico) ______

Of the alumni groups listed above, which one has had (pre-1972) the most effect upon your institution's policy on desegregation? ______________

Of the alumni groups listed above, which one now (post-1972) has made the most effect upon your institution's policy on desegregation? ______________

In what ways has this alumni group made its effect felt? ________________________________
28. List in order of importance three major issues that have been created because of demands for desegregation upon your institution:
   a. _______________________________________________________________________
   b. _______________________________________________________________________
   c. _______________________________________________________________________
   Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important: _________________________________________________________________

29. List in order of importance three major issues which the faculty has raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:
   a. _______________________________________________________________________
   b. _______________________________________________________________________
   c. _______________________________________________________________________
   Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important: _________________________________________________________________

30. List in order of importance three major issues which the students have raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:
   a. _______________________________________________________________________
   b. _______________________________________________________________________
   c. _______________________________________________________________________
   Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important: _________________________________________________________________

31. List in order of importance three major issues which the alumni have raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:
   a. _______________________________________________________________________
   b. _______________________________________________________________________
   c. _______________________________________________________________________
   Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important: _________________________________________________________________
33. How much effect will the implementation of desegregation have on the future of your institution in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University internal governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., administration thereof)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support (including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundation and philanthropic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic programs (inter-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collegiate athletics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal relationships (e.g., HEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State relationships (e.g., Board,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor, Legislature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Please explain, comment, and/or list what you generally perceive as being the most important effects of desegregation on the future of your institution. If you require additional space to complete this question, please use the back of this page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle West</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs Questionnaire

**Part I Background Information**

Please check the appropriate space or provide information where necessary.

1. **Age:**
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 or over

2. **Sex:**
   - Male
   - Female

3. **Race:**
   - Black
   - White
   - Other (please state)

4. **Please indicate your highest academic degree:**
   - Bachelor's
   - Ph. D.
   - J. D.
   - Master's
   - Ed. D.
   - Other (specify)

5. **In what academic area is your highest academic degree?**
   - Education
   - Natural Sciences
   - Business
   - Humanities
   - Theology
   - Law
   - Social Sciences
   - Fine Arts
   - Other (specify)

6. **Are you published?**
   - Yes
   - No
   - If "yes," please indicate the number of publications (books, articles, monographs) bearing your name

7. **Did you graduate from a traditionally black undergraduate college?**
   - Yes
   - No
   - If "yes," please state the name of the institution
   - If "no," please state the name of the institution graduated from

8. **Do you hold faculty rank at your institution?**
   - Yes
   - No

9. **If you answered "yes" to 8, in what area is this rank?**

10. **Do you also teach at your present institution?**
    - Yes
    - No

11. **Number of years in present position**

12. **Have you previously held your present position at another institution?**
    - Yes
    - No

13. **If you answered "yes" to 12, please indicate:**
    - Name of institution
    - Its size: Under 1000
    - 1001-3000
    - 3001-5000
    - Over 5000

14. **If you answered "no" to 12, please indicate:**
    - The position (title) held prior to your current post
    - If it was in an academic institution, please indicate:
    - Name of institution
    - Its size: Under 1000
    - 1001-3000
    - 3001-5000
    - Over 5000

15. **Is your faculty currently under a formal collective bargaining agreement?**
    - Yes
    - No
    - If "yes," who is the bargaining agent (e.g., NEA, AAUP)?

16. **For a copy of an abstract, please check**
    - and provide your name and address:
    - Name:
    - Address:

---
Part II Effects of Desegregation

The second part of this questionnaire is designed to solicit responses which will help describe demands for desegregation upon public black colleges.

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate space for each question or item below.

1. Has your institution made any effort in the past (pre-1972) to formulate a policy on desegregation?  Yes ______ No ______

2. Has your institution made any effort since 1972 to formulate a policy on desegregation?  Yes ______ No ______

3. If you answered "yes" to 1 or 2, what do you feel have been the factors which prompted this policy? Please explain or state: ____________________________

4. If you answered "no" to 1 or 2, what do you feel have been the factors which have not prompted this policy? Please explain or state: ____________________________

In the following series of questions, please circle an appropriate response:
1 = none at all; 2 = very little; 3 = moderate amount; 4 = very much.

5. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect do you feel you have on the formulation of university policies in general?  1 2 3 4

6. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect have you had in the past (pre-1972) in formulating the university policy that relates to desegregation?  1 2 3 4

7. Compared with other members of your university's administrative staff, faculty, and students, how much effect do you feel that you now (post-1972) have on formulating university policy that relates to desegregation?  1 2 3 4

8. As to your response given in 5, 6, and 7 would you please briefly describe how you have affected the formulation of university policy relating to desegregation? ____________________________

In the following series of questions please provide an appropriate response for each group (i.e., faculty through alumni).

9. How much effect do the following general university constituents have as a group on overall university-wide policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>None At all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How much effect have the following general university constituents had as a group on university policies in the past (pre-1972) that related to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How much effect do the following general university constituents now (post-1972) have on university-wide policies that directly relate to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To what extent are your decisions in general on university matters backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. To what extent have your decisions in the past (pre-1972) relating to desegregation policies been backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. To what extent are your decisions relating to the effects of desegregation upon the institution now (post-1972) backed and supported by the following general university constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. There are many off-campus interest organizations which try to effect the development of policies relating to the demands of desegregation upon an institution (e.g., NAACP, CORE). How much effect have these interest organizations had in the past (pre-1972) on university policies that relate directly to desegregation? Please check an appropriate response for each organization listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Organizations (e.g., NAACP, SCLC, PUSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black state political organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic/social organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How much effect do you feel these off-campus interest organizations now (post-1972) have on university policies that relate directly to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Civil Rights Organizations (e.g., NAACP, SCLC, PUSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black state political organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic/social organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Please briefly describe the way(s) in which these off-campus interest organizations have made their effect(s) felt

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

18. There are many on-campus organizations (organized interest groups other than general categories such as faculty, students, etc.) which try to effect university policies relating to desegregation and its implementation (e.g., student government ass'n, faculty senate). How much effect have these organizations had in the past (pre-1972) on university policies that relate directly to desegregation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Please list the on-campus organization(s) that you feel have had the most effect in the past (pre-1972) on your institution's desegregation policies.  
__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

b. How much effect do you feel that the on-campus organizations listed in (a) now (post-1972) have on university policies relating to desegregation and its implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Have you ever attempted in the past to alter or change the institution's desegregation policy by appealing to outside groups for assistance (other than off-campus interest groups already listed)? Yes ____ No ____
19. (continued)
a. If "yes," in order of importance (1 being the most important), please rank in terms of frequency used both pre-1972 and post-1972 the following activities from 1 to 10. You may list and rank accordingly any other groups that do not appear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-1972</th>
<th>Post-1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters to newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV or radio reports addressed to desegregation policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to accrediting agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to influential governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine or newspaper articles addressed to desegregation policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to influential alumni groups or benefactors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to influence foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony about the university before government committees and agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How much effect do you feel the activities checked above in (a) have had on formulating and implementing desegregation policies in your institution?

- Very much
- Moderate amount
- Very little
- None at all

20. How much effect have the following authorities had in the past (pre-1972) in getting your institution to devise desegregation policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State governor or state agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How much effect do the following authorities now have (post-1972) on getting your institution to devise desegregation policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal authorities (HEW, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State governor or state agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Of the five authorities listed in 20 and 21 (Federal, State, and local [if it applies]), which one has had the most effect in the past (pre-1972)? and which one now (post-1972) has the most effect?

Please explain briefly why the authorities stated above had the most effect in getting your institution to devise desegregation policies:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
23. Have you shared information on your desegregation policies with other administrators of public black colleges in the past (pre-1972)? Yes ___ No ___
If "yes," why was this information shared? __________________________________________
____________________________________
If "yes," how was this information shared? __________________________________________
____________________________________
If "yes," to what extent was the sharing of this information helpful?
Very much _____ Moderate amount _____ Very little _____ None at all _____

24. Do you now (post-1972) share information on your desegregation policies with other administrators of public black colleges? Yes ___ No ___
If "yes," why is this information shared? __________________________________________
____________________________________
If "yes," how is this information shared? __________________________________________
____________________________________
If "yes," to what extent has the sharing of this information been helpful?
Very much _____ Moderate amount _____ Very little _____ None at all _____
If "yes," in what way(s) has the sharing of this information been helpful? __________
____________________________________

25. In the following questions please circle an appropriate response:
1 = None at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Moderate amount; 4 = Very much

a. To what extent has the implementation of affirmative action in the past (pre-1972) in terms of personnel policy been of equal concern as the desegregation of the student body?

b. To what extent do you now (post-1972) consider affirmative action in terms of personnel policy to be of equal concern as the desegregation of the student body?

26. Does your institution have any current interinstitutional arrangements? Yes ___ No ___
If "yes," are these arrangements with two-year _____ four-year _____ other (e.g., Army bases) _____ (If all three, please check accordingly.)
If "yes," in what capacity are these arrangements?
Faculty exchange _____ Space sharing _____ Other (please explain) _____
Student exchange _____ Program sharing _____

If "yes," what percentage of the arrangements checked above have been with predominantly white institutions, traditionally black institutions and others (e.g., Army bases) both before 1972 and since 1972?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Pre-1972</th>
<th>Post-1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly white four-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally black four-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly white two-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally black two-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Army bases)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. How much effect have these arrangements had (pre-1972) on the development and implementation of desegregation at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. How much effect do these arrangements now (post-1972) have on the development and implementation of desegregation at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. List in order of importance three major issues that have been created because of demands for desegregation upon your institution:

a. 

b. 

c. 

Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important:

______________________________________________________________

30. List in order of importance three major issues which the faculty has raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:

a. 

b. 

c. 

Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important:

______________________________________________________________

31. List in order of importance three major issues which the students have raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:

a. 

b. 

c. 

Of the issues listed above, please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important:

______________________________________________________________
32. List in order of importance three major issues which the alumni have raised with your institution regarding the desegregation of your institution:

a. 

b. 

c. 

Of the issues listed above please briefly explain why these particular issues have been important:

__________________________________________________________________________

33. How much effect will the implementation of desegregation have on the future of your institution in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Moderate amount</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University internal governance (e.g., administration thereof)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support (including foundation and philanthropic support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic programs (inter-collegiate athletics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal relationships (e.g., HEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State relationships (e.g., Board, Governor, Legislature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board (if it applies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Please explain, comment, and/or list what you generally perceive as being the most important effects of desegregation on the future of your institution. If you require additional space to complete this question, please use the back of this page.
## APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Washington (D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle West</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Far West</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sirs:

Very little information is presently available to the chief executive administrators of public black colleges about the effects of desegregation upon their institutions. My research is designed to focus on the impact of desegregation upon public black colleges and to attempt to explain and interpret that impact upon the present and future life of these institutions.

In that regard, the enclosed instrument has been designed to ascertain the effects of desegregation upon public black colleges. You will recognize that the enclosed instrument is long and may take more than a few minutes of your valuable time to complete. However, there simply are not enough data about the effects of desegregation upon public black institutions and how these effects may affect their futures. Thus, the instrument is designed to explore as thoroughly as possible an area about which little is known. And it is only with your help, and patient attention to the questions contained in the instrument, that more can become known about public black colleges and their response to the issues and problems posed by desegregation.

Therefore, I would be sincerely grateful if you would please take the time to assist me in this important research endeavor by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me at your earliest convenience. You have my assurance that all data collected will be treated confidentially. I have placed a code number on each copy of the questionnaire only to facilitate response coding. You will be identified in no way in any reports which result from this study.

I might add that I have received the support and endorsement of several public black college administrators in this effort (see attached memo). They have recognized that this research can be a significant step towards better understanding of the problems faced by public black colleges.
Finally, a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope has been enclosed with each questionnaire for your convenience. Upon request, I will be more than happy to make available to you a copy of the abstract and summary of the findings as soon as the study is completed. Please feel free to call me or contact me if you have any questions. You may reach me at (614) 422-2424.

Again, thank you for your thoughtful assistance.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Haynes III

LLH/ab

Enclosures
Statement of Endorsement

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BLUFF
PINE BLUFF, ARKANSAS 71601
801/335-5700

Office of the Chancellor

To: Prospective Participants In The Current Doctoral Study of Mr. Leonard L. Haynes III

From: Herman B. Smith, Jr., Chancellor The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Subject: Statement of Endorsement

Date: October 31, 1974

It has been my pleasure to have cooperated closely with Mr. Leonard L. Haynes III, doctoral student enrolled at The Ohio State University, in several facets of his important study from the early rationale for and design of his project until the present time. This cooperation began during the period when I yet served as Director of the Office For Advancement of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and has continued since my departure from that Atlanta location.

Having conferred extensively with Mr. Haynes, having reviewed his materials, and having assisted him in necessary revision of early drafts of manuscripts, I am able to here endorse his work heartily and to commend to your careful attention his requests for assistance as he seeks to secure your active participation in his research.

I am certain that the results of his extended efforts will be instructive and useful to us practicing administrators. Be assured that the quality of his work will be enhanced considerably by your faithful and punctual response to his request for assistance.

Accept my thanks for your help to a young professional who is succeeding in upgrading his knowledge and qualifications for future service.
January 10, 1975

205 Administration Bldg.
190 North Oval Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43210

MEMORANDUM

To: Chief Executive Administrators of Public Black Colleges
From: Leonard L. Haynes III
Subject: "An Analysis of the Effects of Desegregation upon Public Black Colleges"

Although you may not have had an opportunity to complete and return to me the instrument that I mailed to you in December, designed to elicit your responses and comments on the effects of desegregation upon your institution, because of your obvious time constraints and the holiday season, I am asking that you please, at your earliest convenience, do so now.

I am happy to report that I have already received responses, and encouragement, from many of the public black colleges. In addition I have also had the opportunity to visit and meet with the chief executives of Tennessee State, Jackson State, Alcorn State, and Southern Universities in order to discuss with them, in additional detail, the effects of desegregation upon their institutions. In all cases (the returned questionnaires and the interviews) these responses and comments have been most helpful, and informative.

Although you have not responded, I remain hopeful that you will assist me in this important research by completing and returning to me, at your earliest convenience, the instruments that I mailed to you in December. It is true that I am actively seeking your participation in this research endeavor as I regard your responses and comments to be just as valuable and informative as those I have already received. Moreover, your assistance will add greater depth and understanding in examining one of the most crucial areas of policy-making ever to face public black colleges.

In order to help in expediting your response, I have enclosed again the instrument that was mailed to you in December which you may keep for your files or complete and return to me if you have misplaced the earlier one.

Again, thank you for providing me with a few moments of your precious time and for your thoughtful consideration.

LH/ab
Enclosure
Dear Dr.

You have received a questionnaire from Mr. Leonard Haynes, III, a doctoral candidate at Ohio State University. This is a significant study and once it is completed will make a tremendous contribution to higher education.

I know Mr. Haynes and his father very well. I would appreciate your helping Mr. Haynes with his study by completing the questionnaire and returning it to him at your earliest convenience. If you are not able to locate the questionnaire, please make contact with Mr. Haynes at Ohio State University and request another copy.

Thank you very much for cooperating with this study.

Sincerely,

Walter Washington
President

WW/eh

Sign to all three presidents
J.J. mentioned


*The Future South and Higher Education*. Papers compiled by Southern Regional Education Board, 1968. (130 Sixth St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia).


