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The decision of *Urban Education* to publish a special issue on historically Black colleges is timely. There is a growing need for contemporary scholarship on historically Black colleges and universities. The special issue—“The Black College: New Perspectives and Emerging Possibilities”—provides a much needed treatment of the identity and policy issues facing this unique cohort of institutions.

The issue focuses on institutions in urban centers (e.g., Jackson State University) as well as predominantly but not historically Black colleges (e.g., Chicago State University). This collection of articles is a response to the absence of current literature addressing this unique cohort of institutions. Because of the void in the literature, neither researchers, educators, policy makers, nor judicial officials have been able to cite current academic thinking regarding the practices, successes, and/or challenges of urban and/or predominantly Black colleges.

The Black college does not divorce higher education of its responsibility to explore the sociocultural, socioeconomic, political, and familial backgrounds that contribute to African American student attrition and the ramifications of the larger society that perpetuates these characteristics. In fact, Black institutions have made their most historic educational contribution through their profound commitment to and encouragement of their students. Black colleges have an outstanding record in developing supportive educational programs that help students succeed once they are admitted.

Similarly, the increasing numbers of African American students attending Black colleges obviously means that these institutions provide a comfortable environment for postsecondary studies. What is the emerging shape, role, function, and context of the Black college? This four-part question involves issues that have significant implications for public policy and educational planning.
The beginning of the 21st century is an appropriate time to examine historically and predominantly Black colleges. Given the complexity and ambiguity surrounding many of the issues, it is necessary to use multiple scholars and experts to best summarize the status and future of these institutions. The pages that follow include the voices of many of the leading scholars in Black college research. They each lend an important and expert voice on the continuing and emerging issues facing Black colleges.

—M. Christopher Brown II
*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

—Kassie Freeman
*Dillard University*
THE BLACK COLLEGE
AND THE QUEST FOR
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

M. CHRISTOPHER BROWN II
SARAN DONAHOO
RONYELLE D. BERTRAND
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

As remnants of a period in America’s past that some would like pretend did not exist, Black colleges have frequently been devalued and misconstrued. In a time when affirmative action programs are constantly being questioned, these institutions continue to be accused of promoting segregation. However, those who make such claims do so in direct opposition to the history that led to the development of these institutions. Although it is not often discussed, Black colleges have a long-standing tradition of preparing their students for economic, political, and social success. The purpose of this article is to provide an accurate historical and contemporary view of these institutions. Much can be learned from these institutions which have creatively combined academic instruction, cultural edification, and social uplift to generate a program that has been successfully preparing students for more than 100 years.

Higher education in the United States has been characterized by its pattern of limited access, particularly for persons of African descent. Early institutions such as Harvard and Yale were designed to help cultivate a stable upper class so that the next generation could maintain the existing social order. As such, these institutions tended to deny access to those who were not wealthy, male, Protestant, and White. Prior to the end of the Civil War, these admissions restrictions had little impact on the lives of (most) African Americans, who were being socially, politically, and economically suffocated by the institution of slavery. It was not until the
slaves were freed that the lack of available educational opportunities drew significant attention or concern.

Having been prohibited from gaining even a basic education throughout their enslavement, many freed men and women expressed a strong desire to learn. However, the animosity exhibited by their former masters made it impossible for them to attend most preexisting schools at any level. This is the situation that initially fostered the need for Black colleges and universities.

This article provides a historical review and overview of the place Black colleges and universities have occupied in American higher education. Although they have been attacked in recent years as vestiges and promoters of segregation, historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have a history of diversity that predates the Civil Rights movement. The purpose of this article is to provide a more realistic image and history of how these institutions were developed, who they have and continue to educate, the type of academic success they have been able to produce, and the impact these institutions may have on the future of higher education.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HBCUs

HBCUs are generally categorized as institutions of higher learning founded to educate the descendants of former slaves prior to 1964. Recognizing the need for institutions that would accept and educate African Americans, the American Missionary Association (AMA) began to develop school systems designed for freed people following the end of the Civil War (Browning & Williams, 1978). In addition to the AMA, HBCUs were also funded and established by Black churches, the Freedman’s Bureau, local communities, and private philanthropists (Brown, 1999).

The nation has 103 HBCUs. Each of these institutions is clustered in 19 southern and border states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia) plus Michigan and the District of Columbia. The listing below is a list of
historically Black colleges by state, character, type, and date of founding.

Alabama
1. Alabama A & M University (public, 4-year, 1875)
2. Alabama State University (public, 4-year, 1874)
3. Bishop State Community College (public, 2-year, 1927)
4. C. A. Fredd State Technical College (public, 2-year, 1965)
5. Concordia College (private, 2-year, 1922)
7. Lawson State Community College (public, 2-year, 1965)
8. Miles College (private, 2-year, 1905)
9. Oakwood College (private, 2-year, 1896)
10. Selma University (private, 2-year, 1878)
11. Stillman College (private, 4-year, 1876)
12. Talladega College (private, 4-year, 1867)
13. Tuskegee State Technical College (public, 2-year, 1963)
14. Tuskegee University (private, 4-year, 1881)

Arkansas
15. Arkansas Baptist College (private, 4-year, 1884)
16. Philander Smith College (private, 4-year, 1877)
17. Shorter College (private, 2-year, 1886)
18. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (public, 4-year, 1873)

Delaware
19. Delaware State University (public, 4-year, 1891)

District of Columbia
20. Howard University (mixed, 4-year, 1867)
21. University of the District of Columbia (private, 4-year, 1851)

Florida
22. Bethune-Cookman College (private, 4-year, 1904)
23. Edward Waters College (private, 4-year, 1866)
24. Florida A & M University (public, 4-year, 1877)
25. Florida Memorial College (private, 4-year, 1879)

Georgia
26. Albany State College (public, 4-year, 1903)
27. Clark Atlanta University (private, 4-year, 1989)
28. Fort Valley State College (public, 4-year, 1895)
29. Interdenominational Theological Center (private, 4-year, 1958)
30. Morehouse College (private, 4-year, 1867)
31. Morehouse School of Medicine (private, 4-year, 1975)
32. Morris Brown College (private, 4-year, 1881)
33. Paine College (private, 4-year, 1882)
34. Savannah State College (public, 4-year, 1890)
35. Spelman College (private, 4-year, 1881)

Kentucky
36. Kentucky State University (public, 4-year, 1886)

Louisiana
37. Dillard University (private, 4-year, 1869)
38. Grambling State University (public, 4-year, 1901)
39. Southern University A & M College–Baton Rouge (public, 4-year, 1880)
40. Southern University at New Orleans (public, 4-year, 1959)
41. Southern University at Shreveport–Bossier City (public, 2-year, 1964)
42. Xavier University of Louisiana (private, 4-year, 1915)

Maryland
43. Bowie State University (public, 4-year, 1865)
44. Coppin State College (public, 4-year, 1900)
45. Morgan State University (public, 4-year, 1867)
46. University of Maryland–Eastern Shore (public, 4-year, 1886)

Michigan
47. Lewis College of Business (private, 2-year, 1874)

Mississippi
48. Alcorn State University (public, 4-year, 1871)
49. Coahoma Community College (public, 2-year, 1949)
50. Hinds Community College (public, 2-year, 1954)
51. Jackson State University (public, 4-year, 1877)
52. Mary Holmes College (private, 2-year, 1892)
53. Mississippi Valley State University (public, 4-year, 1946)
54. Rust College (private, 4-year, 1866)
55. Tougaloo College (private, 4-year, 1869)

Missouri
56. Harris-Stowe State College (public, 4-year, 1857)
57. Lincoln University (public, 4-year, 1866)

North Carolina
58. Barber-Scotia College (private, 4-year, 1867)
59. Bennett College (private, 4-year, 1873)
60. Elizabeth City State University (public, 4-year, 1891)
61. Fayetteville State University (public, 4-year, 1877)
62. Johnson C. Smith University (private, 4-year, 1867)
63. Livingstone College (private, 4-year, 1879)
64. North Carolina A & T State University (public, 4-year, 1891)
65. North Carolina Central University (public, 4-year, 1910)
66. St. Augustine’s College (private, 4-year, 1867)
67. Shaw University (private, 4-year, 1865)
68. Winston-Salem State University (public, 4-year, 1862)

Ohio
69. Central State University (public, 4-year, 1887)
70. Wilberforce University (private, 4-year, 1856)

Oklahoma
71. Langston University (public, 4-year, 1897)

Pennsylvania
72. Cheyney State University (public, 4-year, 1837)
73. Lincoln University (public, 4-year, 1854)

South Carolina
74. Allen University (private, 4-year, 1870)
75. Benedict College (private, 4-year, 1870)
76. Claflin College (private, 4-year, 1869)
77. Clinton Junior College (private, 2-year, 1894)
78. Denmark Technical College (public, 2-year, 1948)
79. Morris College (private, 4-year, 1908)
80. South Carolina State University (public, 4-year, 1896)
81. Voorhees College (private, 4-year, 1897)

Tennessee
82. Fisk University (private, 4-year, 1867)
83. Knoxville College (private, 4-year, 1875)
84. Lane College (private, 4-year, 1882)
85. LeMoyne-Owen College (private, 4-year, 1862)
86. Meharry Medical College (private, 4-year, 1876)
87. Tennessee State University (public, 4-year, 1912)

Texas
88. Huston-Tillotson College (private, 4-year, 1876)
89. Jarvis Christian College (private, 4-year, 1912)
90. Paul Quinn College (private, 4-year, 1872)
91. Prairie View A & M University (public, 4-year, 1876)
92. Saint Phillip’s College (public, 2-year, 1927)
93. Southwestern Christian College (private, 4-year, 1949)
94. Texas College (private, 4-year, 1894)
95. Texas Southern University (public, 4-year, 1947)
96. Wiley College (private, 4-year, 1873)

Virginia
97. Hampton University (private, 4-year, 1868)
98. Norfolk State University (public, 4-year, 1935)
99. Saint Paul’s College (private, 4-year, 1888)
100. Virginia State University (public, 4-year, 1882)
101. Virginia Union University (private, 4-year, 1865)

West Virginia
102. Bluefield State College (public, 4-year, 1895)
103. West Virginia State University (public, 4-year)

The early curriculum advanced at HBCUs was influenced by the debate between W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington. Both learned men themselves, DuBois and Washington helped to provide valuable leadership to a marginalized and disjointed African American community. Even so, they did not interpret the purpose and mission of HBCUs in the same manner. Symbolized in his establishment of the Tuskegee Institute, Washington was a strong advocate of vocational training. He argued that it was in the best interests of freed people to accept the manual labor employment and roles available, succeed in these positions, and thus prove themselves worthy of better treatment and opportunities. Washington believed that Black colleges should be established to train African Americans to fulfill these roles.

DuBois, on the other hand, did not believe that Black colleges or their students should be so willing to accept segregation. Rather than provide vocational training, DuBois argued that Black institu-
tions should work to develop an elite group known as the talented
tenth that would challenge discrimination and lead Black citizens. He believed that students attending HBCUs should be trained to be doctors, lawyers, teachers, and politicians rather than masons, blacksmiths, or farmers.

Reflecting the influence of both Washington and DuBois, the early curriculum found at many HBCUs was made up of a combination of industrial and liberal arts courses. Many students who attended these institutions learned cooking, sewing, and farming as well as reading, writing, and mathematics. By paying heed to Washington and DuBois, these colleges and universities were able construct environments that allowed them to supply their students with skills that would help them succeed in life as well as in the classroom.

**HISTORIC ROLE OF HBCUs**

Unlike other institutions, HBCUs were founded on and continue to be united by the distinct mission of positioning, preparing, and empowering African American students to succeed in what many perceive to be a hostile society. Applying the notion of racial uplift, these institutions set out to produce students who could not only read and write but who would also be viewed as a credit to both their race and their nation. These institutions not only promoted educational attainment and advancement but also served as a safe haven and cultivated hope in an otherwise racially demoralizing society.

Throughout their history, Black colleges have assumed a double role. As part of a long history of racial inequalities, state systems of higher education “created dual collegiate structures of public education, most of which operated exclusively for Caucasians in one system and African Americans in the other” (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997, p. 96). Although affected by segregation, most predominantly White institutions (PWIs) did not have to address or concern themselves with issues of race. HBCUs, on the other hand, have always been expected to meet the same curriculum standards as other institutions while also providing African Americans with a culture-specific pedagogy. “They must be as much concerned with
Shakespeare, Tennyson, and Marlowe as the white colleges. But the Negro institutions must give equal emphasis to the writings of Paul Dunbar, Countee Cullen, and Langston Hughes” (Mays, 1978, p. 28). Unlike most PWIs, HBCUs have never had the luxury of operating in a vacuum. Since their inception, these institutions have continued to successfully promote an educational agenda that is both academically superior and culturally relevant. As Willie (1981) posited, the success of these institutions and their students has placed HBCUs in the vanguard of higher education.

**PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

Predominantly Black colleges and universities (PBCUs) are similar to HBCUs in their tradition of serving large numbers of Black collegiate students. Whereas historically Black colleges are federally designated, PBCUs include any institution with a 50% or greater Black student enrollment. The nation has 54 PBCUs based on recent federal data. Unlike HBCUs, predominantly Black institutions are scattered across the nation—from California to New York. In addition, PBCUs tend to cluster in urban/metropolitan regions and are more likely to be 2-year institutions or branch campuses of a larger college system. A list of PBCUs is presented below.

**Alabama**
1. Wallace Community College-Sparks Campus (public, 2-year, 1927)
2. John M. Patterson State Technical College (public, 2-year, 1962)
3. Reid State Technical College (public, 2-year, 1963)

**California**
4. Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science (private, 4-year, 1966)
5. Compton Community College (public, 2-year, 1927)
6. Los Angeles Southwest College (public, 2-year, 1967)
7. West Los Angeles College (public, 2-year, 1968)

**District of Columbia**
7. Southeastern University (private, 4-year, 1879)
Georgia
9. Atlanta Metropolitan College (public, 2-year, 1974)
10. Bauder College (private, 2-year, 1964)
11. Columbus Technical College (public, 2-year, 1961)
12. DeKalb Technical College (public, 2-year, 1961)
13. Georgia Military College–August-Fort Gordon Campus (public, 2-year, 1879)
14. Georgia Military College–Fort McPherson Campus (public, 2-year, 1879)
15. Gupton Jones College of Funeral Service (private, 2-year, 1920)
16. Herzing College-Atlanta (private, 4-year, 1949)
17. Central Georgia Technical College (public, 2-year, 1989)
18. Savannah Technical College (public, 2-year, 1929)

Illinois
19. Chicago State University (public, 4-year, 1867)
20. East St. Louis Community College (public, 2-year, 1969)
21. East-West University (private, 4-year, 1935)
22. Kennedy-King College (public, 2-year, 1935)
23. Malcolm X College (public, 2-year, 1968)

Indiana
25. Martin University (private, 4-year, 1873)

Kentucky
26. Simmons University (private, 4-year, 1873)

Maryland
27. Baltimore City Community College (public, 2-year, 1947)
28. Prince George’s Community College (public, 2-year, 1958)
29. Sojourner-Douglass College (private, 4-year, 1972)

Massachusetts
30. Roxbury Community College (public, 2-year, 1973)

Michigan
31. Davenport University-Dearborn (private, 4-year, 2000)
32. Davenport University-Flint (private, 4-year, 2000)
33. Wayne County Community College (public, 2-year, 1967)
Mississippi
34. East Mississippi Community College (public, 2-year, 1927)
35. Mississippi Delta Community College (public, 2-year, 1927)
36. Natchez Junior College (private, 2-year, 1884)

New Jersey
37. Bloomfield College (private, 4-year, 1868)
38. Essex County College (public, 2-year, 1966)

New York
39. Audrey Cohen College (private, 4-year, 1964)
40. Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College (public, 2-year, 1971)
41. Helene Fuld College of Nursing of North General Hospital (private, 2-year, 1945)
42. Long Island College Hospital School of Nursing (private, 2-year, 1858)
43. Medgar Evers College (public, 4-year, 1967)
44. New York City Technical College (public, 2-year, 1971)
45. York College (public, 4-year, 1966)

North Carolina
46. Edgecombe Community College (public, 2-year, 1967)
47. Roanoke-Chowan Community College (public, 2-year, 1967)

Ohio
48. Cuyahoga Community College (public, 2-year, 1963)

Pennsylvania
49. Peirce College (private, 4-year, 1865)

South Carolina
50. Williamsburg Technical College (public, 2-year, 1969)

Tennessee
51. Southwest Tennessee Community College (public, 2-year, 2000)

Texas
52. Bay Ridge Christian College (private, 2-year, 1962)
U.S. Virgin Islands
   53. University of the Virgin Islands (public, 4-year, 1962)

Virginia
   54. Virginia University at Lynchburg (private, 4-year, 1888)

The institutions listed represent a full range of institution types, missions, and histories. Like other higher education organizations, the colleges and universities on this list have employed a variety of strategies to succeed in maintaining needed student enrollments. One strategy some colleges have used is to change the name of the institution. For example, Macon Technical Institute (in Georgia) is now Central Georgia Technical Institute, and Metropolitan Community College (in Illinois) is now East St. Louis Community College Center. Although these institutions remain relatively the same, their current names better reflect the areas they serve, which may also help in attracting students.

Another survival strategy employed by these institutions has been to merge with others. Many of the institutions are the result of mergers between two or more preexisting colleges. In 2000, Davenport University (Michigan and Indiana) was founded when Davenport College, Detroit College of Business, and Great Lakes College merged. This merger allowed the individual campuses to stay and maintain their local history and identity yet also gain the ability to appeal to more students by offering a greater variety of courses.

The literature on predominantly Black colleges is often mistakenly embedded with the literature on HBCUs. The confounding of the literature leads to a confusing malaise of institutional lists with divergent realities. HBCUs are eligible for special federal aid. PBCUs are not. HBCUs were founded during legal segregation. PBCUs were not necessarily founded with a mission of educating Blacks. Conversely, PBCUs have majority Black student enrollments. There are increasing numbers of HBCUs with predominantly Caucasian student enrollments. Acknowledging these differences aids in positioning both sets of institutions within the larger higher education discourse.
Davis (1998) suggested that to understand and appreciate the present situation of HBCUs, we must acknowledge the conditions under which they were developed. Most important, he emphasized the fact that Black institutions are products of a racist and segregated society. Indeed, these institutions were founded and developed in an environment unlike that surrounding other colleges—that is, in a hostile environment marked by legal segregation and isolation from mainstream United States higher education. Historically they have served a population that has lived under severe legal, educational, economic, political, and social restrictions. (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 3)

In spite of the fact that slavery was no longer legal, racist ideologies generally prevented African Americans from exercising the same citizenship and civil rights available to members of the dominant culture.

In 1896, the idea of dual, racially divided societies became a legal reality. Although many African Americans had been denied access to various elements of White society, including most predominantly White higher education institutions, this system was not formalized until the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. This decision made segregation constitutional by ruling that it was acceptable to develop racially divided social systems that complied with the prevailing standard of “separate but equal” (Johnson, 1993). Although this system relegated African Americans to a castelike status within mainstream society, it also created circumstances that have allowed HBCUs and their students, alumni, and communities to flourish. Under segregation, HBCUs helped in the development of Black fighter pilots, international diplomats, labor organizers, and most of the attorneys who later helped to make segregation laws overturned.

Although the notion of separate but equal was the law of the land, it was not the reality for HBCUs or the students they served. HBCUs did not receive the same level of consideration or support given to other higher education institutions. The Supreme Court’s ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) acknowledged that
separating students solely on the basis of race was unconstitutional because separate educational facilities were essentially unequal (Cohen, 1998). In assessing the ruling, Johnson (1993) proclaimed, “The decision was in response to the deplorable conditions in which African Americans were educated and forced to live—conditions which were the result of legally sanctioned segregation” (p. 1409). For the most part, the Brown decision focused on desegregation in primary and secondary public education. The thrust to dismantle dual systems of higher education was not widely supported or promoted until the passage of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Brown, 1999). With the passage of Title VI, states supporting dual systems of higher education were required by law to dismantle them (C. Thompson, 1998).

Even though federal law called for all systems of segregation to be eliminated, 19 states (most located in the South) continued to operate dual systems of higher education: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (Brown, 1999). Although the law was well intentioned, it was difficult to enforce because “the law did not identify what was meant by discrimination based on race or national origin—it just outlawed it. The meaning of discrimination, desegregation, and compliance were not even explored in the legislative evolution of Title VI” (Brown, 1999, p. 8). Therefore, states were given autonomy to interpret and apply the law in their own way. The letter of the law did not clearly define or describe its intent. This inevitably allowed states to uphold the segregated system of higher education.

Despite changes in Title VI, college desegregation remains an issue for concern. Brown (1999) argued that the success of collegiate desegregation is contingent upon the willingness of higher education to (a) “re-designate the missions and institutional statements of those institutions designed to deliver inferior service,” (b) “redefine the financial formula whereby institutions are funded,” (c) “reassess the standards of institutional admission,” and (d) “reinterpret the possibility of incongruent collegiate populations” (p. 11). However, the problem with most desegregation plans is that once they are initiated, Black colleges and universities tend
to suffer the most. The primary issue in *Brown* was that African Americans wanted to have the opportunity to attend schools without being denied access on the basis of race. Following the rise of the New Right, the desire to desegregate American higher education has now turned against HBCUs and PBCUs. Like other institutions, the colleges and universities are increasingly being expected to enroll diverse student populations. In recent years, desegregation decisions have threatened to close and/or merge Black institutions, not the predominantly White colleges and universities that necessitated their development.

**CONTINUING VALUE OF HBCUs IN DESEGREGATED AMERICA**

Under segregation, HBCUs guaranteed college access to African Americans. Whether by choice or default, Black students interested in higher education knew that they would have the opportunity to pursue it at one of the nation’s HBCUs. Although isolated HBCUs and their students, segregation also created a niche population from which HBCUs were able to consistently draw sufficient enrollments. Since the 1960s, higher education has become accessible, ideally allowing full participation irrespective of race, class, or gender.

Even though African Americans now have the opportunity to attend majority Caucasian institutions, research suggests that these institutions may not provide the same level of education or social experiences available at HBCUs and PBCUs. Research shows that Black students at predominantly Caucasian colleges experience the following: (a) lower academic achievement, (b) lower persistence rates, (c) poorer overall psychological development, (d) less likelihood of enrolling in advanced degree programs, and (e) lower postgraduation attainments and earnings (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991). Although such universities may allow them to stay closer to home, many Black students have a difficult time developing a healthy personal identity and often experience feelings of isolation and discrimination on predominantly White campuses.
Although African American students are now given a variety of colleges to choose from, the most prevalent research on college choice by Black students suggests that many prefer to attend Black colleges and universities. According to Davis (1998), about one fifth of all African Americans college students continue to be found at HBCUs. This may be due to the fact that the Black college campus tends to be more accepting and less prejudiced than majority institutions. Unlike other institutions, “HBCUs emphasize the development of black consciousness and identity, black history, racial pride, and ethnic traditions. They provide an African American culture and ambiance that many students find essential to their social functioning and mental health” (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 17). Moreover, Allen (1992) also found that Black students at HBCUs perform better academically and possess higher occupational aspirations than those who attend primarily Caucasian institutions.

Despite their academic and cultural success, HBCUs have been criticized for perpetuating segregation. They are mistakenly perceived as homogeneous entities that only serve Black students. HBCUs were created primarily for the education of African Americans. Unlike most majority institutions, these institutions did not prohibit participation from other groups of people from enrolling or attending. Rather, these institutions have always been inclusive and open to all those who sought access to higher education. In an effort to increase access, HBCUs practically invented the open-door policy, which welcomed all that applied. Although called Black colleges, this term is something of a misnomer, because

the heterogeneous student body of the black college gives them unique status among institutions of higher education. The policy of open admissions goes beyond the acceptance of students with varying preparation for college work. It includes the acceptance of African, Asian, Caribbean, European, Latin American, and White American students. (Hedgepeth, Edmonds, & Craig, 1978, p. 18)

It is ironic that HBCUs have been ignored when the discussion of diversity surfaces when in fact they were perhaps the first higher education institutions that did not discriminate. Not only do
HBCUs embrace people from different racial backgrounds, but they also reach out to those students who have been convinced that they are not college material due to their socioeconomic status, family background, and previous academic performance. Predominantly Caucasian colleges and universities are often self-serving institutions. Some do their best to make admissions as cutthroat, competitive, and difficult as possible by demanding that all potential students have high grade point averages and standardized test scores. Freeman (1998), however, claimed that HBCUs are able to successfully educate students in spite of the predictive validity of standardized tests. The strict selection process of some colleges possibly causes more harm than good because it detours a large number of potential students. The HBCU open-door policy, however, provides more opportunity for more students. Notwithstanding, Black colleges have acquired a negative image because of this policy. D. C. Thompson (1978) contended that

Black colleges literally reversed the tradition of social-class and academic exclusiveness that has always been characteristic of higher education. They invented the practice if not the concept of open enrollment. Their flexible admissions practices and academic standards have been without precedent in higher education. This is, no doubt, a fundamental reason why Black colleges have been so widely criticized by leaders in higher education and why they have been largely ignored by the most prestigious honor societies. (p. 185)

More than any other set of institutions, HBCUs have discarded the notion that higher education is an advantage open only to the rich or socially prestigious. Surrounded by hostile forces, these colleges and universities have established and maintained a tradition of academic excellence. The efforts of HBCUs should not only be applauded but also envied. It is easy to work with students who come to college academically strong. But it is a challenge to work with those students who may have low grades and test scores and, due to certain circumstances, may not be as well prepared. According to Kannerstein (1978), HBCUs are not concerned with who gets admitted but rather what happens to them afterward. Undeniably, HBCUs have readily accepted the challenge and continue to
help students to succeed and beat the odds. Zinn contested the dominant culture’s image of Black colleges, citing,

What is overlooked is that the Negro colleges have one supreme advantage over the others: they are the nearest this country has to a racial microcosm of the world outside the United States, a world largely non-white, developing and filled with the tensions of bourgeois emulation and radical protest. And with more white students and foreign students entering, Negro universities might become our first massively integrated, truly international educational centers. (as cited in Cook, 1978, p. 64)

Incontestably, historically Black colleges have been pioneers in higher education. Although they were created for the education of African Americans, HBCUs have been successful in making higher education more accessible for all students. Indeed, Black colleges have been much more responsive to America’s changing educational needs than most other institutions. Conversely,

Black colleges are not monolithic. Although they are similar to white institutions in many ways, their historical traditions and their levels and types of support make them distinct. Like many other institutions of higher learning, black colleges reflect the diversity that is so characteristic of the United States’ postsecondary education system. This diversity should always be remembered when considering their past, their current conditions, and their future roles in American higher education. (Garibaldi, 1984, p. 6)

Research shows that Black colleges and universities have been the primary educators of African Americans (Allen et al., 1991; Garibaldi, 1984). Roebuck and Murty (1993) noted that Black institutions produced approximately 70% of all Black college graduates up to 1991. In addition, although HBCUs enroll less than 20% of Black undergraduates, they confer one third of all bachelor’s degrees earned by Blacks. In Roebuck and Murty’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Vernon Jordan stated that HBCUs were the undergraduate home to 75% of all Black Ph.D.s, 75% of all Black army officers, 80% of all Black federal judges, and 85% of all Black doctors. Yet, in spite of this high rate of success, HBCUs
often go unacknowledged and unappreciated by much of American higher education.

**FUTURE FOR BLACK COLLEGES**

In spite of America’s efforts to desegregate, access to predominantly Caucasian schools has not and will not eliminate the need for Black colleges. Black colleges continue to provide their students with a social and academic education that is not available at other institutions. Even so, these institutions continue to be dismissed and degraded by many for promoting reverse discrimination. The fact that HBCUs and PBCUs have been attacked for maintaining high numbers of Black student enrollment is somewhat hypocritical. In spite of the existence of desegregation law, many majority institutions continue to maintain high enrollments of White students. Indeed, some of these institutions have little or no diverse enrollment whatsoever. Yet, rarely if ever are these institutions criticized for drawing such populations. Although these colleges and universities are encouraged to recruit students from other races, cultures, and ethnic groups, they are not threatened with severe sanctions such as closure if they are unable to attract diverse students. The fact that HBCUs face such threats suggests that dual systems of education continue to exist and affect higher education policy.

For American higher education to move forward, more positive consideration and attention must be given to Black colleges. After more than 30 years of formal desegregation, majority colleges are unable to attract, educate, or prepare students of color as well as the nation’s Black colleges. Rather than laud these institutions for having high concentrations of diverse students, other institutions would do well to try to learn from them.

**NOTE**

1. J. M. Patterson State Technical College was originally chartered in 1947.
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THE MISALIGNMENT BETWEEN THE CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS AND BLACK COLLEGES

JAMES COAXUM III
Rowan University

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have played a unique function in the American higher education system. However, research on HBCUs remains scant. One reason for the lack of research may be due to the fact that scholars have not engaged in studies that examine the diversity among these institutions. Collectively, the mission, role, and function of these institutions have been documented in the research literature. Yet, no study has considered the individual identity that exists between and among these institutions. This article highlights the misalignment that exists between the Carnegie Classification and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). The case is made for a separate classification that solely focuses on HBCUs. However, in doing so, such a classification must be based on variables that are unique to HBCUs and not just traditional classification variables.

Perhaps one of the most commonly used tools in the world is the process of classification. Classification is a very central process in all facets of our lives (Bailey, 1994). Regardless of who, what, where, when, why, and how, the context of everything falls into some type of classification. The grouping and classification of objects into distinct types is a basic orientation of human agents to their situation (Tiryakian, 1968). Crowson (1970) noted that classifying phenomena is the most fundamental and characteristic activity of the human mind. Everitt (1993) provided an excellent illustration of classification by explaining that “naming is classifying” and that “every noun in a language is a label used to describe a class
of things” (p. 1) with similar features. Thus, for example, the terms teacher, pilot, doctor, lawyer, and mayor all describe different classes or types of professions.

Even as higher education evolved in the United States, colleges divided their labor and coalesced into sectors, each offering a form of education designed for a different segment of the market (Ruscio, 1987). Colleges were divided along lines of mission, size, type, orientation, geographical location, and other factors. The division of colleges and universities along these dimensions resulted in taxonomies and typologies that set the context for these institutions. Although many classification schemes exist, more are needed to further understand higher education in the United States, especially classifications that highlight the distinctiveness of the more than 3,000 higher education institutions in existence. One such area in higher education where classifications should be explored is historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs).

The research literature in higher education is scant on HBCUs. The lack of research in this area is caused by the fact that there is no typology, taxonomy, or classification system of HBCUs (Coaxum, 1999). Bailey (1994) pointed out that without classification, there is no advanced conceptualization, reasoning, data analysis, or social science research. Romesburg (1984) stated that “classifications are essential building blocks in all fields of research” (p. 2). The nonexistence of a classification that sorts HBCUs into more precise categories leads many to believe that all HBCUs function and operate in an homogeneous manner. The incorrect thought that undergirds this fallacy must be challenged through research. Although these institutions collectively were established with the same goal in mind, to provide education to a population once denied education under the law, there are vast differences among these colleges and universities.

A recent review of the literature on HBCUs reveals that no study has looked at the differences and similarities among these institutions. In light of the early role and function of these institutions in preparing Blacks to enter careers in teaching and the ministry, it is not surprising that the distinctiveness of HBCUs has escaped the attention of social scientists. Since the establishment of the first
HBCU in 1837 until now, these institutions have moved away from the single focus they once had to embracing the unique needs and demands of an ever-changing and increasingly diverse society.

Today, there are 104 HBCUs that make up 3% of the total number of higher education institutions. As of 1997, 50 of these institutions were public, 54 were private, 89 were 4-year institutions, and 15 were 2-year institutions (White House Initiative on HBCUs, 1997). Beyond this general classification (see Table 1), much remains to be learned about HBCUs.

Research scholars (Allen, 1985, 1986; Fleming, 1984; Smith, 1981) have continued to point out the importance of HBCUs. Smith reported that HBCUs provide assets for Black students that are unavailable at White institutions, including offering an accepting environment and unconditional emotional support. Fleming noted that HBCUs foster healthy social relationships, whereas Allen pointed out that HBCUs educate students with learning deficiencies and provide opportunities for students to assume leadership roles. From an academic perspective, Allen, Epp, and Haniff (1991) reported that Black students attending HBCUs perform better academically than do Black students attending predominantly White institutions (PWIs) and HBCU students also tend to go on to graduate school in higher proportions.

However, despite differences in size, type, and mission, research has tended to lump all HBCUs into the same category. After more than a century of existence, it is not logical to assume that all HBCUs are functioning and operating as they did when they were founded. Even among themselves, HBCUs have unknowingly created a division of labor. Today more than ever, the division of labor must be differentiated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4-Year Institution</th>
<th>2-Year Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One step to better understanding the nature of this differentiation while ensuring that more research is done on HBCUs is through the development of a typology or classification of HBCUs that highlights the differences and similarities among these institutions. Moreover, it can serve as an organizing framework for future studies in this area.

DEFINING THE MISALIGNMENT

Within higher education, few classifications actually exist, and those that do exist are often found to be inadequate or wanting due to their limited depth and scope. A brief examination of the Carnegie classification provides an excellent illustration of this point. The Carnegie classification categorizes American colleges and universities on the basis of highest level of degree offered and the comprehensiveness of their missions (Boyer, 1987, 1990). The original Carnegie classification was conceptualized in 1973 by the Carnegie Commission lead by Clark Kerr (Lagernmann, 1988). Since that time, four updates were made to the classification system in 1976, 1987, 1994, and 2000, respectively. Although this classification is the most widely used classification system known in the field of higher education, research scholars (Braxton, Smart, & Theike, 1991; Katsinas, 1993; Korb, 1982) have pointed out the incongruities in this classification as well as with other lesser known higher education typological and classification schemes.

Korb (1982) noted that traditional classification schemes such as Carnegie separate institutions into broad categories. He added that to be able to make comparisons within these broad categories on micro-level analyses is virtually impossible. Braxton et al. (1991) also noted the inconsistencies with the Carnegie classification when controlling for variables other than institutional type. Katsinas (1993) pointed out that often traditional classifications miss the diversity among certain types of colleges and universities, with the result that they are treated as homogenous institutions when they are not so contextually. Perhaps Boyer’s (1994) comments best illustrate Katsinas’s point: “The Carnegie Classification
does not begin to describe the richness of American higher education” (p. viii).

Nonetheless, it cannot be said that the Carnegie classification is static. In fact, it has been updated four times. Recognizing the need to expand classification categories, the 1994 update of the Carnegie classification introduced for the first time a new category called tribal colleges and universities that took into account cultural context and institutional distinctiveness. Boyer (1994) stated that it is important to place within the Carnegie classification categories for institutions whose joint efforts define distinctive missions; in effect, these institutions create new clusters based not on degree level but on their special qualities. Boyer’s statement is essentially a call for not only new categories within Carnegie but also for new classifications that accurately highlight the distinctiveness among the nation’s highly diverse colleges and universities. Thus, this article singles out HBCUs as a target for such a classification.

It is important to note that HBCUs do not make up a separate group in the Carnegie classification, yet taken collectively, these institutions have a distinctive mission to serve the higher education needs of a special population, namely, African Americans. Using the Carnegie classification system to examine HBCUs limits higher education research to solely examining the role, scope, and mission of these institutions while ignoring their special qualities. Table 2 shows the number of HBCUs in each of the 10 Carnegie classes based on the most recent 2000 classification update.

An important question to ask is the following: What can be learned about HBCUs from the Carnegie classification? The answer to this question is simple: One learns that HBCUs range in institutional type from the doctoral/research extensive to the associate’s, with nearly two thirds of HBCUs being baccalaureate institutions. According to this classification system, most HBCUs are liberal arts colleges in which the baccalaureate is the highest degree awarded. But there are also HBCUs that award doctoral, master’s, and associate’s degrees. One can conclude that the Carnegie classification shows diversity of HBCUs as related to types and degrees offered. Beyond these general statements, however, there is still much more knowledge to be gleaned from these institutions through other classification techniques.
HBCUs are misaligned in Carnegie classes because their scope and mission go far beyond the type and number of degrees they award. By virtue of the fact that Carnegie represents more than 3,500 colleges and universities, many institutions are lost in classes that have no bearing on their true scope and mission (Coaxum, 1999). Moving beyond these inherit limitations, scholars such as Katsinas (1993) and Breneman (1994) used smaller subsets of Carnegie to develop classifications that more accurately depict the distinctive identity of certain institutions. These smaller subsets allow institutions to be aligned in the context of other peer institutions. Katsinas’s classification focuses on community colleges, and Breneman’s focuses on private liberal arts colleges. This article calls for a more in-depth analysis of HBCUs through a classificationary perspective. Such a classification would allow HBCUs to be aligned with peer institutions and more aligned with their purpose.

### EARLY ATTEMPTS TO CLASSIFY HBCUs

Although the merits and contributions of classifications to higher education are significant, there are potential risks associated with classification construction. Bailey (1994) noted that among
criticisms, classifications are descriptive rather than explanatory. They are pretheoretical and thus do not explain and predict. For HBCUs in particular, the use of classifications has threatened their survival. According to Anderson (1988), the first attempts to classify HBCUs were made by W.E.B. Dubois in 1900 when he classified 34 HBCUs as colleges. In 1910, Dubois made a second attempt to classify HBCUs. In essence, his classification was to serve as a tool designed to strengthen the HBCU system by concentrating college-level work in 32 of what were considered the better HBCUs. Dubois’s classification resulted in a three-tiered system that consisted of first-grade colored colleges, second-grade colored colleges, and third-grade colored colleges.

Anderson (1988) also noted that the establishment of accrediting agencies and educational foundations also threatened the existence of HBCUs. Many HBCUs were threatened because they did not have the adequate resources to gain status as an accredited college. Thus, Jones (1913) published a book on HBCUs in which he critically attacked the existence of these colleges. He identified only two institutions that were capable of offering college-level instruction. HBCUs could not exist apart from the power and control of White standardizing agencies (Anderson, 1988).

The discussion concerning the survival of HBCUs still lingers today. Institutional resources are still the primary judge for most accrediting agencies. Although HBCUs historically have been underfunded, today they are still rated against other types of institutions that permit them to be viewed out of context. Thus, the historical use of the term classification raises many concerns for proponents of HBCUs due to the negative implications. This is no surprise given the historic nature of classifications in creating a hierarchical system among America’s colleges and Universities. But rather than focusing on the negative implications, proponents of HBCUs must use classification techniques to gain insight into the diverse nature of these institutions and the critical role they serve in higher education. Astin (1993) criticized classification models that favor institutional resources and contended that classifications should be based on the value added or the educational impact to students by higher education institutions.
TOWARD A CLASSIFICATION FOR HBCUs

Research has proved to be a fundamental and vital component of today’s society and is used throughout every context of the American experience. In its simplest form, research is the exploration for explanations to daily occurrences. It is through these explanations that knowledge is conceived and then produced. The historic and unique role of HBCUs in educating its clientele suggests that these institutions place far greater emphasis on students as opposed to the institution. Historically, institutional resources at HBCUs have been modest. Despite these modest resources and facilities, HBCUs manage to have a tremendous impact on students (Fleming, 1984; Thompson, 1973). Thus, to build a classification scheme of HBCUs solely based on institutional characteristics without giving attention to student characteristics would be unfair and preposterous. To substantiate this claim, Astin (1993) stressed the need for classifications that underscore the importance of institutional impact on students. Because the impact on students at HBCUs is noteworthy (Allen et al., 1991), it seems appropriate to include measures of student entry characteristics and measures of student outcomes as components of a classification for HBCUs (Coaxum, 1999). The choice to include student entry characteristics and student outcome measures is further validated by the fact that although enrolling nearly one fourth of all Black collegians, HBCUs produce nearly one half of all Black baccalaureates.

Careful attention must be given to including data that go beyond the theoretical underpinnings of traditional classifications that rely solely on institutional characteristics as the primary factor for classifying institutions. However, the significance of institutional characteristics to classification studies must not be neglected because of its relationship to earlier studies (Boyer, 1994; Katsinas, 1993; Korb, 1982; Teeter & Christal, 1984) and should also be used in the development of a classification scheme for HBCUs. Thus, based on a cross-section of literature on HBCUs, Coaxum (1999) proposed a model as one way to conceptually construct a framework for a classification scheme for HBCUs (see Figure 1). Although this conceptual design is in no way the definitive conceptual framework for a
classification, it is a good starting point for this exploratory analysis. The evidence for this framework is derived from a cross-section of literature on HBCUs and literature on classification.

**STUDENT ENTRY CHARACTERISTICS**

HBCUs invented the practice of open enrollment (Thompson, 1978). The one theme that unites all HBCUs is that they have traditionally accepted students who otherwise would not have gone to college (Kannerstein, 1978). This has been the collective mission of HBCUs. These institutions admitted students whose educational backgrounds or economic circumstances prevented them from attending other institutions. Therefore, including the entry characteristics in a classification scheme seems appropriate so that the educational impact on these students could be measured.

**INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

Benjamin Mays (1971) surmised that HBCUs have always done so much with so little and so few. HBCUs were expected to produce more with less than any other segment of higher education (Robinson, 1978). To most, it seemed a paradox that these institutions would accept students who had educational deficiencies and within a 4-year period transform them to compete with their counterparts at PWIs. But for HBCUs, this was the essence of education, taking “certain students who are rejected by most or all afflu-
ent, high-ranking, prestigious white colleges and produce a relatively large proportion of top-flight college graduates” (Thompson, 1978, p. 182).

The funding patterns at HBCUs have always been unfair (Jones & Weathersby, 1978). But Merrill (1978) noted that the intellectual and moral quality of HBCUs could not be compromised because of limited resources. Any institutional characteristic variables selected for a classification of HBCUs should be based on their importance in the direct or indirect educational process of HBCU students. Research scholars link the success of HBCUs in educating its students to a number of factors, including but not limited to faculty and student-teacher ratio, size, cost to attend, financial aid, endowment, and expenditures on instruction (Fleming, 1984; Hedgepeth, Edmonds, & Craig, 1978; Jones & Weathersby, 1978; Thompson, 1978).

STUDENT OUTCOME CHARACTERISTICS

Outcome variables are important to any study of HBCUs. Kannerstein (1978) noted “the concern of black colleges is not with who gets in but what happens to them afterward” (p. 37). He further explained that the entering qualifications of students at HBCUs are important but secondary to the qualifications of a graduating student. Allen (1986) noted that HBCU students, compared to their counterparts at PWIs, enter college with lower academic preparation but leave college as equally prepared as their counterparts at PWIs. These institutions graduate a higher proportion of Black students and have granted a disproportionate number of degrees to Blacks than any other segment of higher education. Braxton et al. (1991) discussed the relative importance of using educational outcomes to study peer institutions.

CONCLUSION

In sum, HBCUs are misaligned with the Carnegie system because the Carnegie’s classes are too broadly defined and thus overlook the distinctive aspects of HBCUs. Although the Carnegie
classification has contributed greatly to our understanding of higher education in America, research scholars must continue to challenge existing paradigms to further explicate our understanding of higher education institutions. The classifications developed by Katsinas (1993) and Breneman (1994) are the first steps in that direction. The next step is the development of a classification scheme for HBCUs.

The White House Initiative on HBCUs (1997) emphasized the need for the American public to learn more about the tremendous impact that HBCUs have had and continue to have on the American economy. There is no question that HBCUs have made a significant impact in the field of higher education. These institutions are responsible for the Black middle class in America. The top four institutions that send Black students to medical schools are HBCUs. These colleges and universities also make up 17 of the top 21 undergraduate institutions that produce Blacks who obtain doctoral degrees (White House Initiative on HBCUs, 1997). This article will, it is hoped, spark discussions that will lead to more research on these institutions as we continue to examine their role in higher education.
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BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL EMPOWERMENT
HBCUs’ Challenges for the Future
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The purpose of this article is to specifically examine the role that historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have played and continue to play in economic development, how these institutions have contributed to the cultural empowerment of African Americans, and the important ways HBCUs have bridged the gap between the two to make a valuable contribution to African Americans specifically and America in general.

No community has ever reached the shores of liberation and equality and empowerment without maintaining and increasing the capacity of their own indigenous institutions.


In this statement, Gray (see Joiner, 1998) accurately captures one of the primary historical and future roles of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in the African American community and in America in general. As the institutions that were founded to educate African Americans, HBCUs are vital to the empowerment of their communities—historically, culturally, and economically.

The role of higher education institutions in the economic development of society has been well documented. For example, eco-
omics of education theorists such as Carnoy (1994), Merisotis (1998), Schultz (1961), and Thurow (1972) have written about the benefits of education to society. Merisotis (1998) concluded that societies benefit from higher education monetarily and non-monetarily. That is, some of the societal monetary benefits of higher education include increased tax revenue, greater productivity, and greater consumption. Although often not recognized, societies also benefit from higher education because of reduced crime rates, increased charitable giving or community service, improved ability to adapt to and use technology, and greater involvement in political activities (Merisotis, 1998, p. 2).

Although we know a great deal about the role of higher education in economic development, educators and policy makers know considerably less about the role of higher education in cultural empowerment, particularly as it relates to the role that distinctive higher education institutions such as HBCUs have played and continue to play in empowering African Americans. Even less is discussed or written about the role that HBCUs play in bridging the gap between economic development and culturally empowering African Americans and why a better understanding of this linkage is important. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to more specifically examine the role that HBCUs historically have played and continue to play in economic development, how these institutions have contributed to the cultural empowerment of African Americans, and the important ways HBCUs have bridged the gap between the two to make a valuable contribution to African Americans specifically and America in general.

To examine these issues, this article focuses on the importance of culturally empowering underrepresented groups in society in general and particularly African Americans in this country. More specifically, the article defines cultural empowerment and provides a rationale for understanding the linkage between cultural empowerment and economic development. Next, it provides a historical overview of the roles that HBCUs have played in the cultural empowerment of African Americans and the economic development of this society. It concludes with the vitally important challenges that HBCUs will face in the new millennium trying to
continue to bridge the gap between economic development and cultural empowerment.

UNDERSTANDING THE LINK BETWEEN CULTURAL EMPOWERMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic development and cultural empowerment are intricately linked, particularly for underrepresented groups in society. Therefore, it is important to understand the concepts of cultural empowerment and economic development and to understand the role that HBCUs have played in carrying out both tasks.

CULTURAL EMPOWERMENT

If culture is defined as the process through which a group develops its ways of being and knowing, cultural empowerment can be defined as the procedures through which a group of people develop a belief system in their capabilities—that is, their ability to achieve. Individuals who are culturally empowered first and foremost understand the importance of history and heritage of their culture. Next, they take pride in those contributions made by ordinary individuals as well as individuals of their culture who have made significant accomplishments. Being culturally empowered creates a sense of psychological well-being that enables individuals to take pride in their culture, clearly understanding that there are varying views and actions among individuals who make up the cultural group. Being culturally empowered is enormously important, particularly for groups who are underrepresented in a society (i.e., smaller populations), because not to feel empowered culturally can create feelings of inferiority, hopelessness and despair, entrapment, and disenchantment among members of the group.

There are many ways in which the process of cultural empowerment can occur, but the most direct way is through education—that is, developing a historical and systematic knowledge base about the accomplishments of individuals who are similar by culture, particularly by race and ethnicity. Also, creating an atmosphere where
individuals who are underrepresented in society can find an environment that is open and accepting of their views is important to culturally empowering groups.

Because of the very nature of their founding, one of the main contributions of HBCUs, whether intentionally or not, has been to culturally empower individuals of the African American community. The works of researchers such as Allen (1992), Anderson (1988), Davis (1998), Epps (1972), Fleming (1984), and Wilson (1994) have, in a sense, laid the foundations for understanding the role of HBCUs in culturally empowering African Americans.

Drawing on these researchers’ works, some of the ways in which HBCUs have culturally empowered African Americans include the following: (a) providing students with an understanding of African American historical and cultural accomplishments, (b) creating an accepting environment, (c) reinforcing students’ sense of self, (d) preparing students to negotiate race in education and work, and (e) developing personal and professional networks. For example, these researchers (Allen, 1992; Anderson, 1988; Davis, 1998; Epps, 1972; Fleming, 1984; and Wilson, 1994), in effect, have found that HBCUs have historically and culturally filled a niche that no other higher education institutions were or are willing to serve and that students who attend these institutions are psychologically and professionally well served. In fulfilling these needs, Davis (1998) has indicated that “these institutions are sources of cultural capital” (p. 148). In addition to serving the role of cultural capital, they have had an impact on their students, their communities, larger American society, and international states through economic development.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Understanding the ways in which HBCUs have contributed to economic development of their communities and to the country as a whole also has merit. The role that HBCUs have served in economic development with the African American community can be characterized in two broad categories: (a) the labor market experiences of their graduates and (b) the linkages with their neighboring communities. Unfortunately, as Constantine (1999) has noted, very little research has been conducted on HBCUs from an economic
perspective. However, from her work on the labor market experiences of Black college students, Constantine concluded the following:

Given their relative lack of resources, HBCUs are providing a relatively less expensive and academically accessible vehicle to four-year degrees and labor market success. This study has also reinforced the important role HBCUs play in providing access to four-year institutions for Black students, in addition to their success in preparing Black students for the labor market. (pp. 100-101)

Because Constantine’s (1999) study was quantitative, such studies often cannot capture the importance of role modeling on labor market experiences. That is, for groups to maximize their economic potential, they must have a belief in the people like themselves to achieve. For example, when African Americans see the economic success of so many prominent African Americans who are HBCU graduates (such as Oprah Winfrey and Andrew Young), they realize that they too can achieve individually and collectively. This is certainly an area where more research is needed.

Constantine’s study (1999) also points out the important role that HBCUs play economically for the larger society through the labor market experiences of their graduates. That is, not only are HBCU graduates experiencing the psychological and cultural benefits of attending HBCUs, but these institutions are producing graduates for the labor market that, in some cases, other institution types will not accept. The nonmonetary benefits (e.g., the intergenerational benefits) alone to this society of educating these students is incalculable. For example, as Davis (1998) stated, “The primary responsibility for creating a Black middle class is often laid at the feet of these schools [HBCUs]” (p. 143).

In other ways, HBCUs have served to economically develop Black communities. Because many HBCUs are geographically situated in urban areas in predominately Black neighborhoods, they have provided vitally important services to empower not only their neighborhoods but to empower African Americans in general. There are many examples of HBCUs that have established partnerships with their communities. For example, when Johnnetta Cole was president of Spelman College, she taught courses to students
who lived in the inner-city neighborhood surrounding the Atlanta University Complex. Coppin State College in Baltimore has received national recognition for managing a public school that was failing to serve the needs of Black children. Other HBCUs that have been directly involved with school programs to assist their surrounding communities include Howard University (Washington, D.C.) and Albany State University (Albany, Georgia). Although these examples are not widely discussed in the larger society, HBCUs have and continue to be situated to serve economically the needs of African Americans who are greatly underserved. As such, these institutions should be used as models for developing programs to better understand the role of higher education institutions in bridging the gap between economic development and underserved communities.

THE HISTORIC ROLE OF HBCUs IN BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN CULTURAL EMPOWERMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

According to Davis (1998), it is very important to understand the historical context of HBCUs because “the present situation of these schools and their students cannot be understood and appreciated without some knowledge of historical events that influenced the development and current state of these institutions” (p. 144). When the first Black colleges were founded more than 150 years ago, they filled an important void that existed in the educational terrain of Black America (Willie & Edmonds, 1978). According to researchers such as Murty and Roebuck (1993), these institutions demonstrated as early as 1837 a remarkable capacity to survive and serve as a cultural and intellectual enclave for America’s Black populace.

In the decade following the emancipation proclamation (1863), it became evident that a system of formal education must be established for the sole purpose of directly addressing the relevant needs and conditions of the newly freed Black citizens (Bullock, 1967). “Education, then, according to the more liberal and dominate segments of missionary philanthropists, was intended to prepare a college-bred black leadership to uplift the black masses from the
legacy of slavery and the restraints of the postbellum caste system” (Anderson, 1988, pp. 240-241). Although, according to Anderson (1988), there may have been a difference of opinion as to the type of education that Blacks should receive while attending HBCUs, there was little doubt that HBCUs should serve the central role of uplifting Black people. Anderson stated it in this way:

At the core of different educational ideologies and reform movements [the role of higher education in the overall scheme of Black education] lay the central goal of preparing black leaders or “social guides,” as they were sometimes called, for participation in the political economy of the New South. (p. 239)

To fill the need to uplift culturally and economically, predominantly Black colleges increased rapidly in numbers in the mid-1800s. From 1 in 1854, the number of HBCUs grew to more than 100 by the middle of the 1900s (Franklin & Moss, 1988). Since their founding, HBCUs have played a unique role in the cultural empowerment and economic development of African Americans. Davis (1998) summed it up in this way:

These institutions, without doubt, not only occupy significant space in diversifying the nation’s higher educational landscape but also play a critical role in the cultural lives of their students and within African American communities that benefit culturally and economically from their presence. (p. 144)

Both Anderson (1988) and Davis (1998) have been in agreement that African Americans have always been active agents in their educational opportunities. That is, the African American community has always envisioned the development of HBCUs as an opportunity to control the direction of their education. In early studies of the social and economic conditions of Black college graduates, Davis (1998) stated that in one of the earliest studies of these institutions conducted in the early 1900s by DuBois, focusing on the educational and cultural contributions of these schools and their graduates, “DuBois’ analysis, although at times accusatory and highly critical, generally presented a favorable picture of Black colleges” (p. 146).
Although the progress of HBCUs has not been easy, they have never moved from two of their core values: (a) uplifting African Americans individually and collectively and (b) economically empowering their graduates and African American communities. Throughout the achievement of their core values, they have in turn served the American society in general and international communities. However, to continue to serve their communities and the American society at large, these institutions in the next millennium will face multiple challenges.

**CHALLENGES HBCUs WILL FACE IN CONTINUING THE LINKAGE BETWEEN CULTURAL EMPOWERMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

There are many challenges that HBCUs face now and will face in the future. Among the challenges that HBCUs will face in the future related to continuing the linkage between cultural empowerment and economic development include but are not limited to (a) playing greater role in knowledge production as it specifically relates to African Americans, (b) being involved to a much greater extent in urban development, and (c) having more leaders with vision and an understanding of the need to bridge the gap between cultural empowerment and economic development.

**GREATER ROLE IN KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION**

As Freeman (1998) indicated, who produces the knowledge controls how a people will be presented; that is, “who conducts research and where and how it is produced have tremendous implications for both the authenticity and the outcomes of research findings and public policy” (p. 2). As long as the majority of research that is conducted on African Americans and HBCUs is conducted by non–African Americans, particularly individuals who have no knowledge of the cultural characteristics of African Americans or HBCUs, the capabilities of African Americans and of these institutions will continue to be severely minimized.
For HBCUs to continue their role in culturally empowering African Americans, these institutions in the future will need to play a much greater role in producing the knowledge that defines how African Americans develop their ways of being and knowing. Founded for the sole purpose of educating Black Americans, no other institution types have the historical and cultural heritage to be greater producers of knowledge on African Americans or HBCUs. However, HBCUs have to find ways to have more of their faculty engaged in research and practice related to culturally empowering African Americans. Also, because cultural empowerment, as indicated earlier, means individuals developing a historical and systematic knowledge base about individuals with similar cultural heritage, HBCUs have to ensure that their curriculums reflect knowledge about the accomplishments of African Americans. In other words, HBCUs curriculum, more than any other institution types, should be infused with knowledge about the accomplishments of Blacks globally.

In an information-based, high-tech economy, knowledge production becomes even more important than in the past. Those cultural groups who allow the greatest amount of knowledge about their community to be produced outside their community will essentially be enslaved to the producers of the knowledge.

GREATER ROLE IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Because many HBCUs are located in urban areas, as these areas continue to be undeveloped or underdeveloped, the viability of HBCUs themselves are intricately linked to the development of these communities. As such, HBCUs can and must play a greater role in urban development. In every area, from innovative teacher education programs to welfare and work programs to crime prevention programs to job creation programs, HBCUs are in the best position to play a much greater role in urban development.

However, as stated in the 1995-1996 annual report of the President’s Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (1996), “HBCUs are often an untapped resource for research, technological, and analytical competence” (p. 11). Yet, no other
institutions can provide the combination of expertise and cultural affinity to address the needs and development of urban areas. HBCUs must pay particular attention to ways that they can be more closely aligned with their urban neighborhoods. Because HBCUs tend to be intricately linked to these neighborhoods, in many cases the future of HBCUs will be tied to the redevelopment of these urban areas.

MORE LEADERS WITH VISION AND UNDERSTANDING OF NEED TO BRIDGE GAP

In a recent article in *Black Issues in Higher Education*, Roach (2000) wrote that Black institutions in the 1980s that were led by high-profile college presidents began attracting national attention. The attention led to increased interest from high-achieving African American students who were looking for ways to connect or reconnect with their communities. For example, one student stated as his rationale for selecting Howard University, “I believe there’s a diversity within the Black community that I will experience” (Roach, 2000, p. 37).

However, more often than not, high-achieving students who choose to attend HBCUs indicated as their reason for enrollment that they were pursued by personal contact via telephone or in person with the president or other administrative leaders. Because HBCUs often do not have the financial resources to compete with the scholarship packages that elite predominately White institutions can offer, HBCU leaders who are creative and have vision will increasingly be needed to both recruit and create environments for a range of student types.

Aside from recruiting high-achieving students in the 21st century, leaders of HBCUs also have to provide opportunities for uplifting those African American students who will not be welcomed at any other institution types. Although not necessarily an easy task, the very founding of HBCUs was based on culturally empowering and thereby providing economic development through education for African Americans.

Historically, those leaders, such Benjamin E. Mays and Booker T. Washington, who had the vision and understanding of the need to
bridge the gap between cultural empowerment and economic development for the African American community were and are considered the among the great educators of our time. Instead of departing from their legacy, those HBCUs and their leaders who stay true to their heritage will be the ones that survive in this century and beyond. As Gray (see Joiner, 1998) indicated, no community has reached the shores of liberation and empowerment without increasing the capacity of their own institutions. In the African American community, HBCUs have been the institutions to provide liberation and empowerment.
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THE IMPACT OF A HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE ON AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS
The Case of LeMoyne-Owen College

JACQUELINE FLEMING
Texas Southern University

An exploratory study assessed the impact of LeMoyne-Owen College (LOC) on students. Eighty randomly selected students (34 freshmen and 46 seniors) participated. They received measures of college adjustment (to the LOC mission), faculty interaction, study habits, personal management, and social adjustment. Results were controlled for social class, aptitude, and variations in age. The results showed that (a) seniors scored higher on all five scales measuring aspects of college adjustment, (b) the strongest effect was the impact of the LOC mission, (c) males showed more widespread development by a factor of 3 to 1, (d) vocational aspiration was the best predictor of grades, and (e) grade point average was the best predictor of the socioeconomic status of vocational aspiration and was positively affected by LOC. The most important implication for institutional action is the power of the mission statement to presage effects on students. Implications for the study of Black student development in college are discussed.

There is general evidence that the impact on students of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) is more positive than that of predominantly White colleges, which may or may not be true in the case of an individual Black institution. For example, Allen (1987) has reported that despite the limited resources on Black campuses, Black students purchase psychological well-being, cultural affinity, nurturing relations, and happiness. According to Cheatham, Slaney, and Coleman (1990), students at a Black institution scored higher on the degree to which a student’s lifestyle is consistent with or promotes good health and wellness practices,
although there were no comparative controls for social class. Fleming (1984) determined that students in Black colleges exhibited approximately twice as much evidence of academic and intellectual growth in Black colleges from freshman to senior year, after controls for social class and aptitude. DeSousa and Kuh (1996) found that although Black students were involved socially at both a historically Black college and a predominantly White college, those at the Black college were more engaged academically and reported greater educational gains in more areas. Even though students entering Black schools are farther behind, several studies have found no differences between graduates of Black and White colleges on critical achievement measures, such as graduate level standardized tests (Centra, Linn & Parry, 1970), critical thinking, reading comprehension, and mathematics achievement (Bohr, Pascarella, Nora, & Terenzini, 1995). Although Baratz and Ficklen (1983) found no difference in the market value of Black and White colleges with no controls for background differences, Constantine (1995), assessing effects later in individual careers, found that the value added in future wages was 38% higher in HBCUs compared with White institutions. Fleming (1984) has suggested that the Black college advantage lies in the constructive network of interactions available to students compared to the relative isolation often found in predominantly White institutions. Whereas Black students on Black campuses appear to have more frequent interactions with friends, mentors, and peers in extracurricular activities, faculty interaction and specifically faculty support of student development may be the most consistent effect of Black schools. There is, however, mixed evidence of sex differences in the impact of Black colleges on Black students such that male development was more positive than female development and that male and female development in Black colleges was more along traditional lines than at White colleges (Fleming, 1983, 1984; see also Braungart & Braungart, 1989; Ganong, Coleman, Thompson, & Goodwin-Wallace, 1996). Thomas (1981), however, found that in terms of prompt graduation, the effect of a Black college on Black females was twice as positive as on Black males.

What is the impact of LeMoyne-Owen College (LOC) on its students? LOC is a small, private, historically Black college in the
South that is engaged in an effort to systematically assess its effect on students to assist in the process of change. LOC’s mission statement suggests that it provides an atmosphere in which students are challenged, supported, and developed. But is this really the case? This study reports a pilot effort to gather empirical evidence as to LOC’s unique academic and personal impact and to define areas for further institutional action.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purposes of the study were fourfold. First, the study was designed to assess the current impact of LOC on students to determine whether the LOC mission was fulfilled in the eyes of students. Second, the study developed instruments to assess development in critical dimensions of the college experience, namely, faculty-student interaction, study habits, personal management, and social adjustment. Third, although this pilot effort was not designed to assess a wide range of effects in the cognitive domain, freshman-senior differences in as well as correlates of grade point average (GPA) and vocational aspirations were of interest.

HYPOTHESES

In accordance with the literature, it was expected that (a) seniors would exhibit greater evidence of positive adjustment and performance compared to freshmen that could not be attributed to differences in socioeconomic status (SES), aptitude test scores (i.e., ACT), or age; and (b) although sex differences in the impact of LOC were expected, the nature of these differences could not be specified with precision.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Participants for the study were 80 students, 30 male and 50 female. Of this number, 34 were freshmen and 36 were seniors. The average age was 24.6. Whereas freshmen were in the traditional age
range of 18 to 22, seniors tended to be much older, with age ranges up to 38 for males and 48 for females \((F = 63.4, \ p < .001)\). ACT scores were available for only 36 (45\%) of the study population, with an average score of 16.6. Average GPA was 2.77, and seniors achieved significantly higher GPAs \((F = 18.19, \ p < .001)\). The average SES score on the Hamburger (1983) scale, which uses a 7-point scale (in which 1 is the highest score), was 4.0. Although scores ranged from 1 to 7, the most frequent SES scores were 5 and 6, indicating a preponderance of manual and service workers. Males scored higher on the measure of SES (i.e., achieved lower scores) \((F = 5.30, \ p < .05)\).

MEASURES

Five scales were developed for this study to assess the following areas of institutional concern.

*The College Adjustment Scale.* The LOC mission statement was submitted to a content analysis. The analysis revealed that three kinds of promises were made to students, that is, to provide an atmosphere in which they will be supported and challenged and in which their development will be encouraged. A 15-item instrument assessed student perceptions of the effectiveness of the LOC mission statement. Three subscales assessed degree of agreement on a 6-point scale, with five items measuring perceived degree of support, challenge, and development. The resulting alpha was .948. Subscale alpha scores were .867, .865, and .888, respectively. All items in this scale were positively stated.

*LOC Faculty Adjustment Scale.* The Faculty Adjustment Scale, a 24-item instrument assessing the perceived quality of faculty relationships, was adapted from Fleming (1984). Five subscales assessed degree of agreement with items measuring perceived faculty performance, faculty expectations, degree of faculty interaction, satisfaction with faculty, and management of faculty interactions. After psychometric analysis, two items were deleted. The resulting alpha score was .907. All items were retained for subscale scores. Subscale alphas were .750, .683, .762, .791, and .491,
respectively. Of the items, 33% (8 of 24) of the items were stated negatively.

*Study Habits Scale.* The Study Habits Scale, a 24-item instrument assessing perceived approaches to studying, was adapted from Fleming (1996). Four subscales assessed the degree of agreement with items measuring time spent studying, structured study habits, meta-organization of studying, and managing interference with study. After psychometric analysis, one item was deleted, with a resulting alpha score of .871. All items were retained for subscale analysis. Subscale alphas were .679, .649, .753, and .679, respectively. Of the items, 21% (5 of 24) were stated negatively.

*Managing College Life Scale.* The Managing College Life Scale is a 16-item instrument that assessed perceived managerial approach to college. Four subscales assessed degree of agreement with perceived time management, managerial self-concept, stress management, and strategic planning. After psychometric analysis, 15 items were retained, with a resulting alpha of .809. Subscale alphas were .606, .666, .676, and .348, respectively. The Strategic Planning subscale was dropped due to a low alpha of .348. Of the items, 43% (7 of 16) were stated negatively.

*Social Adjustment Scale.* The Social Adjustment Scale, adapted from Fleming (1984), is a 25-item instrument that assessed quality of relationships on campus. Five subscales assessed degree of perceived adjustment to people, friends/intimates, belonging, leadership, and social management. After psychometric analysis, four items were deleted, with a resulting alpha score of .776. Subscale alpha scores were .551, .560, .532, .777, and .218, respectively. The Social Management subscale was dropped due to a low alpha. Of the items, 12% (3 of 25) were stated negatively.

**PROCEDURE**

The instruments were developed by the principal investigator in accordance with LOC goals and concerns and were administered by members of the Office of Academic Affairs to a random sample
TREATMENT OF DATA

The analysis sought to determine significant freshman-senior and male-female differences on scores to the five scales and subscales. Thus, the major statistical tool was analysis of variance. Each scale and subscale was submitted to a two-way ANOVA with class (freshmen, seniors) and sex (male, female) as the independent variables. Each significant result was then submitted to an ANOVA, controlling separately for social class, aptitude (ACT score), and age. A covariate control for age was necessary due to the wide age range, especially among women. Note that class and age were significantly correlated \( r = .66, p < .001 \) so that the analysis is an unusually conservative one. Only variables surviving the initial ANOVA and all covariate controls were considered for discussion. The frequent interactions by sex suggested different patterns of development for males and females. Therefore, ANOVAs were performed separately within sex.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine correlates of GPA and SES of vocational aspiration. All study scales and subscales were entered into the equation along with background variables of sex, SES, ACT score, age, and class.

RESULTS

THE IMPACT OF COLLEGE ON ALL STUDENTS

LOC seniors scored higher than freshmen an all five of the college adjustment scales (see Figure 1). Freshmen scored lowest on study habits and social adjustment (3.27 was the standard score) and highest on managing college life (4.39). Seniors scored lowest on social adjustment (3.65) and highest on managing college life (4.88). The scales did differ in the extent to which the subscales showed significant effects. The College Adjustment Scale showed the strongest effects of any scale in that all three of its subscales,
Support, Development, and Challenge, produced significant differences that held across all controls. On the other hand, the Managing College Life Scale produced significant effects for only one subscale, the Managerial Self-Concept. Seniors also achieved higher GPAs. These findings hold even after conservative controls for the differential effects of social class, ACT score, and age. No significant effects were found for SES of vocational aspiration.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF LOC

Interaction effects were observed for three of the five scales: Study Habits Scale ($F = 4.57, p < .05$); Managing College Life Scale ($F = 7.44, p < .01$); and Social Adjustment Scale ($F = 6.22, p < .05$). For all three scales, males showed significant freshman-senior differences in favor of seniors, whereas females showed nonsignificant differences. Figure 2 displays the four-way means. When the male results were submitted to an ANOVA with controls for social class, ACT, and age, significant freshman-senior differences in favor of seniors were found for the three scales showing interaction effects: Study Habits Scale ($F = 25.76, p < .001$); Managing College Life Scale ($F = 33.35, p < .001$); and Social Adjustment Scale ($F = 10.62, p < .01$). These effects were true even after controls for social class, ACT score, and age. Note that GPA did not survive the control for age and that SES of occupational choice was...
nonsignificant. When female results were submitted to an ANOVA, only the Faculty Adjustment Scale showed a significant freshman-senior difference in favor of females ($F = 6.981, p < .01$). Furthermore, two of the five subscales of the Faculty Adjustment Scale, Faculty Expectations and Faculty Interaction, and the Development subscale of the College Adjustment Scale also showed significant effects. Despite the apparent differential freshman-senior impact of LOC on males and females, there were no overall sex differences for any of the scales or subscales. This indicates that although males show evidence of more change from freshman to senior year on three scales, their senior scores do not significantly outdistance females.

CORRELATES OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

To determine the significant correlates of academic performance, the scale and subscale scores as well as background variables (including sex and class) and SES of vocational aspiration were entered into a stepwise multiple regression equation. Figure 3 displays the results for all students. It shows that for all students, SES of vocational choice was the strongest correlate of GPA ($beta = .3544$), followed by the Managing College Life Scale (.3513); the ACT score (.3012); the Adjustment to Friends subscale, which loads negatively ($-.2731$); and class (i.e., seniors;
.2547). These five variables accounted for 51% of the variance in GPA for all students. Given the previous sex differences in the impact of college, the regression analysis was run separately for males and females, although sex did not load as a significant factor in the previous equation.

Among males, the strongest correlate of GPA was the Managing Interference With Study subscale ($beta = .5580$), followed by the Faculty Interaction subscale (.5359); the Structured Study Habits subscale, which loads negatively ($-.4809$); SES of occupational choice (.3408); and the Adjustment to Friends subscale, which loads negatively ($-.2222$). These five variables accounted for 73% of the variance in GPA. For females, the strongest correlate of GPA was the ACT score (.3937), followed by the Managing College Life Scale (.3815); SES of occupational choice (.3439); class (i.e., seniors: .2462); and the Adjustment to Friends Subscale, which loads negatively ($-.2080$). These five variables accounted for 58% of the variance in GPA. Note that the Managing College Life Scale is the only significant correlate of GPA that is also positively affected by LOC.

**CORRELATES OF VOCATIONAL ASPIRATION**

The study variables were entered into a regression equation with SES of vocational aspiration as the dependent variable. For all students, the strongest and only predictor was GPA ($beta = .3996$). For males alone, the only significant correlate was GPA (.4888). For females alone, the results were more complicated. The strongest predictors were the Stress Management subscale, which loaded
negatively (−.4296); GPA (0.4478); the Development subscale (0.3842); and the ACT score, which loaded negatively (−.2847). The Development subscale was the only variable positively affected by LOC. This suggests two opposing forces influencing occupational choice in female students: stress-test management that acts to depress ambition and performance and development acting to enhance ambition. It may be that able females (i.e., with higher ACT scores and stress management ability) lower their ambitions in accordance with sex role conventions (to reduce sex role stress). Figure 4 depicts the female results.

DISCUSSION

The bulk of previous research has shown that historically Black colleges have a more positive psychological, interpersonal, academic, and cognitive impact on Black students than do predominantly White colleges. The results of the present study of LOC were consistent with previous research in showing widespread positive impact on students. There were, however, important sex differences in the results.

GENERAL IMPACT OF LOC

For the entire sample of 80 students, LOC had a positive impact on all five areas that were measured by questionnaire: perception of the LOC mission (i.e., college adjustment), adjustment to faculty,
study habits, management of college life, and social adjustment. In all comparisons, seniors scored higher than freshmen, and the effects held even after conservative controls for social class, ACT score, and wide age ranges. Seniors achieved better grades, and the effect held even after controls for differences in social class, ACT scores, and age. The strongest effect observed was for perceptions of the LOC mission, indicating that seniors more often felt that LOC provided support, challenge, and development. Indeed, the College Adjustment Scale (i.e., LOC mission) was the only scale whose subscales all showed significant effects. This provides support for the contention that the mission statement acts to guide student development and should be considered a powerful mechanism for change (e.g., Winter, McClelland, & Stewart, 1981).

Because college adjustment is not synonymous with academic performance, the determinants of better performance were assessed. There were five predictors of GPA for all students: SES of vocational choice, Managing College Life Scale, ACT scores, Adjustment to Friends subscale, and academic classification for seniors. The Managing College Life Scale was the only full scale that exhibited higher scores among seniors and also made a significant contribution to academic performance. The development of time management, long-range planning, and stress management as well as the management of people assists the improvement of performance. The only other subscale to contribute significantly to GPA was Adjustment to Friends, but this subscale of the Social Adjustment Scale loaded negatively. This finding suggests that low involvement (or satisfaction) with friends contributes to better performance. It is reminiscent of research suggesting that African American students have difficulty finding a peer group subculture that is supportive of academic achievement (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992) and therefore develop the loner philosophy more typical of African American achievers (Fullilove & Treisman, 1990). Note that seniors did not score higher than freshmen on occupational aspirations and that GPA was the only significant predictor of occupational ambition. In short, the path to better academic performance appears to be (a) to aim high; (b) to develop good personal management of time, stress, planning, and people; (c) to develop good verbal and analytical reasoning skills, dis-
played on the ACT; (d) to maintain low involvement with peers; and (e) to stay in college, because performance improves the longer one stays. These ingredients appear to be half the battle (i.e., account for 51% of the variance in GPA), but this study cannot speculate on the nature of the other half.

**SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF LOC**

Although there were no sex differences in the major study variables, the freshman-senior differences from which impact is inferred were greater for males than females. This indicates that although males show evidence of more change from freshman to senior year on three scales, their senior scores do not significantly outdistance females. Put another way, greater male development appears to enable them to catch up to females. This pattern holds true even when the interaction effect is not statistically significant. The impact on females appears limited to faculty-related development, whereas male development centers on personal management and leadership. The traditional sex role appropriateness of the male-female patterns is obvious. Furthermore, although the most important key by far to female adjustment was self-management skills, female college development appears compromised by sex role pressures.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACTION**

What institutional actions are implied by these findings? First, all of the impact effects on students were positive. They suggest an environment characterized by increasingly better adjustment to friends, faculty, and people in general. They also suggest increasing personal strides in academic and personal management. The nature of the results for LOC is in sharp contrast to the findings for Black students in White colleges, which are colored by alienation and social isolation. This is significant because a positive student environment should be compatible with positive efforts toward change. Second, the LOC mission statement appears to deliver what it promises in terms of support, challenge, and development for students in general. The scale adapted from the mission statement pro-
duced the strongest effects in the study, indicating that the mission statement appears to have great power to guide student development. This power should be exercised to full advantage.

Third, the effects of LOC are positive, but the effects are not necessarily tied to increasing academic performance or occupational ambition. Therefore, institutional strategies to raise the level of academic functioning and aspirations—which are closely related—would be appropriate. Fourth, because this preliminary study did not include a wide range of cognitive skills tests, the next step in assessing the institution’s impact would be to assess strengths and weaknesses in the institution’s effects on a series of intellectual skills, including critical thinking. Fifth, sex differences that appear to be sex role appropriate indicate that relatively speaking, the impact of LOC on women is limiting. The institution should therefore seek to understand the process by which sex differences in development occur and how to broaden the developmental effects for women. For LOC, the key to change appears to be the mission statement. The results of this study suggest that if the mission statement was recrafted to include specific and ambitious intellectual goals as well as a goal of gender equality in education, these goals could well be realized.
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THE NOT-SO-INVISIBLE PROFESSORS
White Faculty at the Black College

LENOAR FOSTER
University of Montana

This article explores the growing phenomenon of increasing and majority numbers of White faculty members at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in the United States and the implications that such a growing presence has for the traditional mission and activities of these institutions. The author explores the historical and contemporary presence of White faculty members at HBCU institutions and discusses both the unresolved and emerging issues, problems, and challenges that must be squarely confronted if these institutions are to remain successful in educating and empowering large numbers of African American students in the future.

For students enrolled in historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) situated in or near urban metropolitan areas, the urban landscape serves as both training ground and testing laboratory for the efficacy of educational ideas and the proper conduct of the American ideal. The dynamic tension generated by the pluralistic nature of the urban environment begs for educational utility and the involvement of all its diverse constituencies in bringing solutions and varied perspectives to complex issues. Such has been the service of HBCU institutions to urban populations through the achievements of their many graduates and faculty members. For example, the educational, political, economic, and cultural activism generated in many urban and rural communities during the Civil Rights movement in this country can be traced, in part, to the engagement and involvement of students who attended Black col-
leges and universities located in or near some of the nation’s prominent urban centers. It does not take too much historical mental energy to visualize the demonstrations and sit-ins at department stores, restaurants, and bus stations and the voter registration drives in such urban areas as Birmingham, Alabama; Atlanta, Georgia; Jackson, Mississippi; New Orleans, Louisiana; and even in the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C., to document that student involvement. The graphic picture of Black students from North Carolina A&T State University in Greensboro, North Carolina, facing personal injury and arrest in desegregating public accommodations such as lunch counters, remains a visual benchmark of Black student activism emanating from a Black college campus situated in a major urban corridor.

In more contemporary times, HBCUs have tackled some of the most pressing issues facing metropolitan regions. Many educational programs and activities at HBCU institutions, in large measure, have been enormously accommodating in addressing many of the distinct problems and dilemmas that are unique to the urban drama. This educational engagement in urban settings has included activities such as staffing educational and health clinics, participating in varied community-building initiatives, fostering educational and economic partnerships with urban communities to promote and develop the social capital of the most disenfranchised individuals in many urban communities, and establishing grassroot organizations and programs that develop leadership skills and personal efficacy in urban youth and adults to foster more community determination in local political and economic initiatives. In the area of K-12 education, departments and schools and colleges of education at many HBCU institutions are addressing the need to recruit, prepare, and train minority teacher candidates for service in public and private schools, particularly in schools located in major urban centers where the academic needs of increasing numbers of minority students require special attention and a determined focus for the educational success of a variety of students. Fueled by the fact that there will be a need for 1.7 to 2.7 million teachers by the year 2008-2009 and by the fact that there has existed for the past decade or more a growing cultural gap between the number of minority students enrolled in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools
and the pool of minority teachers, especially African American teachers, to teach them in many of the urban metropolitan areas (Foster, 2001; Goodwin, 1991; Sleeter, 2001; Southern Education Foundation, 1988; U.S. Department of Education, 1990), HBCU institutions are addressing a critical issue that will have a significant impact on the future of life and activity in the nation’s urban centers.

Winfield and Manning (1992) have observed that “a critical component identified in effective schools is a strong culture in which norms are imposed on participants in order to facilitate greater academic and behavioral demands on students” (p. 183). In HBCUs, this strong culture, in large part, has consisted of dedicated faculty members whose history and connections with the regions (both urban and rural) in which such institutions are situated have been defining marks of the education received by African American students. In most instances, these faculty members have been predominantly African Americans. Recent trends in the diversification of faculties, particularly in the growing numbers of White faculty members, at HBCUs have called into question the continued ability of HBCU institutions to create effective learning and nurturing environments for African American students in particular, to be educationally responsive to both urban and rural communities that have depended on such institutions for significant and involved relationships and partnerships, and to produce graduates whose knowledge, skills, insights, and perspectives are particularly efficacious for urban and rural settings.

FACULTY DIVERSITY AND INSTITUTIONAL CONNECTIONS: A FRAMEWORK FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

With respect to faculty ranks, HBCUs are more racially diverse than predominantly White institutions of higher education in the United States (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Slater, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1991). Slater has observed that the “only significant diversity in academic ranks in this country exists in Black colleges and universities” (p. 67). Since 1995, faculty mem-
bers of Asian descent have made up nearly 8% of the total faculty numbers at HBCU institutions, a statistic doubling their general faculty numbers in predominantly White institutions nationwide. In 1993 and 1995, African American faculty comprised 66% and 59%, respectively, of all faculty in HBCU institutions (News and Views, 1998; U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

White faculty constitute 25% or more of all faculty members in HBCU institutions (News and Views, 1998; U.S. Department of Education, 1996). Of late, White faculty members have come to constitute a near majority or majority of faculty members in many HBCU institutions. Among HBCU public and private institutions situated in or near urban areas where White faculty number at least 40% or more of the full-time instructional faculty are Xavier University of Louisiana (New Orleans), Harris-Stowe State College (St. Louis, Missouri), Lincoln University (Jefferson City, Missouri), Delaware State University (Dover), Tennessee State University (Nashville), and Shaw University (Raleigh, North Carolina). At some HBCU institutions, such as Kentucky State University (Frankfort) and the University of Maryland–Eastern Shore (Princess Anne), which are situated in more rural settings, White faculty constitute the majority of full-time instructional staff. And in some rare instances at HBCU institutions, such as at Bluefield State College and West Virginia State University, both in West Virginia, White students are in the majority, and White faculty represent 92% and 80%, respectively, of the faculty at the two institutions.

Although this phenomenon is occurring amid watchful eyes and some amount of perplexed astonishment, many observers relate that the natural cause of this situation can be attributed to the fact that in recent history, as the bastions of legalized segregated higher education have been brought down by federal and state legislation, HBCUs must “fulfill educational goals far beyond those initially set” (U.S. Department of Education, 1991, p.1). Those initial educational goals have included providing a postsecondary education to countless numbers of African American college students who were barred from attending traditionally White institutions and providing formative educational experiences that have instilled a sense of pride and accomplishment in African American achievement. Thompson (1976, as cited in Willie & Edmonds, 1978) also
stressed that the “central challenging mission of Black colleges has always been that of transforming socioeconomically and academically handicapped Black youth into productive citizens, competent professionals, businessmen, and leaders” (p. 188). Pettigrew (1971) concluded that “the missions of the Black colleges over the past century, then, have ranged from producing an articulate Black middle class and concerted protest for change to serving as cultural repositories and links to Africa” (p. 816). In these educational missions, the accomplishments of HBCU institutions have been unequivocal. Of all African Americans who have received degrees in dentistry and medicine, 80% have received their professional education at two traditionally urban Black institutions, Howard University and Meharry Medical College; three fourths of all African Americans who hold doctoral degrees received their undergraduate education at HBCU institutions; three fourths of all Black officers in the armed services were educated at HBCU institutions; four fifths of all Black federal judges are graduates of HBCU institutions; HBCUs are leading institutions in awarding baccalaureate degrees to African American students in the life sciences, physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering; and HBCU institutions rank high in terms of the proportion of African American graduates who pursue and complete graduate and professional training (Roebeck & Murty, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 1996).

The cultivation and attainment of academic achievement by African American students within a concerned, caring, focused, and success-oriented community remains a defining mark of the work of HBCUs and their administrators and faculties. The need for this continued educational mission by HBCU institutions takes on greater urgency today in the face of the inability of predominantly White institutions of higher education to retain significant numbers of African American college-age students and to provide inclusive and positive educational experiences for them during the most formative periods of their higher education. Despite almost 30 years of affirmative action and diversity initiatives on predominantly White campuses to create an inclusive educational environment, African American students continue to encounter major barriers to academic success and social involvement on these campuses. Assaults on affirmative action and other diversity initiatives have
challenged the commitment of predominantly White colleges and universities and their administrators and faculties to further efforts at creating inclusive learning environments that benefit both majority and minority students on their campuses. Whatever commitment is voiced by administrators and faculties continues to dissipate despite the ongoing rhetoric of the value, benefits, and strengths of diversity and inclusiveness. Continued protests by African American and other minority students (Hoover, 2001) for measures of respect and support in making White campuses more inclusive and educationally enriching from diverse perspectives point to the ongoing struggles that American higher education institutions face in making their campuses welcoming enclaves for diverse populations.

HBCUs have always navigated the balance between identity and participation in educating African American students for engagement and success in the wider context of American society. African American administrators and faculty members have been central and crucial to the work of student success and achievement on HBCU campuses. On many of these campuses, public or private, African American administrators and faculty have been the single most driving force in creating educational environments and goals that resonate with the diverse learning styles, motivations, and aspirations of African American students. In no small measure, these administrators and faculty have been able to accomplish their educational mission and goals because in their very persons they have been able to provide models of excellence and engagement for students that defy what is spoken and unspoken about the achievement and success of African Americans in the wider society. In many concrete and powerful ways, these models of excellence and engagement, epitomized by the success, work, and engagement of African American faculty on HBCU campuses, have been efficacious for student achievement because they have mirrored the complex dynamic of how success is attainable and achievable against a historical and contemporary backdrop of insurmountable obstacles that are constructed to result in failure for African Americans. More important, African American students have been able to make visible cultural and personal connections with African American administrators and faculty at HBCU institutions, which serve as
anchors of inspiration, support, and resource—elements that have been documented as being sorely deficient in the educational experiences of African American students on many predominantly White campuses (Hoover, 2001). The growing numbers of White faculty on some HBCU campuses challenges, in the minds of many African Americans, the continued ability of these institutions to remain faithful to African American cultural uplift and as centers for African American educational values. This state of mind is occasioned by the realization on the part of many in the African American community that desegregation of education at all levels in America has more often than not resulted in a diminishment of African American cultural and intellectual perspectives, leadership, individual efficacy, and empowerment. Inevitably, this state of mind challenges HBCU institutions in their commitment to a wider diversity of input and expression in sustaining an educational environment that creates a balance between identity and participation in the education of African American students in the new millennium. Challenging to the educational context of HBCU institutions is the behavior, both overt and covert, of Black faculty, administrators, and students toward White faculty and students as “other” and representative of the dominant external culture within the majority environment of the Black institution.

WHITE FACULTY AT HBCUs: A HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY PROFILE

The largest number of colleges and universities for the higher education of African American students was established in the South during the 30 years following the Civil War. With the exception of those institutions founded by Black religious organizations, northern White mission societies were primarily responsible for administering and staffing the majority of the early collegiate-type institutions established for African Americans in the South. Guyden, Foster, and Miller (1999) noted that

historically Black colleges have always had a white presence. From the beginning, white participation in Black education was the rule
rather than the exception as missionary organizations, religious denominations, and individuals took up the mantle of education for slaves and newly enfranchised freedmen. (p. 1)

Browning and Williams (1978) observed that

the missionaries tended to mix social, economic, and religious ideas in their dedication to the task of uplifting the freed men and women. They were moved not only by their religious convictions but by the social and economic values that had produced the Yankee Protestant society of the North—particularly in New England. They were in agreement that someone needed to demonstrate that former slaves could be remade into the ideal of a Yankee, Calvinist, American citizen. Their common goals were to save souls, educate the minds, care for the bodies, and prepare the freed men and women for their responsibilities as new citizens of the South. (p. 69)

For almost a quarter century after the establishment of higher education institutions for African Americans, the majority of administrators and faculty were White idealistic missionaries who were assisted in their educational endeavors by a nominal group of Blacks who had been educated in the North (Browning & Williams, 1978; Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Harris, 1971). Slater (1993) further observed, “Even well into the twentieth century, most Black colleges were still controlled and dependent on whites for operating funds. For the most part, these institutions were ruled by white administrations and staffed by white faculty” (p. 67). So predominant was the presence of White faculty and administrators in these institutions that “it was not until 1926 that Mordecai Johnson became the first Black president of Howard University—60 years after the institution was founded” (Slater, 1993, p. 67).

As the stamp of accreditation increasingly marked the status and quality of higher education institutions in America from 1900 onward, an important goal of Black colleges was to be accredited by regional and national accrediting associations. Because accrediting requirements, in part, called for certain percentages of faculty to hold advanced and terminal degrees, Black colleges experienced difficulties, in varying degrees, in meeting this provision. Private and religiously affiliated Black colleges continued to depend on the services of White faculty, who had aligned themselves with these
institutions for various religious, social, and political reasons, to meet the accrediting standards for advanced prepared faculty members.

During the 1940s and 1950s, an increasingly valuable and available faculty pool for Black colleges was composed of European immigrants, many of them Jewish scholars, who had fled to the United States to escape the tyranny of oppressive regimes and restrictions. As the Civil Rights Movement of the late 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s pervaded the national landscape, eliminating de jure segregation laws in all facets of daily living and activity, faculty diversity at both private and public Black colleges was enhanced by the presence of young, liberal, and idealistic White faculty who had participated in many of the activities of the movement for equal rights, particularly in the area of educational access and opportunity. Johnson (1971) observed, “These young people brought with them some strange and exciting new ideas from such places as Berkeley, MIT, and the Peace Corps. They also brought a not inconsiderable capacity for work, which leavened the impact of their ideas” (p. 806).

In more contemporary times, White faculty have been increasingly attracted to Black colleges and universities because these institutions are among the few higher education institutions where opportunities for academic employment remain open and viable amid shrinking full-time and tenure-track professorial ranks in academia at predominantly White institutions. In addition, as resolutions to quarter-century-old college desegregation suits are reached, decisions inherent in those resolutions include a mandate for increased desegregation of HBCUs through recruitment of White faculty and students (Gose & Hebel, 2001; Mills & Buckley, 1992).

In some extreme cases, majority White faculty have replaced previously Black majority faculty at some HBCUs. A host of factors accounting for this occurrence have been put forth. For example, at Bluefield State College in West Virginia, where Whites make up 96% of the faculty and African American students constitute 8% of the total student body, changing demographics and competition for students have been cited as reasons for the change in institutional profile. Bluefield State College officials have noted that between 1950 and 1990, the population of the service area covered
by the college has experienced a 35% population decline, from a high of 173,000 to 113,000. Of this demographic change, the population of African Americans in the area declined from a high of 32,000 to 14,000, representing a decline in Black population of 56% (Suggs, 1997b). Given this state of affairs and other conditions, Bluefield State College president Robert Moore, who is White, has concluded, “The problem that we find ourselves in now—and we’ve been in this situation for some 35 years—is that the Black . . . student population has declined to the point that it’s quite difficult to attract others to come to this institution” (Blitzer, 2000). Similar reasons for the change in institutional profile of West Virginia State College have also been advanced, in which White faculty account for approximately 85% of the total faculty and White students are 87% of the student population in a state where African Americans comprise just about 3% of the population (Blitzer, 2000; Suggs, 1997b; U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

In accounting for the rise of majority White faculties and student bodies at some HBCUs, some observers contend that both history and systematic planning are changing the history and traditions and the faculty and student makeup of many Black colleges and universities. Reverberations from Brown vs. Board of Education and the resolution to quarter-century-old college desegregation cases in some parts of the country are dramatically changing the profile of some HBCU institutions where mandates for greater student and faculty diversity are driving forces. In many instances, the degree and extent of such mandates are placing African American faculty and students in minority situations at some HBCU institutions. For those observers who see a deliberate plan in place to reduce the “Blackness” of many HBCU institutions, a chain of events can be described that appear systematic in nature. For example, at Bluefield State College in West Virginia, some observers have noted that dormitories have not existed on the campus since 1968, when authorities closed them to contain student activists. As a consequence, Black enrollment has plummeted because there is no housing for potential Black students who might attend the college. With a lesser Black student presence, a White campus administration since 1968, and an increasingly majority White faculty and student
body from a predominantly White region, Black traditions and history associated with Bluefield State College have vanished (Suggs, 1997b).

HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY LENSES: PROFILING WHITE FACULTY AT HBCU INSTITUTIONS

Public and internal dialogue at HBCU institutions about the presence and role of White faculty has at times been pointed and excoriating. This discussion occurs and continues to occur because of two reasons: (a) the historical remnants of White presence at HBCU institutions, which has been variously characterized as paternalistic, controlling, pacifying, and opportunistic, and (b) the rise of Afrocentricism on many HBCU campuses and the attendant need for more Black faculty to support this educational perspective and the educational experiences associated with it as a core activity. Foster, Miller, and Guyden (1999) have noted that “historically Black colleges and universities have traditionally been welcoming of diverse faculty, particularly white faculty, out of historical and educational need” (p. 190). However, past and present observers of educational intent on HBCU institutions have argued that “it is not patent that the nonBlack presence on these campuses has always been in the best interests of Black educational development” (Johnson, 1971, p. 805).

Several views about the motivations and reasons why White faculty teach at HBCU institutions are contained in the limited literature on the topic, and negative views, at least among some older and younger Black faculty and students, continue to persist in the informal underground of thinking about the role and place of White faculty at Black colleges and universities. Warnat (1976) stated that it has been a general assumption by the dominant White culture that white members of faculties at Black institutions of higher learning, most often, are those individuals who are unable to obtain faculty positions at white institutions of higher learning, primarily due to a low level of competence in the particular academic discipline. (p. 335)
Smith and Borgstedt (1985), for example, in their study of factors influencing the adjustment of White faculty in six predominantly Black public and private colleges in the South and North, found that negative attitudes and comments from significant others, family members, and friends “attached some stigma to their position” (p. 159). Although maintaining that the quality of White faculty at Black colleges and universities is variable, Johnson (1971) has asserted that on many campuses these teachers are all too often political refugees who neither understand the culture nor speak the language intelligibly; retired professors whose energy level does not always measure up to their awesome responsibilities; and wives of professors who are comfortably employed at neighboring white schools. (p. 806)

The historical causality underlying faculty diversity at Black colleges and universities and the continuing public and internal debate occasioned by it has prompted several Black scholars to propose archetypes to define and assess the role, purposes, and outcomes of the presence of White faculty in predominantly Black institutions of higher education. Thompson (1973) has suggested that White faculty at Black institutions fall into four distinct types: the missionary zealot (including the guilt-ridden zealot), the dedicated professional, the young and idealistic White scholar, and the academic reject. A taxonomy of four classifications, which provides a further perspective on some of the various roles played by White faculty, has been proposed by Warnat (1976). These classifications include White faculty as Moron, Martyr, Messiah, and Marginal man. According to Warnat, limited academic ability and limited or no access to White higher education institutions impel White faculty characterized as Moron to remain in the Black institution. For White faculty members working in Black institutions under this characterization, “all personal incompetencies can then be blamed on the institutional setting, thereby absolving personal feelings of frustration and inadequacy” (p. 335). The work of White faculty typed as Martyr is compared to that of “the zealous missionary who will do virtually anything in his power to relieve his guilt, including being punished for the errors committed by society”
Such faculty take on the “drudge work” of the institution and elicit the sympathy and condolence of Black faculty for their willingness to tackle such responsibilities with a high measure of dedication. The major role of faculty typed as Messiah is “to attempt to provide direction which they feel has been lacking” in the Black institution in which they work. Last, Marginal Man faculty live in two worlds and struggle to find their place and meaning in each. According to Warnat, this White faculty member “joins the Black college faculty, but continue to remain an alien because of his affiliation with the white social structure” (p. 337). Although this faculty member is motivated by the academic contribution that can be made to the advancement of the institution and its students, the task of “effectively combining the conflicting cultures is unending” (p. 338). Contemporary critics have observed that White faculty often accept positions at HBCU institutions because such comparable positions are not readily available or accessible at predominantly White institutions, and that while they are employed at HBCU institutions they actively seek to leave these schools as soon as they can obtain a position on a White campus. Such a perception continues to exacerbate long-held historical perceptions and feelings among long-term faculty and students at HBCU institutions, who may come to see White faculty as less committed to the mission of HBCU institutions for African American student growth and achievement.

The relationships and work of White faculty with Black faculty and students at Black colleges and universities who are characterized by the archetypes proposed by Warnat (1976) and Thompson (1973), the perceptions they engender, the socialization and acculturation they undergo within an HBCU institution, the difficulties they may encounter in both academic and interpersonal relationships, and the acceptance and successes they experience vary widely (Anderson & Lancaster, 1999; Foster & Guyden, 1998; Levy, 1967; Redinger, 1999; Slater, 1993; Smith, 1982; Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). White faculty who are viewed as self-enhancing through unwarranted and unsubstantiated criticisms of Black institutions run the risk of being easily identified with “those ills inflicted by the white population and directly related to the Black
segment of the population” (Warnat, 1976, p. 335). Faculty who are perceived as good intentioned yet deprecating in their assessment of their own status and worth to the Black institution may enjoy good relations with students and other Black colleagues but may not realize that conscious acceptance of their status, in the end, lessens the power of their contributions to the institution and serves as a barrier to their advancement of the vision of the institution as well. Faculty members who consciously or unconsciously portray themselves or are perceived as saviors to an institution—a behavior indicative of a lack of respect for the history, customs, traditions, and accomplishments of the institution—may encounter the most negative feelings on the part of their Black colleagues and students. According to Warnat (1976),

More than any other element of the white faculty, this one tends to foster mistrust and feelings of alienation and hostility among his colleagues towards him. Being a constant source of irritation, this individual is one whom colleagues would most like to eliminate. (p. 336)

New and young White faculty in Black institutions may be the clearest at risk for working in Black colleges and universities because many of them come to HBCU institutions with new understandings of diversity and inclusion but may continue to have to balance persistent and conflicting cultural perspectives and stereotypes that are the residue of a continuing “lack of social acceptance on the part of both whites and Blacks in the imposition of social distance between them, and the real or perceived value conflict between Blacks and whites” (Smith, 1982, p. 2) that continues in American society. For both Black and White faculty at Black colleges and universities, it is instructive to review how the archetypes suggested by Warnat (1976) and Thompson (1973) give credence to the continuing social distance from and perceptions of each group to the other. This reflective assessment is particularly important at this juncture in the history of HBCU institutions as the profile of their student bodies and the composition of their faculties are at an important crossroads for defining and reaffirming the educational missions and character of these institutions.
NEW CHALLENGES AND NEW OPPORTUNITIES: NEW DEFINING MARKS FOR HBCU INSTITUTIONS

Historically Black institutions of higher education face the crisis of student enrollment in ways similar to predominantly White institutions. There exists a market fight for students in all sectors. This market fight has become particularly tight and crucial for individual HBCU institutions, which must compete with other HBCU institutions and predominantly White institutions for a declining pool of African American students, and which, like their predominantly White counterparts, must adhere to state mandates and legal resolutions to quarter-century-old college desegregation cases to diversify their student bodies and faculties. In performance of the latter task, HBCU institutions have been unusually successful in attracting substantial numbers of White students and faculty. Aggressive student recruitment, the significantly lower cost of a college education at many HBCU institutions as compared to comparable costs at nearby predominantly White competing institutions, the value and quality of education at HBCU institutions, and the creation and expansion of graduate and professional degree programs at HBCU institutions continue to account for the increased presence of White students and faculties on many predominantly Black campuses (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). Enrollment of White students at Black colleges and universities, for example, climbed 16% between 1990 and 1998 (Blitzer, 2000; Drummond, 2000).

New leadership at HBCU institutions has also challenged the institutions to seek wider and more global markets for the educational experiences provided for students. Reginald K. Wilson, a senior scholar in the Office of Minorities in Higher Education at the American Council on Education, has observed that

a new crop of presidents—former administrators at predominantly white schools in the North and West—are coming to black colleges. With them they are bringing broader experiences and perspectives than their predecessors, who likely attended and received their training at HBCUs. (Wilson, quoted in Suggs, 1997a)
Of necessity and consequence, HBCU institutions are providing wider and more expansive educational venues in which to study for Black and non-Black students. This educational venue brings new diversity, new goals, and new objectives to the educational enterprise currently taking place at HBCUs.

Roebuck and Murty (1993) have noted that HBCU institutions “remain the significant academic home for Black faculty members and many Black students” (p. 10). Despite a declining pool of African American students pursuing higher education, statistics from the U.S. Department of Education (1996) show that 280,071 students were in attendance at HBCUs in 1994, an increase of 26% from attendance records in 1976. Furthermore, HBCUs still continue to graduate the highest numbers of Black students at the undergraduate level and still award some of the highest percentages of graduate and professional degrees awarded to African American college students.

The proper education of African American students remains an important issue in the revitalization of higher education in America and as a response to the myriad of social, economic, political, and cultural ills that still cloud the national landscape. Although HBCU institutions are by no means monolithic, there is general agreement about their educational missions and how those missions should play out in the experience of students. Foster, Miller, and Guyden (1999) have noted this institutional ethos to have

embrace the virtue and necessity of educating students to appreciate the richness and diversity of the human condition of which they are a unique and important component; to acknowledge differing ways of knowing and of contributing to the flow of societal and human history through connections of authentic learning and living; to challenge the realization of democratic ideals and practices through active and constructive participation in the democratic process; and to make substantive contributions to their communities and to the nation through the practice and observance of democratic ideals and principles. (p. 190)

The challenge to White faculty who choose to work at HBCUs is to remain faithful to this ethos as an institutional imperative. In aligning themselves to this ethos, “faculty diversity facilitates and
champions liberation from all sorts of myths and presumed superiorities and inferiorities. The effect becomes empowering through mutual interactions of authentic exchange and becomes efficacious for living out authentic truth in the wider society” (Foster, Miller, & Guyden, 1999, p. 190). White faculty can expect to be called on to respond actively and authentically to this clarion call. Faculty members’ responses will be measured by the history, traditions, and customs of HBCU institutions, HBCU alumni and present students, and by the very communities in which HBCU institutions are situated. A faint response will not succeed.
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This article examines the socialization experience of African American faculty at urban Black colleges. Specifically, this qualitative study explored influences and barriers in the socialization experience of African American tenure-track and tenured faculty in the social sciences and humanities at two urban Black colleges. Clear institutional values and expectations, which were learned formally and informally, were an influential component of the socialization process. Senior faculty, written publications, and department chairs informed new faculty of the institutional values and expectations for promotion and tenure. However, a perceived barrier in the socialization process was that senior faculty were not informing new faculty about the ropes of the institution. New faculty indicated they had to learn the ropes of the institution through trial and error. Nonetheless, this perceived barrier did not significantly detract from the overall positive socialization experience of faculty at the urban Black colleges in this study.

One of the many reasons faculty members choose to work at urban colleges is because of their unique location (Goodall, 1970). But does an urban location manifest an environment conducive for a positive faculty socialization experience? Busy metropolises are known for the daily hustle and bustle and citizens who display an aura of coldness toward people. Do these characteristics of city life have an impact on what occurs within the walls of the urban Black campus and how faculty at these institutions learn the formal and informal knowledge necessary for success? The environment that faculty members at urban Black colleges encounter is unknown because the research to confirm or refute these assertions is virtu-
ally nonexistent. Hence, this article provides insight into the socialization process of faculty at urban Black colleges.

Does location in a city determine whether an institution is designated as an urban Black college? Location exclusively is not enough for an institution to consider itself as an urban college. However, identifying a universal definition for an urban institution proved to be a challenge. Title XI of the Higher Education Act defines urban institutions using three qualities: (a) location in a metropolitan area with a population of 350,000, (b) a significant segment of undergraduate students from urban locales and from adjoining areas to the city, and (c) the administration of programs to ensure postsecondary education opportunities are more accessible to residents of urban and proximate areas (U.S. Department of Education, 1998). Other researchers go beyond the geographic location, student population, academic programs, and community involvement when defining an urban college. Elliott (1994) asserted that urban colleges must be defined based on a philosophy that is conveyed “by the way the institution sees itself in relation to its environment and the community in which it is located” (p. 23). Likewise, one of three tenets that Goodall (1970) posited was that urban colleges should seek to formulate ways to use their urban locale to enhance their educational and research programs while serving the community.

It is interesting to note that in the various definitions of an urban institution, each one discusses service to the community. Accordingly, most Black colleges or historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) view academic excellence and service to the community as “inextricably intertwined, producing together an appreciation of the relationship between the curriculum and the world beyond the campus” (Kannerstein, 1978, p. 31). For purposes of this study, the assertions of Goodall (1970) and Title XI will serve as the definition of an urban Black college.

Elliott (1994) noted that the location and mission of urban institutions have attracted faculty who live in and experience the city’s diversity. Faculty at urban colleges understand the institution’s multiple constituents and are aware of the “needs, challenges and opportunities of the city as they engage in research and service
activities that will benefit it” (p. 66). However, this does not imply that faculty are limited in research and service activities to the concerns of the city or other related urban issues.

PURPOSE

Since their inception, HBCUs have employed faculty from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. Today, 58% of full-time African American faculty are concentrated at the 103 HBCUs, which comprise only 3% of the institutions of higher education in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). Caucasians account for 29%, and other minorities and foreigners account for 13% of the faculty at HBCUs (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). Given the diversity of the faculty at HBCUs, the reader might presume that a body of research on HBCU faculty would be available. However, few studies in any form have been conducted that focus on this subgroup of the professoriate. Moreover, the majority of research conducted on faculty at HBCUs was completed during the middle of the century, from 1940 to 1970, with little research published during the last quarter of the century.

Furthermore, much has been written in recent years about new faculty (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999; Boice, 1991, 1992) and, more specifically, faculty socialization (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). However, conspicuously missing from the literature on faculty socialization is the experience of faculty at HBCUs. Thus, administrators and faculty seeking to understand the socialization experience of faculty at HBCUs have little empirical evidence on how to effectively assist faculty through this process.

This research study begins to address the void in the literature regarding HBCUs. The findings of this study provide a better understanding of the socialization process of African American faculty at HBCUs, specifically urban HBCUs. In addition, the findings may also serve as the foundation for developing a body of literature on the socialization experience of other subgroups of faculty at HBCUs, such as Asian Americans, Hispanics, Caucasians, and women, particularly those at urban institutions. Although the results of the study are not generalizable, higher education institu-
tions can use them as a framework to identify ways to better assist faculty at urban institutions.

SOCIALIZATION

There are several definitions of socialization, but the two primary viewpoints that informed this study are those of Merton (1957) and Tierney and Bensimon (1996). Socialization as defined by Merton (1957) is a process through which individuals acquire the values, norms, knowledge, and skills needed to exist in a given society. A favorable or unfavorable socialization experience can affect how successful the promotion and tenure process will be for new faculty. Hence, it is useful to also discuss another perspective of socialization defined by Tierney and Bensimon (1996) as the rite of passage that begins with probationary membership in the department and concludes, if one is successful, with the granting of lifetime tenure or, if unsuccessful, with immediate termination. The process of organizational socialization begins when a new faculty member enters the organization and then occurs implicitly and explicitly. The study presented here provides insight into the socialization experience of faculty at urban HBCUs, particularly African American faculty.

Faculty socialization involves two stages: anticipatory socialization and the organizational stage. Anticipatory socialization occurs prior to employment, generally during graduate school, and involves taking on the norms of the profession. The organizational stage involves two phases: initial entry and role continuance. Initial entry involves interactions that might occur during the recruitment and selection process as well as the early period of organizational learning that occurs when the new faculty member begins employment. The phase of role continuance begins after the individual is situated in the organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), a positive socialization experience indicates faculty members are more satisfied, productive, and effective, which could encourage faculty to remain at the institution through the promotion and tenure process. In addition, the supportive institutional environment projects an image of an institution taking a proactive stance in ensuring faculty are well
informed of both informal and formal norms, thereby resulting in a better organization. Faculty members who perceive their socialization experience as negative may endure stress and conflict when they are left to figure out the norms of the institution by themselves and to guess what the expectations are. Faculty members who are unhappy or unproductive are more likely to leave the institution.

As stated previously, the literature on faculty socialization at HBCUs is virtually nonexistent. The majority of studies concerning faculty at HBCUs focuses on issues related to the environment, work load, and scholarship. Furthermore, few studies have been conducted in the past 30 years. However, a brief look at the experiences of new faculty across all institutional types may assist in providing a foundation for viewing the socialization experience of faculty at HBCUs.

The first few years as a professor are the most stressful for a new faculty member, and it may be difficult for new faculty to comprehend the culture of the organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Factors affecting all new faculty include loneliness and intellectual isolation, lack of collegial support, heavy workloads, and time constraints (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). To add to the already high stress level, some newcomers may have no formal or informal methods to learn what the institution expects and values—an experience that can leave these faculty members even more exasperated and uncertain of their futures. This study will attempt to provide a glimpse of how faculty at urban HBCUs are socialized.

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

Because limited research is available about the socialization experience of faculty at urban HBCUs, a qualitative research design was used to allow the researcher the opportunity to examine an area in which relatively little was known (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Furthermore, a qualitative design enabled the researcher to gain an in-depth comprehension of the socialization process at HBCUs, which can best be described through detailed examples or narratives (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). To assess the process of socialization at urban HBCUs, this study examines what African Ameri-
can faculty at urban HBCUs perceive as the influences and barriers in their socialization experience.

SITE AND SAMPLE SELECTION

Two HBCUs varying in size, type, and funding source were selected to assess how African American faculty at urban HBCUs perceived their socialization experience. The two institutions included one research university, DuBois University (a private, urban institution with a research focus and large enrollment of more than 10,000 students), and one comprehensive university, Banneker State University (an urban, public comprehensive institution with a medium enrollment of about 5,000 students). The researcher explored socialization in two contexts to discern if there were any common themes across institutions. The cities in which these two institutions are located boast a mix of higher education institutions. DuBois is located in a city that has a total of 10 colleges and universities, whereas Banneker is 1 of 15 institutions in its city.

Faculty in the social sciences and humanities were the focus of this study. The areas of social sciences and humanities (e.g., education, history, anthropology, English, political science, psychology) are commonly referred to as low-consensus fields or the soft sciences (Braxton & Hargens, 1996). Research has indicated that faculty in the hard sciences or high-consensus fields exhibited greater agreement on standards of scholarship than did faculty in the soft sciences or low-consensus fields (Stoecker, 1993). Thus, faculty members in the hard sciences tend to have clearer expectations of what to expect in the promotion and tenure process. Consequently, this study only examined the socialization experiences of faculty in the soft sciences to control for differences across disciplines.

Additional attributes of interest for selection included gender and tenured or tenure-track, full-time faculty in the soft sciences. The choice was made to ensure “variety but not necessarily representativeness” (Stake, 1994, p. 244) across disciplines and gender. A total of eight faculty members in five disciplines (sociology, anthropology, English, education, and psychology) were interviewed, of whom three were tenured and five were tenure track. Table 1 illustrates the gender and tenure status of faculty at each institution.
DATA ANALYSIS AND LIMITATIONS

As is common with qualitative research design, analysis of the data occurred throughout the project, and insights gained during earlier interviews were used to inform later interviews. Information acquired through audiotaped interviews was subject to triangulation and member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The findings are presented in a cross-case analysis format using the method discussed by Yin (1994) for analyzing and reporting multiple case studies. Examining the socialization experience of African American faculty at urban HBCUs was the purpose of this study, and data analysis consisted of identifying common themes across both institutions. Appropriate examples were drawn from the data to support the common themes that emerged.

Concern for anonymity and small sample size were limitations of the study. Given the low number of participants (8) and the fact that only two sites were used in the study, care must be taken in the interpretation of the results and their generalizability. Notwithstanding, the results of the study can be used to guide future research.

FINDINGS

From the analysis of the data collected at both institutions, several common themes emerged that addressed the influences and barriers in the socialization process of African American faculty at
urban HBCUs. Faculty members believed that an influencing factor that assisted them in the socialization process was clear institutional values and expectations that were learned formally and informally. On the other hand, faculty also perceived that a barrier in the socialization experience was senior faculty not showing new faculty the ropes or nuances of the institution, which were learned through trial and error. Based on the emergent themes, a portrait of African American faculty socialization at urban HBCUs in this study will serve as the framework for a discussion of the findings.

CLEAR INSTITUTIONAL VALUES AND EXPECTATIONS

It is imperative that upon arrival at their new academic institution, faculty gain knowledge of both the informal and formal guidelines regarding institutional values and role expectations, particularly as they relate to the promotion and tenure process. Exum, Menges, Watkins, and Berglund’s (1984) study found that new faculty sometimes do not learn the norms and expectations until too late in the promotion and tenure process. However, this contrasts with what new faculty at HBCUs in this study indicated. Tenure-track faculty at both institutions noted that they found out early on what was expected for promotion and tenure. Faculty at the institutions in this study perceived that institutional values and expectations for promotion and tenure were clear and acquired this information via informal and formal methods.

Informal methods. Faculty in this study perceived they learned the institutional values and expectations through informal means. Acquiring information informally involved faculty learning what the institution valued and expected in a casual or spontaneous manner. New faculty indicated that senior faculty informed them of the values and expectations of the institution through informal means such as casual conversations and discussions totally unrelated to faculty socialization, tenure, or the department. Jackie, tenure-track professor at DuBois, indicated, “Senior faculty gave me tidbits of advice at lunch or when they saw me in the hall.” Faculty at Banneker reiterated this manner of acquiring information sponta-
neously in conversation, casually at lunch or other more social gatherings.

To have a direct conversation where we only focused on values and expectations that I would say I don’t remember. I would say over the years senior faculty would say something in passing but it wouldn’t be the main purpose of the conversation. (Carrie, tenured professor at Banneker)

A number of studies have shown that new faculty consistently complain about lack of collegial support or a lack of collegiality (Boice, 1991, 1992; L. L. Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1992). However, in this study new faculty at each institution explained that senior faculty relayed the values and expectations in various informal settings. Robert, a tenured associate professor at DuBois, succinctly expressed how faculty across all institutions perceived that senior faculty informed them of institutional values and promotion and tenure expectations:

By talking to some of the senior people in the department and on the campus in other departments, attending faculty meetings, just talking to people. It was pretty widely stated that’s what moved you along, your research. . . . It definitely happened to be more in the realm of one-on-one with faculty.

Unlike their colleagues at traditionally White institutions (Boice, 1991, 1992; L. L. Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1992), faculty at HBCUs perceived that faculty within and outside the department had good “collegial relations.” Faculty indicated that collegiality was expressed in various ways, from reading manuscripts to working in collaboration on grant proposals or books to participating in casual conversations or occasional lunches. Even though faculty indicated the collegial relations were good, the institution’s urban location could have an impact on the amount of interaction in which colleagues can engage. For example, faculty members at both Banneker and DuBois noted that “faculty are only here 2 or 3 days a week” and “most live an hour away,” so that could reduce the amount and type of collegial relationships in which faculty can
engage. However, the urban location did not detract from the collegiality faculty found in the department and institution.

The collegiality faculty at both institutions discussed would correlate with why faculty informally shared information with new faculty at lunch, in the hallway, or in general conversation. A possible reason that senior faculty members were supportive of new faculty and shared information about the values and expectations of the institution could be attributed to the environment of HBCUs. The supportive and nurturing environment HBCUs provide for students (Davis, 1991; Fleming, 1984) promotes both collegiality and solidarity among faculty. As senior faculty informally communicated the values and expectations of the institution to new faculty, the meaning of information obtained from formal sources, such as faculty handbooks and meetings with department chairs, was enhanced, and new faculty in turn received informal mentoring from their colleagues.

Formal methods. Faculty members at the HBCUs in this study perceived that they learned about institutional values and expectations formally through written publications and annual meetings with the department chair. Written sources provided faculty with evidence of institutional values and expectations for promotion and tenure. Examples of written documents included faculty handbooks, institutional catalogs, and student handbooks. Annual meetings with the department chair to evaluate and discuss the progress of new faculty helped to clarify both the departmental and institutional expectations for promotion and tenure. These sources also provided new faculty with a formal method to assess their progress in satisfying institutional values and expectations.

African American faculty at traditionally White institutions cite a lack of knowledge of promotion and tenure expectations (Exum et al., 1984). This contrasts with the perceptions of faculty in this study who identified catalogs, faculty handbooks, and annual reports as written sources that provide information on values and promotion and tenure expectations of the institution. Jackie, an assistant professor at DuBois, recapped the written sources that
faculty at both institutions used to find out what the institution valued:

There is the faculty handbook, student handbook, there are handouts that come out every so often. . . . People tell you but it is also on paper—this is the model of [DuBois], this is what we expect.

Carrie explained that the annual reports faculty submitted each year were an indicator of what Banneker valued and expected of faculty. Each year, I don’t know if they do that at other universities, we have to fill out an annual report. The annual report has you list your accomplishments and things for the year in those areas [teaching, research, and community service]. So early on I knew that I couldn’t just focus on teaching that they expected me to go to conferences, write papers, be involved in the community, and do this and that.

Several studies have concluded that faculty at traditionally White institutions receive conflicting information regarding promotion and tenure expectations (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). However, this research study contradicts the results of these earlier studies. In fact, faculty in this study stated that promotion and tenure procedures were “clearly outlined in the faculty handbook.” An example of how clear the guidelines are for promotion may best be expressed by Carrie, a tenured assistant professor at Banneker, who recently submitted her package for promotion to an associate professor.

We have a new chair, but he just came in during the summer, and so he came and asked me if I needed to talk to him about the promotion process, and I said no because the guidelines were really clear.

The faculty members also stressed that the information they were told verbally by senior faculty regarding the institution’s values and expectations was supported by what was written in the faculty handbook. It is interesting that all but one of the tenure-track professors in the study believed that if they “adhered to the guidelines, they would receive promotion and tenure.” Unlike their colleagues at
traditionally White institutions, tenure-track faculty at HBCUs learned values and expectations during their first year at the institution, which gave them time to understand and meet the criteria for promotion and tenure. Thus, clear guidelines were critical for a positive socialization experience for African American faculty at urban HBCUs. The criteria for evaluation of teaching, research, and service in regard to promotion and tenure were clearly delineated in the faculty handbook. These criteria were validated through informal conversations with senior faculty who, by virtue of their tenure status, gave credibility to the information in the faculty handbook. Hence, faculty understood at the beginning of the process how they would be evaluated and what measures would be used to assess if criteria had been met.

Whereas senior faculty at HBCUs in this study informally relayed information about expectations and institutional values, department chairs were more formal in their interactions with new faculty. The importance of the department chair in clarifying expectations and providing guidance was confirmed by Sorcinelli’s (1992) study. Department chairs at each institution met with faculty on an annual basis to discuss how they were progressing toward promotion and tenure and suggested various ways by which new faculty could meet promotion and tenure criteria. As indicated by the literature, Alvin, a tenure-track faculty member at Banneker, confirmed the importance of the department chair regarding the promotion and tenure process.

I found out the expectations, number one, from the chair. The chair was very, very upfront with me and told me what my requirements were, told me what my responsibilities were, and also told me about the promotion and tenure process here.

Department chairs were a critical source for ensuring tenure-track faculty understood what the institutional values and promotion and tenure expectations were. In addition, department chairs informed faculty of how they were progressing toward the requirements for promotion and tenure and suggested ways to meet the
criteria. The annual meeting with the department chair confirmed what faculty found in the handbook as well as what they were told by senior faculty. Thus, meeting with the department chair was a crucial component of the socialization process for new faculty. This indicates that informal and formal colleague support is necessary if new faculty members are to have a positive socialization experience.

“THE ROPES”

Faculty believed a barrier in the socialization process was the failure of senior faculty to show new faculty the ropes. Even though senior faculty informed new faculty about institutional values and expectations, they did not show them the ropes of the institution. The ropes of the institution refers to advising, registration, departmental and institutional culture, introductions to key individuals internal and external to the campus, policies and procedures, and disclosure of shortcuts.

Many new faculty members in this study felt senior faculty members were not informing them about the nuances or idiosyncrasies of daily academic life, such as advising, policies, standard operating procedures, hierarchical structure, and registration. L. D. Fink (1992) concluded that new faculty members were not obtaining information on policies, resources, roles, and responsibilities from either formal or informal sources in any comprehensive way. Findings in this study confirm that respondents perceived that they learned information about policies, registration, advising, and the culture through trial and error. Taya’s (tenure-track professor at DuBois) comment best describes what faculty at both institutions in the study perceived as two areas that they had to learn about through trial and error:

What you really need to know, a lot of the questions that you might have that aren’t always easily answered about advising students, about registration—about all the little things that may be written somewhere but you may not know where to go to get the answers.
Studies have found that faculty cite difficulty in learning the informal aspects of organizational culture (Baldwin, 1979; Mager & Myers, 1982). At each institution, faculty members noted they learned about the institutional culture and norms through trial and error or by observation. Sarah, a tenured faculty member at Banneker, perceived that rather than observing or learning through trial and error, “an experienced person could have helped me understand the culture which I am still learning.” Because Sarah feels like she is still learning the institutional culture after 30 years, she makes sure that as department chair she is upfront with new faculty about what is expected in the promotion and tenure process and what the culture of the institution is to her knowledge.

Faculty perceived that learning the idiosyncrasies of academic life through trial and error could be minimized if senior faculty would serve as guides by showing new faculty the ropes of the institution. This perspective is supported by the literature, which found that new faculty view senior faculty members as role models and guides and depend on them for modeling and nurturing (Boice, 1992; Creswell, 1985; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Alvin, a recent graduate in his first academic position at Banneker, related the importance of senior faculty showing new faculty the ropes:

If you are new, you are fresh out of college or maybe from a different college, the rules are different. The focuses are different; the goals are different. Because of all that, you need someone to say, “Wait a minute, this is what you need to focus on,” but you learn that as you go along.

Showing a new faculty member the ropes can encompass a broad range of activities, but one common theme focused on senior faculty informing new faculty about whom to talk to and where to go.

Make sure you know who’s who on the campus, show you where things are, at least kind of guide you in that direction, and then introduce you to people that you should meet. (Taya, tenure-track professor at DuBois)

Knowing where to go and who to talk to . . . a mentor could have helped because something that maybe could have taken 30 minutes
has now taken an hour, maybe an hour and a half, because you are trying to find the right person. (Alvin at Banneker)

If senior faculty are not showing other faculty the ropes of the institution, it may be an indication that tasks, such as advising and registration, are viewed as peripheral in the criteria for promotion and tenure. On the other hand, when it is time for registration and advising, senior faculty are well into the semester and busy with the many duties required of faculty at HBCUs. Wanda, a tenure-track professor at Banneker, correlated the supposition regarding faculty being too busy to assist new faculty with the idiosyncrasies of academic life:

When I first came, faculty told me what I needed to do to get tenure, but after that, I mean no one really helped or took me under their wing. They were receptive, I mean, when I went to them, you know, to get feedback and to ask questions, but they haven’t had the time to really tell me the things I didn’t know but needed to know. Overall, the senior faculty have not provided a lot of mentorship, but maybe they’re just too busy doing their own thing and don’t really have the time to really show anybody else how to get to where they are.

Thus, senior faculty may be inadvertently not communicating to new faculty the ropes or nuances of academic life at the institution. Given the supportive nature, positive collegial relationships, and the informal manner in which senior faculty provided information on the institutional values and expectations at the HBCUs in the study, one can speculate that the lapse in showing new faculty the ropes is unintentional but should be brought to the attention of senior faculty.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of implications for further research generated by this study. While this study provided insight into the socialization experience of African American urban HBCUs, additional research to assess whether these findings would hold true at HBCUs in rural locations is necessary. Furthermore, given the
absence of literature on faculty at HBCUs, increased attention should be given to investigating the socialization experiences of not only African American faculty at HBCUs but other groups as well, that is, women, Caucasians, Asians, and Hispanics. This study provided insight on the socialization experience of African American faculty at urban HBCUs, but additional studies in this area could provide a comparative analysis of the socialization of other “minority” faculty at HBCUs. Finally, an in-depth examination of the role of senior faculty in the socialization process at HBCUs would provide additional insight on the perceptions senior faculty members have of their roles and responsibilities in the socialization of new faculty.

Despite their urban locations, HBCUs in this study were found to provide a supportive environment for the faculty who become a part of their academic family. It is not surprising that HBCUs located in metropolitan areas provide a supportive environment for faculty just as they do for their students. And it might prove challenging for faculty at urban HBCUs to provide a nurturing environment for students if they were not being supported, to some degree, by senior faculty. This study indicates that even though senior faculty did not show new faculty the ropes of the institution, this alone does not substantially diminish the overall support senior faculty provided through an informal sharing of institutional values and expectations. However, senior faculty should be cognizant that information should be shared with new faculty, even those with previous academic experience, about the idiosyncrasies or the ropes of academic life as well as the values and expectations of the institution. This study suggests that examining African American faculty socialization at urban HBCUs can be an important frame for continued understanding of faculty socialization across all institution types.
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