ABSTRACT

Reaves, Nicole. African-American alumni perceptions regarding giving to historically Black colleges and universities. (Under the direction of John Levin.)

The continued existence of several private historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) has been threatened due to limited financial resources. Several of these institutions are on probation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) or in jeopardy of losing their accreditation due to financial position. Similarly, HBCUs have been dependent primarily on the government, the church, and benevolent philanthropists for funding. As government support of the private HBCU decreases, and as the economy worsens, competition for funding sources increases. As a result, these institutions focus their attention towards resource development and philanthropic support. The number one source of financial support for most colleges is the alumni (Yates, 2001). Unlike predominantly White colleges, HBCUs have not had a long history of generous alumni giving (Ramsey, 1992). Hence, if HBCUs can facilitate giving from their alumni, the financial condition of these institutions may improve.

This study examined African-American alumni perceptions regarding giving for two private HBCUs located in the Southeastern United States. The purpose of this study was to determine the factors influencing African-American alumni perceptions regarding giving and how these factors facilitate or impede participation in giving to the HBCU. For this case study, data were collected through interviewing African-American alumni, attending alumni association meetings, and examining web-pages and other documents at the respective colleges.
The findings under the lens of cultural, critical race and institutional theories (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Outlaw, 1996) revealed factors influenced by Western social construction of culture, race, class, and power which have, consequently, impacted African-American alumni participation in giving to HBCUs. The conclusions and implications of this study are significant enough to warrant further investigation into the ramifications of African-American alumni giving to HBCUs in order to determine whether the anticipated benefits of alumni giving can, in fact, ameliorate the financial position of the HBCU.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) face numerous challenges in financing their programs (Boulard, 2001; Chronicle of Higher Education, 2003; CNN, 2003; June, 2002; SACS, 2002;). According to the literature, HBCUs have been dependent primarily on the government, the church, and benevolent philanthropists for funding. As government support of private HBCUs decreases, and as the economy worsens, competition for funding sources increases (Boulard, 2001; Chronicle of Higher Education, 2003; CNN, 2003; June, 2002; SACS, 2002). As a result, these institutions focus their attention towards resource development and philanthropic support (Hunter, 1999).

According to Yates (2001), the principal source of financial support for most colleges is the alumni. The American Association of Fundraising Counsel Trust for Philanthropy (AAFRC) (2001) reported that the majority of private support for all non-profit organizations comes from individuals. Of the estimated $203.45 billion given to non-profit organizations in 2000, 75% or 152.07 billion was given by individual donors, excluding bequests (AAFRC, 2001, p.36). Similarly, private support to education which included colleges and universities totaled $28.18 billion in 2000 (AAFRC, 2001, p. 36). Of this total, the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) (2001) estimated $23.3 billion was given to institutions for higher education. Gifts from alumni and friends of $6.8 billion and $5.42 billion, respectively, accounted for 52% of all the gifts to higher education (CAE, 2001).
However, these statistics do not hold true for the HBCU, as noted by Ramsey (1992):

Unlike white institutions, black colleges have not had a long history of generous alumni giving. In the past, there was not much emphasis placed on alumni giving in the HBCU. The task for most HBCUs is to educate and motivate Black alumni to give. For many graduates of HBCUs, giving back is not a priority and, in some cases, not a consideration (p. 36).

African-Americans have not historically participated in philanthropy. Most of their efforts involving philanthropy have been traditionally to churches (Yates, 2001). Thus, Black colleges did not have a culture of alumni-giving, and they relied on the church, benevolent philanthropists, and government for support (Yates, 2001). Historically, the purpose of many of the Black colleges was to teach freedmen to read the Bible and to become preachers (Hunter, 1999). According to Hunter (1999), this purpose was called the missionary motive: these colleges functioned under the auspices of the religious denominations that founded them. By the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, many of the missionary groups were diminishing in scope and activity, leaving the private HBCU struggling to find other sources of financial funding (Hunter, 1999).

Hansmann (1980) distinguishes two sources of funding for nonprofits including higher education institutions. The first source is ‘donative’ which suggests that the institutions operate like churches and are supported by charitable donations from people who endorse the institution’s ideological purposes. For example, charitable motives of donors include a dedication to equal opportunity under the belief that human capital is an
investment, an alumni’s sense of obligation to repay the past subsidies, and a desire to reflect on the “glory” of improving the alma mater (Hansmann, 1980). The second source of funding is commercial which suggests that the institutions operate more like car dealerships and are supported by more conventional methods such as the sale of goods or services (Hansmann, 1980). Colleges and universities are funded by both sources of revenue (Winston, 1999). However, the literature indicates that HBCUs operate primarily according to the commercial nonprofit model given that most of these institutions are tuition dependent (Brown & Hendrickson, 1995; CNN.com, 2003; Fields, 1997; Journal of Blacks in Education, 1995, NCES, 2002). Furthermore, “money is a fundamental ingredient in the educational structure of any college or university and is essential to achieving institutional goals” (Homan, 1970, p. 695). Finances are most critically important for the HBCU, which historically has been forced into an inferior position (CNN, 2003; Cross & Slater, 1994; Journal of Black Issues in Higher Education, 1995; Rowland, 1997). Similarly, the HBCU continues to operate on a meager budget and has severe financial problems (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Cross & Slater, 1994; CNN, 2003; Henderson, 2000; Homan, 1970; Journal of Black Issues in Higher Education, 1995; Rowland, 1997). Several scholars contend that HBCUs are at a crossroads, operating under legal sanctions and limited resources; their existence is in jeopardy (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Henderson, 2000).
Statement of the Problem

The literature reports financial position as a major problem challenging the existence of many private HBCUs (Boulard, 2001; Chronicle of Higher Education, 2003; CNN, 2003; June, 2002; Southern Association for Colleges and Schools, 2002;). According to the December 2002 report from Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS), several HBCUs were sanctioned because of financial position. Grambling State University in Grambling, Louisiana was denied reaffirmation of accreditation because of failure to comply with the criteria regarding “financial resources;” Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina and Talladega College in Talladega, Alabama were given probation for twelve months because of failure to comply with the criteria regarding “financial resources;” and Morris Brown College, in Atlanta, Georgia recently lost its accreditation because of “bad book-keeping” (June, 2002, p. 31; SACS, 2002). According to June (2002), the school is $23 million in debt and accused of using federal money to pay overdue bills. In addition to the loss of accreditation, Morris Brown will also lose government funding—“a crippling blow to any private HBCU” (June, 2003, p. 31).

Currently, HBCU funding sources come from the state and federal government, foundations, corporations, and private donors. Additionally, some HBCUs have maintained their affiliation with the church and continue to receive financial support from this source (Hunter, 1999; Peep, 1981; Rowland, 1997). The United Negro College Fund also continues to remain a public champion for African-American Higher Education. Other foundations and corporations that make contributions to HBCUs include Am
South, Ban Corporation, Bellsouth, Chase Manhattan, Ford Foundation, ITT, Kellogg Foundation, Kresge Foundation, Pepsi Co, UAL, Upjohn Company, and Woodruff Foundation (Hunter, 1999; Peep, 1981; Rowland, 1997). However, a weakened economy and a decline in state and federal aid to universities have created fierce competition among colleges and universities for donations from foundations and corporations, which themselves have cut their giving amid a poor stock market performance (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Rowland, 1997). Panas (1984) contends, “that corporations and foundations alone will not save our not-for-profit institutions and organizations. They have not in the past. They will not in the future. Men and women properly motivated and giving from personal resources will make the difference” (p. 11).

**Background of the Research Project**

Several scholars argue that Historically Black Colleges and Universities must progress from the days of being almost exclusively dependent on the government, the church, and benevolent philanthropist for funding (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Rowland, 1997). Throughout the literature, the most salient recommendation regarding alterations in HBCU fund-raising is the encouragement of alumni giving (Fields, 2001; Hunter, 1999; Mercer, 1998; Paschal, 2001; Ramsey, 1992; Yates, 2001). However, the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (2000) reports that for complex reasons not fully understood, HBCUs have always had difficulty raising money from their alumni. Similarly, the
alumni rate of giving to HBCUs is significantly lower than the alumni giving rate at predominantly White colleges and universities (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1996; 2000). For example, in 1998 31 to 64 percent of the Ivy League college alumni graduates gave money to their alma mater. Yet, at the prestigious historically Black Spelman College and Howard University the percentage of alumni who gave was 15 percent and 11 percent, respectively, and in recent years, Howard University has dropped to 5 percent (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1996; 2000).

In comparison to White institutions, Black colleges have not had a long history of generous alumni giving (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2000; 1996; Yates, 2001). However, other voices have more optimism than expressed in the literature, the President of Howard University, Swygert, is convinced that Black colleges are about to benefit from a wave of donors whose financial positions have been underestimated: Black Americans who are in their 60s, 70s, and 80s and who have accumulated substantial wealth. Swygert contends that the college graduates within this group most likely attended Black colleges, and many are considering major gifts to them. Whether the view is optimistic or pessimistic, the task for most HBCUs is to educate and motivate Black alumni to give (Ramsey, 1992). Furthermore, if alumni-giving is the major source of financial support for most colleges it is imperative that the factors that facilitate or impede alumni-giving at the HBCU be examined carefully. Consequently, if HBCUs can facilitate giving from their alumni, the financial condition of these institutions may improve.
This study uses a cultural framework (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ogbu, 1988) to examine African-American alumni experiences at the HBCU and how these experiences influence African-American perceptions regarding financial giving. HBCUs were established as a direct result of America’s discrimination against African-Americans. According to Allen and Jewell (2002), at the center of the American dream is the emphatic conviction that, in this society, education opens doors to material benefits. The belief that even the poorest American can achieve greatness with talent and hard work is one of society’s cherished cultural ideals (Hochschild, 1995). “African-Americans have embraced this belief to the extreme” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 241). Dating back to the period when Black slaves were forbidden to learn to read and write under threat of physical harm or death, education was seen by the slave as freedom (Allen & Jewell, 2001). Similarly, “HBCUs were shaped by this striving of African-Americans for education and have embodied the hopes and frustrations of a people seeking the Promised Land” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 242).

The private HBCU has a unique history and culture. According to DuBois (1903), in many ways, private HBCUs were far more than educational institutions. DuBois (1903) referred to them as “social settlements” where the “best traditions of New England” were made known to the sons and daughters of former slaves through close contact with White missionaries (p. 100). Therefore, according to Allen and Jewell (2002), the HBCUs were graduating African-Americans thoroughly assimilated into the middle-class Anglo-Protestant culture. “These institutions gave a distinct and definite cultural meaning to class and status among African-Americans” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p.
Having successfully assimilated this knowledge, college educated African-Americans assumed that it was their responsibility to hand the “principles of Western culture” to “the masses below” (Millner, 1998, p. 15). Kevin Gaines purports that late 19th and early 20th century ideas of racial uplift, instilled and nurtured by the HBCUs, were connected to elements of cultural paternalism and class privilege. These elements would later spur the students of the 1960s and 1970s to protests. “To make their voices heard, African-Americans typically resorted to protests on campus and in the surrounding community” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 246). Similarly, this study listens to the voices of the alumni of the private HBCU, and uses the cultural frame to examine how history and culture have influenced the perception of participation in alumni-giving.

Additionally, this inquiry uses the framework of critical race theory. Critical race theory derives its foundation from the focus of critical theory which challenges ideology, attempts to overcome alienation of marginalized groups, contests hegemony, and unmask power (Brookfield, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Merriam & Brocket, 1997). European critical theory is not abandoned. Instead, it is reinterpreted to serve the particular interests of African-Americans (Brookfield, 2003). In scholars’ attempt to understand other groups, this theory has become what Outlaw (1997) terms racialized. When a phenomenon is racialized, it is viewed through the distinctive lens of a racial group’s experience of the world (Outlaw, 1996). The dominant conceptualizations and mechanisms in place for the production and dissemination of knowledge for this study are grounded in one particular racial group’s experience (in this case African-Americans). This study uses Critical Race Theory to guide an investigation of how African-American
ways of knowing is the result of the Western social construction of race, class, and power which has influenced their perceptions and life decisions. Similarly, under the guidance of institutional theory, particularly the concept of isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), this study examines, using the isomorphic processes—coercive, mimetic, and normative, how the drive for homogeneity in organizations has constrained resource development in private HBCUs which have left these institutions and their alumni powerless and under the authority of capitalist elites. Hence, this study investigates whether the factors of history, culture, race, class, and power influence African-American alumni giving to HBCUs.

Purpose of the Study

In order to explore the factors influencing African-American alumni-giving in more detail, this study examines the perceptions of African-American alumni and their giving to the HBCU. The purpose of this study was to identify factors that facilitate or impede African-American alumni participation in financial giving to HBCUs. The following research questions were addressed:

1) What are historical and cultural factors that influence African-American alumni perceptions regarding giving to the HBCU?

2) What factors do African-American alumni perceive facilitate or impede participation in giving to historically Black colleges and universities?

3) How do race, class, and power impact perceptions of African-American alumni regarding giving to the HBCU?
4) What is the African-American alumni perception of philanthropy?

5) What strategies do African-American alumni perceive will facilitate giving at the HBCU?

6) What are the perceptions of African-American alumni regarding the continued survival of the HBCU?

Methods

This study employs qualitative inquiry using the case study methodology. Qualitative research was chosen because of the nature of the research questions and the dearth of qualitative literature regarding this topic. To answer the research questions, nineteen African-American alumni were interviewed at two private HBCUs; participant observation was conducted at alumni association meetings and web-sites; and documents were analyzed from the respective colleges. The data were then analyzed under the lens of cultural, critical race, and institutional theories, and the discourse analysis process was conducted according to Marshall and Rossman (1999). This analysis includes a six phase process: (1) organizing the data; (2) generating categories, themes and patterns; (3) coding the data; (4) testing emergent understandings; (5) searching for alternative explanations; and (6) writing the report (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 152).

Significance of the Study

It would be a travesty to see the HBCU eliminated. Rowland (1997) affirms that these institutions have prevailed as producers of large numbers of successful college
graduates. The nation’s 103 HBCUs represent roughly three percent of our nation’s colleges and universities, yet from 1990 to 2000, these institutions enrolled one-quarter of all Black students in U.S. higher education and granted over 28% of baccalaureate degrees, 15% of master’s degree and professional degrees, and 10% of Ph.D.s to African-Americans (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Henderson, 2000). In the face of numerous obstacles HBCUs have functioned as multifaceted institutions, providing not only education, but also social, political, and religious leadership for their students (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Additionally, Brown and Hendricks (1997) contend that “African-American colleges are among the few institutions other than the Black churches where a young African-American can be in an environment dominated by other African-Americans. It can be an environment that provides shelter, comfort and network for Blacks” (p.19).

Several scholars assert that both private and public HBCUs are necessary to provide educational access and opportunity to all students who are not given the chance through main-stream educational institutions (Allen, 1997; Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Rowland, 1997; Willie, 1995). Furthermore, Allen and Jewell (2002) document that HBCUs have a long, distinguished history of challenging the racial and gender status quo. In addition to offering educational opportunities to African-Americans, they were among the first institutions to have an “open door policy” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 255). Regardless of race, creed, color, gender or national origin, African-American, Native American, Asian, Latino American, and Caribbean students have all benefited from the educational and social commitment of HBCUs, as have White women and Jews who enrolled in professional schools at these
institutions when gender, religion- and race-based quotas kept many of them out of traditionally White institutions (TWIs) (Allen & Jewell, 2002). However, because of the open door policy of several HBCUs and the responsibility of repairing deficiencies through remedial instruction, many HBCUs are not recognized as high-quality academic institutions (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997; Henderson, 2000).

Yet for a select set of institutions this is not the case. Spelman College, Morehouse College, Xavier University, Hampton University, Howard University, and Florida A&M University all differed dramatically from the challenges faced by most HBCUs. “Not only were these schools able to maintain strong academic programs and to build strong endowments, but they also competed successfully with predominantly White institutions (PWIs) for the brightest of the bright—the offspring of the growing Black middle class” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 254). In many instances, these HBCUs surpassed the PWIs on commonly accepted indicators of academic excellence and institutional success (Allen & Jewell, 2002). For example, according to the 1999 U.S. News and World Report, Spelman College, Morehouse College, and Fisk University were named among the best liberal arts colleges in the nation. Additionally, Xavier University has been recognized as the nation’s leading institution for the production of Black undergraduates who enter medical school, and for several consecutive years, Florida A&M University held the record for the largest number of National Merit Achievement Scholars enrolled (Allen & Jewell, 2002)

Scholars contend that by any standard, the accomplishments of the HBCU are truly impressive (Allen, 1997; Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997;
Henderson, 2000; Rowland, 1997; Willie, 1995). However, according to Brown and Freeman (2002), these institutions have existed for more than 100 years without being serious subjects for academic research and/or inquiry. Research regarding the HBCU is limited and outdated; thus, there is a significant gap in the literature (Brown & Freeman, 2002). Because of the void in the literature, neither educators and policy makers nor higher education institutional researchers have been able to cite fresh academic thinking about the practices, successes, and/or challenges of Black colleges (Brown & Freeman, 2002, p. 239). According to Brown and Freeman (2002), there is a need for empirical and exacting research on HBCUs. Likewise, they posit that there is a need for a contemporary body of literature which documents the history and practices of the HBCU (Brown & Freeman, 2002). Thus, my research provides a much needed contribution to the extant literature and current research of HBCUs. Additionally, this research offers new scholarship regarding African-American alumni donor behavior and motivation and provides insightful information that may be utilized by HBCU institutional advancement offices and presidents to aid in creating strategies to facilitate participation of African-American alumni in giving.

Limitations

The observations and conclusions reached in this study may have limited external validity for the following reasons:

1) The data were derived from the personal opinions of volunteer participants who were not randomly selected.
2) The alumni were all actively participating in giving to their alma maters.

3) There is inherent subjectivity in both the phrasing of the questions used to elicit responses from the participants and in the interpretation and categorization of the responses (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**Delimitations**

The delimitation of this study is that alumni from two private HBCUs were chosen. There are 103 HBCUs in the United States of various representations which include public, private, two-year, and four-year institutions. This study provides a foundation for future study expansion.

**Overview of the Study**

Chapter One provides an introduction and contextual background regarding the research project. Chapter Two reviews relevant literature and establishes a theoretical framework for the study. Chapter Three presents the methods of data collection and analysis. Chapter Four elucidates the results obtained from these methods. Chapter Five discusses conclusions and implications of the study as these relate to the research questions and theories. More research is clearly needed to determine whether alumni giving can improve the financial position of the HBCU, and it is to this end that insights from this study will make a contribution.
Chapter 2

Review of Relevant Literature

**Introduction**

This chapter reviews literature relevant to the history, financial strife, and progression of the private HBCU, and encompasses literature that relates to the survival issues of the private HBCU. Literature regarding African-American alumni-giving to HBCUs is examined and the theoretical framework for this study is discussed. The purpose of this chapter is to examine what is currently known about the historical and contemporary plight of the private HBCU and the corresponding effect of African-American alumni giving.

**The Historical Context of the Private HBCU**

“Sankofa, an oft African cultural symbol, shows the body of a bird facing forward while the head looks backward. The message is explicit: the past shapes the future” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p.256). As scholars reflect on the future of the HBCU, it is imperative that they look backward to see what is ahead (Allen & Jewell, 2002). The historical literature regarding the private HBCU reports the centuries-old struggle of African-Americans for access and parity in higher education. Additionally, the literature reveals that the African-American pursuit for education is inextricably connected to the HBCU (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Peeps, 1981; Peterson, 1996; Pifer, 1973; Rowland, 1997; Wright, 1960). According to Peeps (1981), in order to understand the progressive and regressive developments of the private HBCU movement and the African-American
students served by these institutions, it is important that those developments be placed within a historical era.

In 1862, President Abraham Lincoln’s signing of the Emancipation Proclamation to free slaves was the inauguration of a new era of freedom and legal education for African-Americans (Peterson, 1996; Rowland, 1997). However, this emancipation carried new obstacles and hardships. With over four million newly freed slaves, there was an immediate need to teach these individuals how to survive. Stephen J. Wright (1960) and other historians estimated that as many as 96 percent of the four million slaves were illiterate. That number is not alarming considering the South’s pre-war White supremacist society (Peeps, 1981). All Southern states employed laws called the Black Codes that strictly prohibited the education of Black slaves. Peeps (1981) purports that the White supremacist thinking was that any education of the former slaves would undermine the slave mentality. Similarly, Pifer (1973), President of the Carnegie Corporation, begins his historical review of Black higher education with the following.

Understandably, the development of higher education for Blacks during Reconstruction and its aftermath was conditioned by…military, political, and social developments…Indeed, the history of higher education for blacks in the latter part of the 19th century is mainly a chapter in Southern history (p. 419). According to Willie (1978), the continuing story of the private HBCU cannot be analyzed outside its time. “For example, the progressive era called Reconstruction must be understood as a clear aberration to Southern history. It is important to remember that the
reforms which governed the Southern Whites during Reconstruction were anything but enduring or homespun” (Peeps, 1981, p.256).

Notwithstanding, the Civil War and Reconstruction period spurred considerable higher education activity. In 1863, the first proposal for the Freedmen’s Bureau was submitted. U.S. Congressman Thomas Elliot of Massachusetts proposed a House Bill to sponsor a Bureau of Emancipation. Two years later, March 3, 1865, the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands was created. This Freedmen’s Bureau targeted four areas of operation that focused on records, land, finance, and medical divisions. Initially, the bureau did not have a priority for educating freed men (Rowland, 1997). Moreover, President Johnson vetoed a Bill proposing an educational component. However, there was a general belief among abolitionist, missionaries, and Black leaders that education, which had long been denied, was critical if African-American people were to know any substantiated freedom. Thus, because of the diligent efforts of a few congressman and several civic leaders, on July 16, 1866, a Bill was passed requiring education as one of the primary focuses (Millner, 1998; Peterson, 1996; Rowland, 1997).

In 1867, the Bureau allocated over a half million dollars for the educational division. This financial allocation and educational empowerment incited great opposition. Disgruntled members of racial hatred groups protested against the education of freed men being educated and their support by the federal government. This remonstration included verbal and written disapproval along with physically violent acts of resistance towards the progression of African-American education (Holmes, 1934). “With the strife of slavery and the plight of the freed men, the quest for African-
American higher education was welcomed by social and political upheaval” (Rowland, 1997, p. 23). Thus, the creation of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) was a direct result of America’s discriminatory barriers of racism, elitism and political injustice.

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were established for the sole purpose of educating African-Americans (Millner, 1998; Peterson, 1996; Rowland, 1997). Before the Civil War, there were no legal institutions created exclusively for African-Americans. The first three HBCUs were founded in the Northern region of the United States: Cheyney State University (1837), Lincoln University (1843), and Wilberforce University (1854). Over the next five years following the Civil War (1865-1870), twenty-two private HBCUs were established, largely in the southern region (Millner, 1998; Henderson, 2000; Rowland, 1997). Currently, there are 54 private HBCUs of the total 103 private, public, four-year, and two-year HBCUs. These institutions are located in 20 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands (See Appendix A) (Black College Search, 2005; Brown & Freeman, 2002; Katembo, 2003;) and in them began what is characterized as the most ambitious undertaking of adult education in American history (Kujovich, 1994; Millner, 1998; Peterson, 1996; Rowland, 1997).

Private HBCUs have a unique historical context. Missionary groups and religious organizations were the first to respond to educating the millions of freed men by founding private Black institutions. The denominations of these religious groups included northern Baptist and their American Baptist Home Mission Society, the Congregationalists’
American Missionary Association (AMA), and the Episcopalians’ Freedmen’s Aid Society. The missionaries’ belief in educating the African-American was counter to that of most white southerners (Hunter, 1999; Peeps, 1981; Rowland, 1997). Brown and Williams (1978), in Black Colleges of America, describe the missionary belief.

Education in the liberal arts was, for missionaries, a means of remaking blacks into the image of the ideal American citizen...What distinguishes missionaries’ work from other social reforms of the period and from that which followed was a belief, at least stated, that blacks were equal to whites but for the debilitating effects of slavery (p. 91).

Traditionally, the primary purpose of many private Black colleges was to teach freedmen to read the Bible and to become preachers or teachers (Kujovich, 1994). During the early 1900s, private Black institutions produced the majority of Black college graduates. Nonetheless, during those years, a high rate of illiteracy continued. In 1870 there was an 81 percent illiteracy rate among African-Americans. To remedy illiteracy, there was a need for more funding in physical and human resources in these institutions (Rowland, 1997).

As Black independent support of the private HBCU was next to impossible, African-Americans had no choice but to accept assistance from the White philanthropists and missionary societies that founded them (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Hunter, 1999; Rowland, 1997; Peeps, 1981). As such, African-Americans found their collective voice regarding their education limited by the paternalism of their White allies (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Similarly, White philanthropy as a major source of funding for the HBCU also
determined the educational destiny of the African-Americans. This influence can be clearly seen in the Booker T. Washington/W.E.B. Dubois debate. The conflict stemmed from a fierce ideological struggle between the two Black leaders. Each took antithetical stands on what level of education was in the best interest for African-Americans (Peeps, 1981; Rowland, 1997).

Booker T. Washington, graduate of Hampton Institute (now Hampton University) and founder of Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee Alabama (now Tuskegee University), believed in vocational and technical training for African-Americans (Anderson, 1988; McPherson, 1975). In Washington’s opinion, there was clearly little room for “mere book learning” (Wolters, 1975, p. 20). His ideals clearly deviated from the philosophy of the missionary brand of learning that was promoted earlier. Washington believed that industrial education would slowly but surely advance his people to a level of parity with the White race (Peeps, 1981). Hence, he used the Hampton model for industrial education to establish Tuskegee Institute. The Hampton/Tuskegee model of education was accepted and avidly supported by White Northern philanthropists (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

In support of the southern Whites’ industrial education design for African-Americans, an out-pouring of dollars from northern philanthropists was funneled into black institutions that supported vocational education. Hampton and Tuskegee were the benefactors of millions of dollars from these philanthropic groups. According to Peeps (1981), ledgers of foundation appropriations show that most philanthropic dollars did indeed turn up at these two institutions. By 1915, Hampton and Tuskegee’s respective
endowments of $2.7 and $1.9 million were by far the largest of all black colleges. In poignant contrast, Lincoln University, then the oldest, best-endowed liberal arts college reported a $700,000 endowment (Peep, 1981). Northern philanthropists gave money to those institutions that embraced the “proper education of Negroes” which was industrial education (Peep, 1981, p. 262).

“The overwhelming support of the Hampton/Tuskegee model and Washington’s national prominence as a leader and spokesman for African-Americans generated controversy within the African-American community” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 245). W.E.B. Dubois, co-founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a liberal arts graduate of Fisk University and the first African-American Harvard doctor of philosophy graduate, opposed the industrial education model. DuBois was an ardent believer in liberal arts and intellectual training for African-Americans. He was convinced that Black parity meant developing Black leaders in the same fashion of intellectual, social, and political education as Whites (Aptheker, 1973). DuBois argued that industrial education required Blacks to give up political power, abandon their insistence on civil rights, and withdraw demands for the education of Black youths (Aptheker, 1973). Similarly, Peeps (1981) states that “industrial education was seen by some Blacks and many progressive Whites as a dangerous new weapon to keep the Negro caste-bound” (p. 260).

This debate divided the African-American intellectual community and HBCUs themselves into two separate camps (Allen & Jewell, 2002). As a result of the Washington influence, many liberal arts institutions were forced to acquiesce to the
Hampton/Tuskegee philosophy to maintain financial support from Northern philanthropists and Southern state governments (Bullock, 1967; Dubois, 1969). The Washington/Dubois controversy is significant because it reveals how powerless African-Americans were in attempting to decide their educational destiny. The outcome of the debate was largely decided by those with the power and resources, the White-controlled state governments, the White individual and corporate philanthropists, and the White dominated agencies.

Additionally, the literature reveals opposing points of view regarding the missionaries and Northern White Philanthropists in funding the private HBCU. Peeps (1981) contends that the White philanthropists were responsible for the “retarded evolution” of Black private education.

It seems ironic that more than a century after their founding and financing by White philanthropists, Negro colleges should lag behind their White counterparts. It was, after all, white philanthropists who presided so centrally over the conception, birth, and early childhood of most private Black colleges. Given such a commanding presence, it appears odd that White control—particularly if born of strong philanthropic sentiment—would have had so little influence on long-range development (p. 252).

Conversely, Holmes (1969) offers an opposing view point regarding the Northern philanthropist and missionaries.

It is likely that if there had been no Northern philanthropy there would have been no Negro college in the South until a transformation had taken place in the
attitude of the white South on this subject...The point is clear, at any rate, that however mistaken the Northern denominational bodies may have been in their educational theories, without zeal the Negro race would have been lacking in leadership which the first generation out of slavery furnished (p. 70).

The problem of White philanthropy and missionary control remained an issue for the private HBCU well into the early to mid 1900s. By the late 1900s many of the White philanthropist and missionary groups had reduced their funding and had diminished in scope and activity, leaving the existence of the private HBCU in jeopardy. (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

In addition to the funding issues of the private HBCU, historically and legally, there were a series of executive orders, amendments, and court opinions that were issued by the United States government in order to rectify the disparities of opportunity for minorities. These court cases played a significant role in the establishment of HBCUs. In 1896, the Plessy vs. Ferguson case stated that separate education was equal. This ruling led to a dual system of higher education, most of which operated exclusively for Caucasians in one system and African-Americans in the other (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Millner, 1998; Rowland, 1997). This stratagem persisted until several African-American students filed a series of cases seeking admissions to traditionally White institutions: Berea College v. Kentucky (1908), Pearson v. Murray (1936), Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada (1938), Sipuel v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma (1948), Sweatt v. Painter (1950), and McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1950)
(Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002). These integration cases served as a precedent for the *Brown v. Board of Education* Topeka ruling in 1954 which established that school settings restricted by race were unconstitutional. This law supported full integration and was the beginning of the complex and elusive process of desegregating the educational system. After some delay and resistance, previously segregated White institutions grudgingly opened their doors to African-Americans in the decade following the Brown decision (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Millner, 1998; Rowland, 1997).

As a result of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the national enrollment of African-American students increased from 83,000 in 1950 to 666,000 in 1975 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). “More dramatic, however, was the shift in patterns of where African-American students attended college” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 249). For example, in 1950 the majority of African-American students attended HBCUs; conversely, by 1975, three-quarters of African-American students in college attended PWIs (Allen & Jewell, 2002). According to Allen, Epps and Haniff (1991), it was the second Great Migration. Instead of movement from the South to the North, it was a migration in enrollment of African-American students from HBCUs to PWIs. Thus, the *Brown vs. Board of Education* ruling was significant for HBCUs because these institutions found themselves competing with PWIs for African-American students that were once inherently their own.

Competing for African-American students as well as ensuring that they are in compliance with state desegregation laws have been major tasks for the HBCU. Title VI
of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 bolstered the federal government’s authority to withhold federal funding to any educational program or activity not in compliance with desegregation. In June of 1992, the Supreme Court declared that the state of Mississippi’s higher education system had not been desegregated, thus the *Fordice vs. the United States Case*. The primary issue in this case was whether an institution could be considered desegregated, even if it had race-neutral missions and policies, while it still had racially predominant enrollments, that is an HBCU of 90 to 99% African-American student enrollment. The Supreme Court ruled that HBCUs could not be considered desegregated if they operated in this manner (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, et. al., 1997; Rowland, 1997). Rather than integrating the campuses or increasing funds for the HBCU, the state of Mississippi proposed closing the Black schools and merging them with stronger and better funded institutions which were almost exclusively White. This case led to desegregation efforts which focused on changing the demographics of 19 southern and border state college campuses (Brown, 2002; Brown, et. al., 1997).

Many scholars argue that the Fordice litigation could ring the death knell of several HBCUs in the South (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown, et. al., 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Rowland, 1997). Allen and Jewell (2002) contend that education, and higher education, particularly, has been and continues to be contested ground for African-Americans. Operating under constrained resources and legal sanctions, the existence of the private HBCU is in jeopardy (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Henderson, 2000).
Survival of the private HBCU

The resounding issue throughout the literature regarding the private HBCU is that of survival due to constrained financial resources (Brown & Hendrickson, 1995; CNN.com, 2003; Fields, 1997; Journal of Blacks in Education, 1995). Albeit the issue of survival due to financial position is a major dilemma for the private HBCU, much of the literature regarding this issue are editorials and not empirical research. “Among the few places research on the HBCU appears is in the extant literature on student diversity, institutional quality, and cost-benefit studies” (Brown & Freeman, 2002, p. 238). Additionally, there was a significant amount of research developed on the HBCUs during the 1970s and 1980s, and little research was conducted in the 1990s (Brown & Freeman, 2002). According to Brown and Freeman (2002), this has led to a significant gap in the literature. Hence, this present study gives a clear theoretical basis, which Brown and Freeman (2002) articulate is often absent in the research regarding the HBCU, and offers new scholarship in the area of institutional advancement, specifically responding to the survival issue regarding private HBCUs by examining donor behaviors and motivations of African-American alumni giving to HBCUs.

Since its inception the private HBCU has had to contend with the issues of survival stemming from financial position (Allen & Jewell, 2002). In 1967, the Southern Regional Board, after intensive study, cited dire financial deprivation as the most critical problem faced by the Black college.

Without exception, the South’s traditionally Negro colleges and universities are in dire financial need. By almost any means of financial measurement, they
historically have fallen below not only national but regional averages. Their most critical needs are for (1) basic operating income which is stable, recurring, and sufficient to permit dramatically increased faculty salaries, and (2) supplementary funds which will support the upgrading of curriculum and instruction, and full battery of remedial and compensatory programs, and the expansion of administrative services (Southern Regional Board, 1967, p. 21).

Today, according to several scholars, the private HBCU continues to operate on a meager budget and has severe financial problems (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; CNN.com, 2003; Cross & Slater, 1994; Henderson, 2000; Homan, 1970; Journal of Black Issues in Higher Education, 1995; Rowland, 1997). This is evident in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) December 2002 report where two private HBCUs’, Morris Brown College and Mary Holmes, accreditation was terminated due to the criteria regarding financial resources. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education (2003), Morris Brown College was $23 million in debt and accused of using federal money to pay over due bills, and Mary Holmes’ accreditation was revoked because it was short of cash as a result of a decline in its enrollment over the years. Additionally, several other private HBCUs were placed on probation, as revealed in the SACS December 2002 report, due to problems with financial resources. They included Grambling State University, Grambling, Louisiana; Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina; Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama.

Imperative to the existence of the private HBCU, it is apparent that these institutions must focus on resource development. Currently, private HBCU funding
sources come from the state and federal government, foundations, corporations and private donors. Additionally, some private HBCUs have maintained their affiliation with the church and continue to receive financial support from this source (Hunter, 1999; Rowland, 1997). Although the private HBCU receives funding from other sources the data (see Table 1, Appendix B) from the National Center for Education Statistics (2002) reveal that the majority of funding for most private HBCUs comes from tuition and fees and the government (federal, state, and local). Similarly, according to the Institute for Higher Education Policy (2003), HBCUs enroll a large population of students who come from educationally disadvantaged, low-income backgrounds and are first-generation college attendees. As articulated by Wolanin (2003), many of these students cannot afford tuition and as result receive government assistance. There are several grant programs from the federal government that are aimed at developing and strengthening postsecondary institutions that serve students who face societal barriers, particularly first-generation, low-income, and minority students (Wolanin, 2003). These grants, Title III and Title IV, allocate millions of dollars annually to HBCUs for the purpose of providing financial assistance to its students and for development of its programs, faculty and staff.

*Title III, Part B, Section 323* which provides financial assistance based on a formula to strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The purpose of these public and private colleges was to help African-Americans overcome the legacy of slavery and to provide higher education opportunities to African-Americans excluded from predominantly White institutions by de jure or de facto segregation. In FY 2002, $206 million was appropriated for this section of Part B. Awards were made to more than 100 institutions, and the size of the average award was $2.1 million (Wolanin, 2003, p. 16).

*Title III, Part B, Section 326*, which provides formula funding for specific graduate-level HBCUs named in the law. In FY 2002, $45 million was
appropriated for five new development grants, averaging $4.9 million and thirteen continuation awards, averaging $1.9 million (Wolanin, 2003, p. 16).

*Title III, Part E, Section 1,* the Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program, provides competitive grants to institutions that serve high numbers of minority students, non-profit science-oriented organizations, and consortia to increase the number of minorities particularly minority women, who are trained for science and engineering careers. In FY 2002, $8.5 million was appropriated for forty-two new awards, averaging $105,000, and for fifty-nine continuation awards, averaging $68,000 (Wolanin, 2003, p. 16).

*Title IV* is a federal program that provides financial aid to students attending college. This federal aid may be provided through a combination of grants, loans, and work-study funds. Federal aid may also be packaged with aid offered by states, from institutional resources, or from private sources. The grants are: the Pell grant often envisioned as the foundation of student aid—upon which other forms of aid are added. Other grants include: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) and the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP). The loan programs include: The Federal Family Educational Loan Program (FFELP), The Direct Loan Program, and The Perkins Loan Program (Wolanin, 2003, p 32).

The literature reports that leaders of HBCUs vehemently seek continued support from Title III and IV as well as programmatic changes to increase flexibility (Devarics, 1996; 1997; 1998; Slark, 1997; Wolanin, 2003). Because the private HBCU is almost solely dependent on tuition and the government, these subsidies are critical to the maintenance of the private HBCU. However, a weakened economy and a decline in state and federal aid to universities have created fierce competition among colleges and universities for donations from foundations and corporations, which themselves have cut their giving amid a poor stock market performance (Mercer, 1998). Mercer (1998) contends that the survival of the HBCU is contingent upon re-thinking current strategies for development and aiming high with fund-raising campaigns. Fields (2001) states that several HBCUs have “gotten savvy about fund-raising” (p. 38). Additionally, Fields
(2001) purports that more and more HBCUs are adopting advancement models to enable them to craft a more cohesive and lucrative approach to development. Similarly, Fields (2001) reports that the array of opportunities that HBCUs are exploring now includes non-alumni donor development, online-contributions, alumni giving, endowment development, challenge grants, faculty staff giving, student giving, estate planned giving, major gifts, and foundation and corporate gifts.

Throughout the literature the most salient recommendation regarding alterations in HBCU fund-raising is the encouragement of alumni giving (Fields, 2001; Hunter, 1999; Mercer, 1998; Paschal, 2001; Ramsey, 1992; Yates, 2001). According to Rowland (1997), whether an institution is private or public, fund-raising efforts from private organizations, alumni, and friends is vital for economic success. Similarly, Yates (2001) asserts that alumni-giving is the number one source for financial support for most colleges. However, HBCUs have not had a history of generous alumni giving; thus, knowledge of African-American alumni behavior and motivation is critical to the practicing fund-raiser at the HBCU (Hunter, 1999). In addition, a shift in institutional based fund-raising such as alumni-giving is one realistic alternative available to increase the probability that private HBCUs will survive into the next century and continue to play critical roles in higher education (Boyce, 1992).

**African-American Alumni-Giving**

A review of the literature reveals a paucity of empirical studies that address African-American alumni-giving using a qualitative research methodology. The results
of the empirical studies have varied and to some degree have been contradictory. Hunter (1999), in a study conducted on Livingstone College alumni, reports extracurricular activities, major subject area of study, year of graduation, grade point average, sorority and fraternity involvement, church affiliation, and scholarship and financial aid receipt were important factors that influenced alumni giving. Additionally, Hunter (1999) found a significant relationship between financial giving and attitudes of alumni toward their alma mater. Alumni were more inclined to give to their alma mater if the president is perceived to be an effective writer and speaker, if the public image of the institution is high, and if there is an effective information network (Hunter, 1999). Rowland (1997) identifies five factors influencing alumni giving that are somewhat disparate. These factors include (1) the lack of cultural understanding of the HBCU legacy, (2) the perceived poor treatment of HBCU students, (3) the perception that the student tuition payment is enough to donate to HBCUs, (4) the debts that students owe for educational expenses (i.e. student loans), and (5) the resistance of the organizational climate that has to adhere to student needs. According to the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (2000), several other reasons explain the lower level of giving among graduates of HBCUs: (1) Many black colleges are either public universities or receive public funds which dampens the incentive of their graduates to make personal contributions to these schools. (2) There is almost no tradition of higher education philanthropy among black households. Many white families have sent several generations of students to various colleges, whereas few black families have not established such a tradition. (3) Money begets money. A preeminent predominantly white university such as Rochester earns
millions of dollars a year in royalties from medical research. This inspires Rochester alumni to give to their university. However, many Black universities have no stunning research success to inspire philanthropic activity by its alumni. (4) Success on the football field or the basketball court by a university’s team often produces a jump in alumni donations. Black colleges operate on the sidelines of big college sports. For the most part, athletic teams at HBCUs do not appear on national television, do not compete in bowl games, and do not play before home crowds of 80,000 fans. As a result, they do not generate the passionate support of loyal fans who reward the university with donations after a significant athletic triumph.

Among the few places that African-Americans have traditionally been philanthropic is the church. Regardless of their current status, many African-Americans have given generously to the church (Yates, 2001). Several scholars have examined religious affiliation and the church on African-American donor behavior (Oglesby, 1991; Carson, 1989; McKinney, 1978; McNulty, 1976). McKinney (1978), McNulty (1976) and Oglesby (1991) point out that alumni who reported a higher level of involvement with the church were more inclined to give to the HBCU. Additionally, McKinney (1978) and McNulty (1976) report that possession of a strong religious belief was a significant variable of the prediction of donor status, and alumni who have the same religious affiliation as their alma mater are more likely to participate in giving. Carson’s (1989) findings reveal that African-American alumni are more likely to give if asked by the clergy. As Billingsley and Caldwell (1991) articulate, the Black church holds the
allegiance of large numbers of African-Americans and exerts considerable influence over their behavior.

A weakness of current empirical studies is that they examine intrinsic factors regarding alumni giving but neglect extrinsic factors. The issue of race and wealth, which many African-Americans contend with, are external factors influencing African-American alumni-giving. Conley (1999), author of Being Black, Living Red, posits that “while African-Americans may have the opportunity to obtain the same education, income, and wealth as whites, in actuality they are on a slippery slope, for the discrimination their parents faced in the housing and credit markets sets the stage for perpetual economic disadvantage” (p. 152). Furthermore, Conley (1999) and Shapiro (2004) both argue that wealth not education or occupation is the greatest marker of inequality in America. Thus, the dilemma for African-Americans is a matter of asset inequality. As compared with their white counterparts, African-Americans are less likely to receive intergenerational wealth, wealth within families and across generations. According to Shapiro (2004), author of The Hidden Cost of Being African-American: How Wealth Perpetuates Inequality, one-half of a family’s net worth derives from handed-down, transformative assets, resources that can put a family on an economic and social path beyond the means of their salaries. Many African-Americans are asset poor. As a result, they are almost solely dependent on their income, and usually do not have a capacity to give back to their alma mater (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2000). The previous studies fall short in examining external factors which are beyond the African-American alumni’s control which may prevent them from participating in giving
back to their alma mater. Hence, this present study incorporates those external factors created by a hegemonic Western society and examines whether these factors influence African-American alumni giving to HBCUs.

The challenge of increasing alumni-giving has been an issue for the private HBCU for several years (Paschal, 2001). There is a movement among HBCUs to address the problem—a problem that has existed because there was not much emphasis placed upon it in the past (Jefferson, 2001; Paschal, 2001). Paschal (2001), Vice President for Institutional Advancement at Spelman College, contends that “alumni-giving is the number one concern in the area of African-American philanthropy and alumni are the single base of support that is inherently our own” (p. 27). Additionally, Paschal (2001) outlines several strategies to increase alumni giving.

(1) Reconnect with alumni. Many HBCUs have lost touch with alumni. Much of this is due to inadequate record keeping. When alumni are located, do not ask initially for money, but a better option may be to gauge their level of interest by using face-to-face meeting, web site chat rooms, and focus groups. The information gathered can be valuable to the institution. (2) Education is critical. This strategy involves creating publications and presentations that are substantive and provide information on academic and administrative trends, students, and the impact of their gifts. (3) Involvement is essential. Participation in alumni programs or serving as trained volunteer solicitors provide a sense of ownership in the college. Programs should be geared towards the individual interests. This demonstrates to alumni that the institution understands them and their needs.
(4) Develop alumni pride campaigns. This campaign includes leadership, development, recognition, philanthropy, and involvement (p. 1).

Alumni-giving is important to the private HBCUs because it impacts the overall fund-raising efforts of the institution. For example, according to Dr. Shaw (2001), president of Shaw University, the university was denied contributions from foundations on the grounds that alumni support was minimal. According to Winston (1999), colleges and universities operate under the church and car dealership model. A focus on the church model or donative institutional wealth includes alumni giving, private, corporation and foundation funding, and endowments. The car dealership model ideology entails commerce or the sale of goods and services with a focus on tuition. Access to donative resources buys quality and position (Winston, 1999). Hence, an increase in donative wealth for the private HBCU can attract quality faculty and students and increase corporate, foundation and private philanthropy. Additionally, donative wealth can inspire charitable motives in the alumni of the HBCU such as the perception of being apart of a prestigious institution and a desire to give financially to ensure that the institution maintains its position (Winston, 1999). Furthermore, Jefferson (2001) asserts that no matter how large or small the gift may be, the graduate’s contribution is a testimony to the external community that they believe in the mission and vision of the institution. In order for the private HBCU to continue to thrive and to compete for donations from corporations, foundations and other private philanthropists, it is likely that the alumni from HBCUs must understand and adopt the church model of charitable financial giving (Winston, 1999).
Theoretical Framework

As a framework for investigating African-American alumni giving at private HBCUs, this study employs cultural, critical race, and institutional theories. Using these theories as a lens this study examines African-American perceptions regarding philanthropy and giving to HBCUs. Consequently, this study searches for data as they relate to factors that facilitate or impede African-American alumni participation in giving to HBCUs.

The impact of the factors of history and culture on African-American perceptions regarding giving to the HBCU are examined using a cultural framework. The cultural frame emphasizes a pattern of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that define an identity for its members as well as characterizing how they behave and act (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Ogbu (1988) offers a more formal definition: “culture is a way of life shared by members of a population. It is the social, technoeconomic, and psychological adaptation worked out in the course of a people’s history” (p.11). Similarly, Freire (1985) believes that culture and history have a profound impact on the experiences of individuals or as he terms it “consciousness” (Freire, 1985, p. 70). Furthermore, Freire (1985) contends that an individual’s domain of existence is the domain of work, history, culture, and values—the domain in which people experience the dialectic between determinism and freedom.

Several scholars contend that slavery more than any other event has had a profound affect on African-Americans (Akbar, 1996; Huddleston-Mattai & Mattai, 1993; Patterson, 2002). Akbar (1996) asserts that the legacy of slavery has captured the mind
and imprisoned the motivations, perceptions, aspirations and identities of African-Americans. Additionally, Akkbar (1996) contends that the legacy of slavery has also created in African-Americans anti-self images, generated personal and collective self-destruction that has destroyed loyalties to themselves and has established allegiance to the forces which destroy them. Indelibly marked by their slave experience, Blacks invested education with great importance (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Formal education was seen as freedom. However, this quest for education by African-Americans was challenged with strife and discrimination from the White society.

HBCUs were established as a direct result of America’s racial discrimination. The persistent conflict between Black desires for education and empowerment and the White desires for assimilation and social control shaped these institutions as well as the individuals in them (Allen & Jewell, 2002). According to Allen and Jewell (2002), many White missionary teachers sought to divest Blacks of their “peculiar” cultural past and to teach them the ways of middle-class White Americans (p. 246). The result produced a system that rigidly defined appropriate behavior, dress, speech, and extracurricular activity for future leaders of the Black race (Allen & Jewell, 2002). These rules were similar in fashion to those enforced at White institutions in the early years and lasted well into the 20th century for the HBCU, long after they had been relaxed or modified at TWIs (Flemming, 1983; Jewell, 1998; Little, 1981). The missionaries succeeded, in the early 1900s, at producing a group of African-Americans thoroughly assimilated into the middle-class Anglo-Protestant culture.
However, during the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s, the Black student activists turned their attention towards self-definition and self-determination. To make their voices heard many African-Americans resorted to protests, both on campus and in the surrounding community, renouncing the vestiges of the cultural paternalism that had been intrinsic in founding many HBCUs (Wolters, 1975). Thus, this study examines the cultural ethos of the HBCU on the perceptions of its graduates and determines the extent to which this ethos influences participation in alumni-giving.

The population served by HBCUs lived and live under educational, economic, political, and social restrictions and survive under conditions of great inequity (Hunter, 1999). According to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the United States. Critical race theory guides an understanding of how hegemony and political economy foreclose African-Americans’ opportunities to realize their potential (Brookfield, 2003). According to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), society is based on property rights not human rights. In 1865, at the time of the Emancipation Proclamation, African-Americans owned 0.5 percent of the total worth of the United States (Conley, 1999). This statistic is not surprising: most Blacks were slaves up to that point. However, by 1990, a full 135 years later, African-Americans owned only a meager 1 percent of total wealth (Conley, 1999). In other words, almost no progress had been made in property ownership (Conley, 1999). According to the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (1998), in education as well as in most human endeavors and situations that control power and well-being, African-Americans lag behind Whites. Thus, despite almost three decades of civil rights gains,
most African-Americans remain disadvantaged and deprived because of race, class, and power (Brookfield, 2003). The intersection of these factors creates an analytical tool through which social inequity is examined in this study.

Accordingly, critical race theory promotes the change of oppressive conditions by replacing the existing system and creating a different perspective (Brookfield, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Merriam & Brocket, 1997; Outlaw, 1996). HBCUs began and developed in an environment of legal segregation and isolation from the rest of higher education (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Rowland, 1997). Historically, the HBCU operated under abysmal conditions. The facilities were dilapidated and the institutions suffered from meager budgetary allocations and fiscal constraints (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; Rowland, 1997). Currently, many of these institutions continue to operate under similar dynamics (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997). Little change is evident to the condition of HBCUs. DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) concept of institutional isomorphism informs this dawdling pace of change for the HBCU. Additionally, institutional isomorphism is a useful lens through which to examine the hegemonic influence of the elites regarding resource development while at the same time providing understanding of the irrationality, the frustration of power, and the lack of innovation that are commonplace in the organizational life of the private HBCU (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). As reported by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), isomorphism is a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions. Additionally, DiMaggio
and Powell (1983) identify three mechanisms through which institutional isomorphic change occurs that will be important to this study.

(1) coercive isomorphism that stems from political influence and the problem of legitimacy; (2) mimetic isomorphism resulting from standard responses to uncertainty; and (3) normative isomorphism, associated with professionalism (p. 150).

“Coercive isomorphism results from both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 150). Historically, HBCUs were forced to conform to the desires of White philanthropists who funded their institutions. Several private liberal arts HBCUs were forced to adopt the technical model of education in order to receive funding, which produced a homogenous organizational structure among private HBCUs. Today, the private HBCU acquiesces to the government, corporations and foundations to which they are dependent for financial resources. Hence, organizational change is a direct response to the hegemonic influence of government mandates and philanthropy interests.

Institutional isomorphism is not exclusively derived from coercive isomorphism; mimetic processes also encourage imitation (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). According to March and Olsen (1976) when organizational technologies are poorly understood, goals are ambiguous or when the environment creates symbolic uncertainty, organizations may model themselves after other organizations. Since HBCUs are unique or different in the population served, missions and curriculums as compared to TWIs, many HBCUs are
criticized for their perceived lack of quality (Brown & Freeman, 2002). Traditionally, because of segregation, HBCUs did not have to compete for African-American students. Today, after integration and the HBCU as tuition dependent as opposed to donative resource dependent, these institutions find themselves competing with TWIs for the African-American students they primarily serve. Thus, as a result they are forced to model TWIs by offering similar programs.

According to Winston (1999), higher education is a hierarchical industry with a range of rich and poor institutions. The universities at the top of the hierarchy include such institutions as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton and the bottom of the hierarchy includes such accredited degree granting HBCUs as Saint Augustine’s College, Morris Brown, and Livingstone College (Winston, 1999). According to the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (1999), there are nineteen private HBCUs, each of which has a total endowment of less than $10 million. The total combined endowment of these institutions is approximately $90 million which is roughly equal to the amount of money Harvard University earns on its endowment in 17 days (Journal of Blacks in Education, 1999). In addition, even the wealthiest of the HBCUs such as Howard, Spelman, and Hampton have endowments that are only a tiny fraction of the endowment of the wealthiest TWIs such as prestigious Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1999).

Organizational prestige and resources are important in attracting students. Winston (1999) contends that the greater the donative resources, the more control the institution has over student quality. Additionally, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) assert
that the wider the population or customers served by an organization the stronger the pressure experienced by the organization to provide the programs and services offered by other more successful organizations. “This process encourages homogenization as organizations seek to ensure that they can provide the same benefits and services as their competitors” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 154).

A third factor of isomorphic change is normative pressure stemming from professionalization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Collins (1979) describes professionalization as the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of work, to control the production of producers, and to establish a cognitive base of legitimation for their occupational autonomy” (pp. 49-52). One important mechanism of normative isomorphism is filtering personnel. Kanter (1977) refers to it as the homosexual reproduction of management. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) contend that since personnel are filtered based on a common set of attributes, they tend to view problems in a similar fashion, see the same policies, procedures and structures as normatively sanctioned and legitimated, and approach decisions in much the same way (p. 153). Many of the presidents and the top leaders of colleges and universities are chosen based on whether these individuals can perpetuate the culture (Rowland, 1997). According to Bolman and Deal (1997), the main strategies of administrators perpetuating the culture are casting the right actors, writing a suitable script, and setting the appropriate stage. On the surface, leaders appear rational. However, on a deeper plane, leaders provide a carefully crafted ritual that delivers the performance demanded. Departures from the script carry a high risk and disrupt
everyone else’s ability to deliver their lines. Bolman and Deal (1997) stated it best, that leaders can “change the symbols, revise the drama, develop new myths—or dance” (p. 249). However, perpetuating the status quo can be detrimental to the existence of the private HBCU.

Thus, imperative to their existence and according to critical race theory, these institutions must examine their current state, replace their antiquated systems and embrace different perspectives (Brookfield, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Merriam & Brocket, 1997; Outlaw, 1996). However, the unique and valued characteristics of the private HBCU have been undermined by the organizational impetus for homogeneity. Institutional isomorphism is useful to the present study because it reveals how the hegemonic influence of elites has rendered the private HBCU and its alumni virtually powerless.

Summary

HBCUs continue to exist from a historical parameter. Created for the primary purpose of educating African-Americans, these institutions, established by the church and state, have survived in the United States for more than 135 years. However, they have operated under legal sanctions and limited resources and their existence is in jeopardy (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997). HBCUs have been solely dependent on the government, the church, and benevolent philanthropist for funding. As government support decreases and as the economy worsens, competition for funding sources increases. Similarly, another challenge for the HBCU is their identity as a Black institution in a country where
race is a substantial issue. According to Mercer (1998), “the need for Black colleges may be generally accepted these days, but that does not mean that these institutions have the same fund-raising clout as predominantly White colleges” (p. 3).

Despite the challenges, HBCUs are re-thinking their current strategies for resource development (Fields, 2001; Mercer, 1998). The most vital strategy reported by the literature for assistance in resource development is to increase alumni-giving, a strategy in which the HBCU has had limited success. The literature reveals that African-American alumni giving alone will not ameliorate the financial position of the HBCU. However, according to several scholars, alumni giving plays a significant role in stimulating private philanthropists, corporations and foundations to invest in the institution (Fields, 2001; Jefferson, 2001; Paschal, 2001). Jefferson (2001) asserts that philanthropists want to see that alumni believe in the mission and vision of the institution; conversely, donors have refrained from contributing to HBCUs based on the low percentage of alumni-giving. Hence, African-American alumni giving at the HBCU is significant because it can be used as leverage to assist in the fund-raising efforts of the institution.

In order to contribute to the extant literature regarding HBCUs, this study examines the factors that facilitate or impede African-American alumni participation in giving to the private HBCU. To accomplish this, the study relies on theories of culture and critical race to guide the question formation, data collection, and analysis, which will be explained in Chapter Three. Additionally, since African-American alumni giving, exclusively, will not improve the financial position of the private HBCU, this study
employs institutional theory to guide how external factors such as the hegemonic influence of elites have rendered the private HBCU and its alumni powerless.
Chapter 3
Methods

Introduction

This study employs qualitative inquiry and explores the perceptions of African-American alumni from historically Black colleges and universities as these relate to their participation in giving back to their institutions financially. The purpose of qualitative inquiry is “to produce depth of understanding from a particular topic or experience” (Manning, 1999, p. 12). Davis (2002) views knowledge as an entity that “does not and cannot produce representations of an independent reality, but instead is rooted in the perspective of the knower (p. 511). Hence, this study obtains knowledge as it is constructed through the lived experiences of the participants of this study and understands this experience from the participants’ perspectives. Additionally, the interpretive framework of this study draws heavily upon critical race theory as promulgated by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) and Brookfield (2003) informed by institutional theory, particularly as it relates to isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), and cultural theory (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The fundamental question of this research pertains to what factors facilitate or impede African-American participation in alumni-giving to HBCUs. This study begins with certain assumptions about what would be found. Some of these assumptions are based on what was found in the literature. It is expected that some of the same intrinsic factors influencing alumni-giving will be found in this study (graduation date, major/degree, religious affiliation, alma mater experience, and leadership) (Carson, 1989;

However, this study moves beyond the extant literature and examines those extrinsic factors that influence African-American alumni-giving. Hence, this research expects to find certain extrinsic factors influencing African-American alumni giving such as those related to history and culture and Western social construction of race, class, and power. Finally, it is expected that this study will increase the understanding of African-American donor behaviors and motivations as these relate to these internal and external factors.

In addition to the methodology, there are five qualitative traditions of inquiry—biography, phenomenological study, grounded theory study, ethnography, and case study (Creswell, 1998). According to Stake’s (1995) typology, an instrumental case study design was used for this study. This inquiry has a research question or “puzzlement,” a need for both general understanding and insight which may be gained by studying a particular case; the case is used instrumentally to illustrate an issue (Stake, 1995, p. 3). Case studies take the reader into the setting with vividness and detail not typically present in more analytical reporting formats (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). This study is a case of the perceptions of African-American alumni regarding giving to HBCUs. This study was conducted at two different sites, but is a case of a particular phenomenon and uses a holistic analysis of the entire case as well as an embedded analysis of a specific aspect of the case (Yin, 1989). Data analysis will be discussed further later in the chapter.
Confidentiality

To protect the confidentiality of all information sources and as part of the agreement with the participants of the study and the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects in Research at North Carolina State University, each participant was asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix C for a copy), which informed them of the nature and purpose of the study, that their participation was voluntary, and that their anonymity would be protected. Pseudonyms are used to refer to the HBCUs and the alumni throughout this study. The interview sites, as mentioned later, will be known as Liberal University (LU) and Technical University (TU) and the alumni will be given fictitious names.

Site Selection

The two sites for the interviews of this study were “typical” private four year HBCUs. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), a typical case highlights what is normal or average. In this procedure, the researcher develops a profile of attributes possessed by an average case and seeks an instance of this case (LeCompe & Preissle, 2001). Thus, a “typical” private four year HBCU has a predominantly African-American student population and has limited funding from state and federal subsidies (Kujovich, 1994; Millner, 1998; Peterson, 1996; Rowland, 1997; United Negro College Fund, 2001). Using this profile, the literature revealed that there are fifty-four four year private HBCUs that fit this description (see Appendix A). Since the researcher was limited by travel, the search was narrowed to the southeastern United States.
The two colleges chosen for conducting the interviews were selected on the basis of the above mentioned criteria. They were both “typical” HBCUs. The first university, hereafter referred to as Liberal University (LU), is a small HBCU located in a state capital. The metropolitan population is estimated at 316,979. Liberal University is a private four year liberal arts higher education institution that was founded and continues to operate under Southern Baptist religious principles. Its student population is approximately 2,600 and the institution has a liberal arts program curriculum with concentrations in Education, Humanities, and the Performing Arts (see Table 3, Appendix E). Additionally, LU is the university where the researcher had access. Researcher access raises the issue of researcher bias; however, qualitative research is distinguished partly by its admission of the subjective perception and biases of both researcher and the participants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Several strategies, which will be discussed later, have been employed in the research to limit bias in data collection and interpretation.

The second university, hereafter referred to as Technical University (TU), is a large HBCU located in a separate state from LU with a metropolitan population estimated at 146,000. Technical University is a private four year higher education institution whose focus is more technical than LU. The student population is approximately 5,700 and the institution has a program curriculum with concentrations in Engineering, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Physical Therapy (see Table 3, Appendix E). This site was selected because it was a larger private HBCU and has a larger endowment and offers a different curriculum from LU. According to Burgess (1984), locations chosen for sociological
field of research should encompass varying levels of complexity, and these two sites varied considerably in location, size of institution, and program offerings.

**Participant Selection**

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), simple-criterion based selection was used to identify participants for the study. This selection includes all cases that meet some criteria and is useful for quality assurance. Creswell (1998) posits that “criterion sampling” works well when all individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon (p. 118). Since the study examines African-American alumni giving to HBCUs, the first criterion for this research was that the participants had to be African-American adults. Another criterion was that the alumni were actively involved in the University Alumni Association. This criterion was chosen because it ensures that the individuals graduated from an HBCU and provides a convenient method of identifying participants for the study.

The final criterion was that the alumni had been graduates of the university for at least 15 years. The rationale for this sample is based on a pilot study conducted by Barnhill (2002). The study revealed that alumni who are older and more established in their present careers are more likely to consider participating in alumni giving. Based upon this criterion-sampling approach, nineteen individuals were selected. However, to gain access to these individuals, the researcher had to obtain permission from those individuals whom Creswell (1998) refers to as “gate-keepers” (p.117). These are individuals who are members of, or have insider status within, a cultural group (Creswell,
1998). Establishing rapport with the gatekeepers and providing them with the information regarding the study was also important in gaining access to other participants.

Data Collection

Data collection was extensive, drawing upon multiple sources of information, such as document analysis, observations, and interviews (see Triangulation of Data section below). At the completion of the data collection phase, nineteen alumni from the two universities were interviewed. In addition, the websites for the two institutions were reviewed, archival documents showcasing the universities’ current state of affairs were examined, and two Alumni Association meetings for the respective institutions were attended. Nonetheless, the major source of data for this study was the interviews with the alumni.

Web-sites

This category of data refers to the electronic homepages for the two institutions used in this study. The websites included useful information regarding the surrounding area, historical information about the university, academic programs offered, student population, and general information regarding alumni giving. This information is compiled in Table 3 Appendix E.

Documents

The researcher examined the alumni magazine published for the institutions which included data highlighting current events and addressing the current state of affairs
of the university. The magazines also contained sections that illuminated the fundraising efforts of Institutional Advancement and the alumni donor report.

**Observations**

Alumni meetings were observed and observations were recorded by field notes (see Appendix E Table 3). Liberal University’s meeting took place on a Saturday morning on campus and Technical University’s meeting took place on a Tuesday evening at a local YMCA. There were forty-one members in attendance at LU. Of those forty-one, four were men and thirty-seven were female. At LU, the majority of the members were approximately forty years of age with another group around retirement age. TU, however, had a smaller meeting with nine members in attendance of which seven were women and two were men. Additionally, as compared with LU, there were younger alumni (approximately 30 years of age) than older alumni. The younger alumni atTU also held the offices in the association.

The agenda for both meetings included opening comments, previous minutes, treasurer’s report, chapter business, committee reports, announcements, and adjournment. There were, however, slight differences in the agendas for the two meetings. LU’s agenda included an invocation which reflects the religious affiliation of the institution. LU also had a breakfast, introductions, and upon adjournment sang the school song. In contrast, TU’s agenda was shorter and the members’ conversations deviated somewhat from the agenda. Finally, the alumni dues for LU and TU are $65 and $35 respectively.
Interviews

Liberal University (LU) was the first university where the researcher solicited participants for interviews. Researcher employment was useful in gaining access to the participants. All of the participants for this university came from the researcher’s attendance at the Alumni Association meeting except the Director of Alumni Affairs who was solicited via electronic mail. At Liberal University, eleven alumni were interviewed, one of whom was the Director of Alumni Affairs and one of whom was the National President of the Alumni Association. These interviews were conducted on the campus and at the homes of the participants.

At Technical University (TU), entry was difficult. The Director of Alumni Affairs did not return the researcher’s calls or respond to e-mail messages. However, an alumnus that the researcher knew from TU provided contact information for several other alumni. These individuals were contacted which resulted in one response from the Secretary of the local Alumni Association. This individual was the first person interviewed from TU. In addition, this individual was also what Creswell (1998) calls a gatekeeper. Thus, because of this insider status, the secretary granted permission for the researcher to attend the Alumni Association meeting. Additionally, because the researcher was considered an outsider the interviewing process was slower at TU relative to LU.

At TU, eight alumni were interviewed, three of whom held the office of president, secretary, and treasurer of the local Alumni Association. Four of these individuals were solicited through the Alumni Association Meeting. These contacts subsequently referred
me to the other alumni. Most of these interviews were conducted in the homes of the individuals.

In-depth interviewing was used for this study. Qualitative researchers rely extensively on in-depth interviewing to gather data. Several scholars define interviewing as a conversation with a purpose (Kahn & Cannell, 1957; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 1990).

In-depth interviewing is more like conversations than formal events with predetermined response categories. The researcher explores a few general topics to help uncover the participant’s views but otherwise respects how the participant frames and structures the responses (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 108).

Additionally, following Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998) semi-structured interview approach, an interview guide was used (see Appendix D). Although an interview guide was used during the interview sessions, the researcher engaged the participants by probing for elaboration, question re-framing, and clarification (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The researcher was also vigilant regarding the interviewees remaining the expert and their responses guiding the interview (Bogdan & Biklan, 1998). As Bogdan and Biklan (1998) advise, the researcher was prepared to let go of the plan and yield to the opportunities presented by the interview situation.

All interviews were tape-recorded with the full knowledge and consent of the interviewees. The length of the interviews ranged from thirty to ninety minutes, with most lasting approximately forty-five minutes. Interview were transcribed verbatim and used in conjunction with the research field notes which included researcher thoughts
about the interviews and observations of non-verbal expressions (for example, facial expressions, changes in demeanor, or voice).

**Triangulation of Data**

The data were triangulated using the various aforementioned data collection procedures which included: 1) document review and analysis; 2) semi-structured interviews; and 3) observation (Denzin, 2001; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Additionally, the study used space triangulation (data collected at more than one site), person triangulation (data collected from multiple participants), and interactive analysis (studying members of groups who interact with one another regularly), which according to Denzin (2001) are all methods of triangulating data. The use of different sources of data is more reliable than a single source because multiple sources lead to a fuller understanding of the phenomena one is studying (Denzin, 2001; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1999)

**Researcher Stance**

Qualitative research is informed by some interpretative framework of human and social behavior. Theory influences how we analyze the data as these data relate to the empirical world as well as what we consider to be significant in what we understand. Drawing heavily from a critical perspective, this investigation did not fully embrace traditional research assumptions. Instead, investigative assumptions included the perspective that (a) research fundamentally involves issues of power; (b) the research
report is not transparent but, rather, is authored by raced, gendered, classed, and politically oriented individuals; (c) race, class, and gender [among other social identities] are crucial for understanding experience; and (d) historic, traditional research has silenced members of oppressed and marginalized groups (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). This study assumes that knowledge is subjective, but it incorporates the perspective that society is essentially conflictual and oppressive (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). This inquiry, with a researcher using critical perspective, was viewed as leading others to change or emancipation from oppressive social structures. However, the researcher carefully scrutinized the complex interplay of personal biography, power, and status, as well as the researcher’s interactions with the participants (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Furthermore, this study recognized the powerful influence of its theoretical and ideological framework and was vigilant in ensuring that what was learned from the participants also shaped the study (Bogdan & Biklan, 1998).

Data Analysis

Relying on the strategies of Marshall and Rossman (1999), the researcher searched the interview transcripts, the documents, and field notes from the alumni association meetings for pertinent words and phrases which could be coded into categories. According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), typical analytical procedures fall into six phases: (a) organizing the data; (b) generating categories, themes, and patterns; (c) coding the data; (d) testing initial understandings; (e) searching for alternative explanations; and (f) writing the report. These phases were followed in this investigation.
Organizing the Data

To begin the process, the researcher read the data several times to become familiar with the data in intimate ways (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). During the reading process, the researcher listed the data available and performed the minor editing necessary to make field notes retrievable (Marshall et. al., 1999). There is a considerable amount of data which can seem overwhelming and unmanageable to the researcher.

The data generated by qualitative methods are voluminous. I found no way of preparing students for the sheer massive volumes of information with which they will find themselves confronted when data collection has ended. Sitting down to make sense out of the pages of interviews and whole files of field notes can be overwhelming. Dealing with all those pieces of paper seems like an impossible task. (Patton, 1990, p. 379)

Patton (1990) further underscores that qualitative reporting consists of descriptive data, the purpose which is to display the daily events of the phenomenon under study. Careful attention to how data undergo reduction is necessary throughout the research endeavor (Patton, 1990).

Generating Categories, Themes and Patterns

Under the lens of culture, critical race and institutional theories, data were analyzed to determine patterns evident in the setting and expressed by the participants. The researcher’s identifying salient themes, recurring ideas or language, and patterns of belief that link people and settings together are part of the most intellectually challenging
phase of data analysis and a phase that can integrate the entire endeavor (Marshall &

Initially, data were categorized into four themes: (1) Race (2) Class (3) Power,
and (4) African-American alumni perspectives regarding giving, as well as the individual
characteristics, such as gender, year of graduation, and occupation. These themes are
what Marshall and Rossman (1999) term “analyst-constructed typologies” which are
created by the researcher and grounded in the data but not necessarily used explicitly by
the participants. Patton (1990) affirms this typology.

[A]s with all analysis, this process entails uncovering patterns, themes, and
categories and may well be subject to the “legitimate charge” of imposing a
world of meaning on the participants that better reflects the observer’s world than
the world under study. (p. 398)

However, the researcher was cautious not to allow these themes to drive the analysis but
instead to generate concepts to guide further explorations (Patton, 1990).

Coding the Data

The next phase of analysis involved sorting the data mechanically by using the
emerging categories as units of analysis. Transcripts and field notes were coded
individually and then compared to reveal key linkages among themes and sub-themes.
According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), during this phase, the researcher applies a
coding scheme to those categories and themes and diligently and thoroughly marks the
passages in the data using the codes. Abbreviations of key words and colored
highlighting pens were used to underline passages in the transcripts. As the researcher
continued to read through the text, sub-categories were added whenever it became apparent that a particular idea or concept was both prevalent and complex enough to be divided into sub-themes.

**Testing Initial Understandings**

During the process of coding and developing categories and themes, the researcher began the process of testing emergent understandings. This phase entails the researcher evaluating the plausibility of understandings regarding developing data and challenging this understanding by searching for negative instances (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), part of this phase also involves evaluating the data for their usefulness and centrality. Hence, the researcher determined the usefulness of the data in illuminating the research questions and social phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

**Searching for Alternative Explanations**

Marshall and Rossman (1999) posit that “as the researcher codes the data, new understandings may well be discovered, necessitating changes in the original plan” (pp. 155-157). Hence, data were re-coded by searching for alternative explanations. Before the final themes were established, data were organized and re-organized several times. Ultimately data were categorized into nine general themes and included several sub-themes (see Table 6, Appendix E).

**Writing the Report**

central to the process. “In the choice of particular words to summarize and reflect the complexity of the data, the researcher is engaging in the interpretive act, lending shape and form—meaning—to massive amounts of raw data” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 158). There are several models for report writing that exist. This study employs what Taylor and Bodgan (1984) define as the presentation of data gathered through in-depth interviews and participant observation, where the participants’ perspectives are presented and their worldviews form the structural framework for the report.

Summary

This chapter was a description of a qualitative study based primarily on in-depth interviewing of African-American alumni from two HBCUs in the southeastern United States. Other data sources included institutional documents, web-sites, and field notes based upon two alumni association meetings. Data were analyzed under the lens of cultural, critical race, and institutional theories and the principles and procedures of Marshall and Rossman (1999) to arrive at the conclusions which will be explained in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

Data Analysis

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher describes the categories that were identified from the data sources based upon the discourse coding process described in Chapter Three. The categories are arranged in a logical format from which an interpretive presentation of the data is provided. The presentation begins with an historical-cultural context which includes the participants’ recollection of historical or cultural events and their experiences at their alma mater. This section illuminates how these events and experiences have influenced their perceptions regarding giving. From there, the study explores the participants’ perceptions of alumni giving to their alma maters. This category presents an analysis of the demographics of the participants, examines their perceptions of factors that influence alumni giving, as well as how they define philanthropy, strategies they suggest to facilitate giving, and their role in the continued existence of the institution. Then, under the lens of critical race theory, the study examines how race and class influence African-American alumni giving. Finally, under the guidance of the concept of institutional isomorphism, this study conceptualizes how power influences African-American alumni giving at the HBCU.

Overview

The responses to the interview questions, as well as data gleaned from the websites, documents, and alumni association meetings, were organized into nine general categories as these relate to the research questions. The categories include: (1) Historical-

As described in Chapter three (and mentioned here for clarity), several measures have been employed to protect the identities of the participants and the institutions. Each alumnus has been assigned a fictitious name, and the year of graduation follows each fictitious name by reason that the data indicated that year of graduation was an important factor in African-American alumni-giving.

**Historical-Cultural Context**

Under the lens of the cultural frame, the first category begins with a historical-cultural perspective. Freire’s (1985) notion about cultural-historical experiences provides a useful framework to examine how history and culture influence perceptions and behaviors.

The reflectiveness and finality of men’s relationships with the world would not be possible if these relationships did not occur in an historical as well as physical context. Without critical reflection there is no finality, nor does finality have meaning outside an uninterrupted temporal series of events. For men, there is no “here” relative to “there” that is not connected to a “now”, a “before”, and an “after”. Thus, men’s
relationships with the world are per se historical, as men themselves.

(pp. 70-71)

This section illuminates the notion that individual behavior can be influenced by collective factors which are historically and culturally remote (Akbar, 1996). According to Akbar (1996), social positionality and oppression are determinants of African-Americans ways of knowing which influence life decisions.

This historical-cultural context section includes three sub-categories that are embedded throughout the findings of this study: the Sankofa Context, the Sambo Mentality and the Church. These themes conceptualize how history and culture influence the perceptions of African-Americans as these relate to alumni-giving.

The Sankofa Context

As defined earlier in the literature review, the Sankofa is an African cultural symbol that depicts the body of a bird facing forward while the head looks backward. Its message is explicit: “The past shapes the future” (Allen & Jewell, 2002, p. 256). The accounts of the alumni reveal a historical connection regarding their perceptions of giving to HBCUs. One alumnus recalls how there was no other choice for African-Americans but the HBCU:

It was kind of prestigious to be able to go to the institution…It was prestigious to get to go to any university because most people were not college educated in the area where I lived and all around there. (Patricia, 1966)
Furthermore, several of the alumni describe the strong student bonds and powerful activism that took place in the community and on the campuses. Twelve out of the nineteen alumni interviewed at LU and TU matriculated through their alma maters during the Jim Crow laws and Civil Right’s movement. The alumni recall this period where African-Americans decided to fight these discriminatory laws and participate in sit-ins and arrest to protest:

During the civil rights movement in the sixties, the campus was the headquarters…[W]e housed students from other HBCUs…[T]hey couldn’t get lodging in the city, so they came to the campus…[T]he campus was a very strategic location to launch the demonstration from. (James, 1956)

I remember I was there during the sit downs. In fact, students went downtown and sat in at Walgreen’s drug store trying to get served as we were not able to eat there or be served there at the time and students went down there and were arrested. (Patricia, 1966)

This perception of events is important because many of the alumni express that the reasons that several of the younger alumni do not give back is because they do not have a cause as they did in the 1960s and earlier. The Director of Alumni Affairs from one of the institutions stated that many of the older alumni give on a consistent basis to the HBCU as compared with the younger alums. The Director defined this behavior as “generational giving.” This behavior will be discussed later in the analysis.
The Sambo Mentality

Although the alumni had different experiences, they are all descendents of the same legacy. This inheritance is the residual effects of slavery. The alumni were asked what they believe were some historical-cultural factors that influenced African-Americans’ participation in giving to HBCUs. Several alumni made reference to slavery, and one alumnus spoke of the “slave-mentality”:

Some things come up from the slave-mentality. It just seems that the White community, they have always seemed to care more for each other. As I look at some of the slave movies when we were growing up, we had to fight to survive, to stay alive. We were always beating down this brother that brother so that we personally could live and I guess that kinda just stays with us…[I]n the slave arena someone else took care of you; you weren’t allowed to make decisions. So, someone else told you, told you were going to live. They told you everything: how long you were going to do; how high to jump. Someone always told you what to do. So, you didn’t have to think of it…(Patricia, 1966)

This notion of the “slave-mentality” espoused by the alumnus is a legitimate phenomenon. Elkins (1968), in his classic book, Slavery, deals with the Sambo mentality which entailed the personality characteristics of plantation slaves. A salient element of the Sambo personality, and one of particular relevance, was the relationship that existed between the slave and master. The relationship degenerated to one of “utter dependence and childlike attachment” (Huddleston-Matatt & Mattai, 1993, p. 345). Ochberg and
Soskis (1982) corroborate Huddleston-Mattai and Mattai’s contentions in their analysis of the aftermath of a bank robbery in Stockholm, Sweden: this phenomenon is referred to as the Stockholm Syndrome. It was found that intense dependence on the captor led to a regressive child-like behavior among the hostages and ultimately an identification with those in control.

This finding supports the literature which revealed that slavery more than any other event has shaped the psyche of the current African-American (Akbar, 1996; Huddleston-Mattai & Mattai, 1993; Patterson, 2002). Many of the alumni did not realize that their responses were in line with this consciousness. For example, according to Akbar (1996), slavery produced an unusual attraction for slaves toward material objects. The material objects of the Master became a symbol of pride and status. The theme of Consumer Spending among African-Americans, which will be discussed later, reveals how large sums of money are thrown away yearly by African-Americans leaving little disposable income for participation in alumni giving. This behavior is consistent with those of African American slaves whose pursuit of material objects emulated their master. Thus, through possession of objects, they patterned the behavior of the Master, The Church

Another prevalent theme evident in the responses of the alumni is the church or religion. All of the alumni except one said that they were members of a church and give monetarily on a consistent basis. One alumnus stated that she had been a member of her church for over fifty-four years. There was a sense of pride in her conveying of this
information. In addition, several of the alumni used religious words such as “blessed” and made biblical references when answering their questions:

Interviewer: Why do you give to your alma mater?

Respondent: I feel blessed. Life has been good to me. I told my first wife, probably 20 years ago. I said if I die today, the Lord owes me nothing, because I’ve just had a good life…I have been blessed with a good income ever since I started working. It wasn’t great when I started but it got better quickly. And so I feel that I have been blessed so I can bless others. I am a Christian. I believe in the teachings of the Bible…(Charles, 1968)

I believe you reap what you sow. I believe in reciprocity. (Janet, 1999)

I feel like in the Bible and I can’t quite say where it is in the Bible. But, you know, to whom much is given, much is required. (Lola, 1947)

It’s just the feeling you get when you come to the university…Even in the songs we sing: ‘Oh Technical University a thought sent from heaven above’. So, you’re like, ‘Okay’. So God’s got a hand in the university…(Dorothy, 1971)

The church is characterized throughout the data as a powerful historical and contemporary influence regarding African-Americans and giving. Furthermore, the Black church continues to hold the allegiance of large numbers of African-Americans and
exerts considerable influence over their behavior (Billingsley & Caldwell, 1991). For example, as noted earlier, Liberal University is affiliated with the Baptist church and has been since its inception. In the past, large numbers of students who attended this institution had their tuition paid by the church. Additionally, there is a tradition at this university where several churches across the United States plan a day where they take up collection to contribute to the university and its students. Historically, the church (see Appendix A) is one of the institutions that have been responsible for the viability of the HBCU. However, several of the alumni indicated that the church has reduced its financial support to these institutions and that other strategies of philanthropic support should be sought.

**African-American Alumni Demographics and Behavior**

The data in this section indicate how demographics influence African-American alumni behavior. Degrees and employment background, generational giving, and alumni involvement are the sub-themes of this section.

**Degrees and Employment Background**

Each interview started with the alumni providing demographic descriptions which included gender, age, graduation date, type of degree, and employment background. A compilation of these demographics can be found in Table 7, Appendix E. Based upon the data in this study, type of degree and employment background were not significant variables influencing perceptions on giving. However, data from this study did reveal that those who occupied professions where the income was substantially higher, such as
the engineers and the computer science professionals, gave more substantial contributions annually. Thus, professional background influenced the amount but not giving in general. The amounts given ranged from $25 to $10000, (see Appendix E, Table 7). The alumni did report that the amounts given have varied, but have increased over time along with an individual’s financial status.

Years ago when I started giving I’d send five dollars a pay period. I got paid every two weeks. And then I increased it to ten dollars. And then I increased it to fifteen dollars a pay period. And I just tried to, as I got raises, [LU] got a raise. (Charles, 1968)

When I first graduated, I was probably giving maybe twenty-five dollars, fifty dollars, or sixty dollars. I’ve always given every year—something. But I’m more able, now, to up that since I’m out of graduate school, and I’ve been out for a number of years, now. I feel I should be able to give more back. I give two hundred or three hundred dollars a year. I’m going to try to up that starting this year to be at least one thousand dollars a year. (Erin, 1986)

Generational Giving

According to the Director of Alumni Affairs at one of the institutions, age and graduation date have a significant influence on giving. The director defined this phenomenon as generational giving.
Your older alumni give because they have a sense of love and admiration and ‘I need to support my school’ feeling about their schools in general…It is pretty much kind of a generational thing. At the time say from the ‘60s back, there was something instilled in people that this is your school and you must support it and that is what they have been doing. When you get with the ‘70s up it’s kind of ‘I will if I can’. ‘I probably won’t, but maybe’. You might hear from them once then again three years later. They are not as consistent as the first group. I think it has to do a lot with the changing times…(Jasmine, 1988)

This idea of “generational giving” is enmeshed in a historical-cultural context. Several alumni spoke of a time period during the Jim Crow Laws and Civil Rights movement when there was no choice for post-secondary education but the HBCU. Many of the alumni stated that after integration there was a loss of community for African-Americans. One alumnus recalled “all we had was each other and the campus.” According to the alumni, younger African-Americans have other options and many of them are not choosing HBCUs. If they choose the HBCU, it appears that they do not have that same sense of love and pride for the university as the older alumni. Thus, the era in which the alumni matriculated through these institutions has a significant influence on perceptions of giving.

Alumni Involvement

More woman than men participated in the local Alumni Association for both institutions. During my participant observation, which was where I attended association
meetings for both institutions, there were forty-one people in attendance at one meeting, including four males and thirty-seven females. And at the other meeting there was a total of nine in attendance with two males and seven females. The data suggested that African-American women are more likely to give than African-American men; however, the Donor Honor Roll for LU indicates that the men participated in giving on a somewhat equal basis as the women. What these data suggest is that females are more actively involved in the local Alumni Association Chapters compared with their male counterparts.

**African-American Alumni Perception of Philanthropy**

This category identifies the alumni’s perception of philanthropy or giving in general. Each alumnus was asked to define philanthropy and what causes they supported and why.

**Definition of Philanthropy**

According to Worth (2002), philanthropy is defined as a tradition in which individuals contribute, for reasons of altruism, their time or financial resources to nonprofit institutions with the goal of improving society (p.418). Seventeen of the alumni gave their definition of philanthropy. Two of the alumni had no idea what the word meant and asked the researcher promptly to go on to the next question. Most of the alumni said that philanthropy was the giving of money and time. Additionally, there were alumni who stated that they believed that a philanthropist was someone who has a sizeable amount of money and who could give a significant amount.
To me, philanthropy is giving a significant sum of money. You give $1000 a year or give $5000 at homecoming. It is giving on an annual basis, on an on going basis, not sporadic giving, but continuous giving. (Nancy, 1969)

Philanthropy to me means a spirit of giving. Now, I do connect philanthropy with people who have a lot to give. Usually when someone is referred to as a philanthropist, in my experience, its someone who is wealthy, who has a lot of money, and is generous with it. (Charles, 1968)

According to this definition and based upon the amount given by most of these individuals, they would not consider themselves philanthropic. This issue of not having a large sum of money to give was a reason stated for why some alumni do not give. In a subsequent section, this issue along with other factors influencing giving will be discussed.

Causes Supported

The conversation continued with the researcher asking what causes the alumni supported and why. The church was noted as a cause by all except one of the alumni interviewed at both institutions for this study. This finding indicates that historically African-Americans have always been extremely philanthropic towards the church (Rowland, 1997). Other causes that were stated by several of the alumni included National Association of Colored People (NAACP), United Way, American Cancer
Society, American Diabetes Association, and Alzheimer’s Foundation. Similarly, several of the alumni stated that they tended to support causes or organizations that are related to the African-American community and have impacted their lives in some way.

I tend to support groups that affect me, and have something to do with my life. (Jasmine, 1988)

My mother died of cancer, stomach cancer, so I think about that when I’m called upon to give to the American Cancer Society. My father died of complications associated with diabetes, so I think about that also. (Charles, 1968)

I am a life member of the NAACP because I see that as a need. Part of that comes from my age of sixty-three and realizing that—realizing the struggle, and realizing that many of our gains have been because of the NAACP and its philosophy, so I support the NAACP. (Marie, 1962)

Factors Impeding African-American Alumni Giving

One cause that all the alumni had in common was support of their alma mater. The alumni were asked to give factors they believed influenced alumni giving. Since this study addresses the financial position of the HBCU, the discussion was limited to monetary giving. The alumni offered several factors that they believed impeded giving. The collective responses included negative alma mater experience, leadership and
progress of the institution, poor communication, donation amount, and financial priority. This section will be framed specifically with examples of the alumni responses.

**Negative Alma Mater Experience**

The alma mater experience depicts experiences at the university that the alumni observed or lived through during their tenure at the university. Out of the nineteen alumni interviewed at both institutions only one had a negative experience. The other alumni recalled having a positive alma mater experience. Almost all of the alumni attributed having a negative experience as a factor that influenced their not giving. One participant describes a story as an example of an alumnus who had a negative experience and as result does not want to have anything to do with the university:

I recall an individual who was a very outstanding athlete, very outstanding, but he was on scholarship for four years. But he stayed five and he wanted his scholarship to go beyond that. His scholarship only called for four years, but he left with an attitude. He’s never been back. We have contacted him and very adamant. His wife says, ‘no indeed, he doesn’t want anything to do with the university because he felt that the university did him wrong’. (James, 1956)

Similarly, another alumnus notes that those students who leave the institution with a positive experience feel more obligated to give:

A lot of people leave the institution with a good feeling. They leave with a good spirit and they will in turn give…On the other hand some of the people leave with an ill feeling because of some
treatment by a professor perhaps. And it’s hard to get them to give when they leave with that kind of feeling; and therefore, I would suggest any way possible while a student is there to build a good will because they will feel more obligated to give having had a good will at the university.

(Sadie, 1951)

Progress of the Institution

To create this good will, the alumni believe that administrative leadership is important. According to the alumni, the perception of leadership and progress greatly influences alumni giving. One alumnus out of the nineteen interviewed at both institutions reported leaving the institution with a negative attitude. This individual shares how the new administrative leadership changed her perception.

We have a new president who has a new vision. And he brings new energy and if you could make an old die hard like me who was mad at the school come back and work and serve, he’s good. So, now what’s coming back is someone who’s bringing something back to the school and then others of us can go back and say, ‘but you got to come and see this’. ‘The institution is a new place. It’s not what it used to be during a certain period of time’. (Stella, 1997)

Another alumnus gives her perspective on leadership and progress at her alma mater. This alumnus believes that having leadership with good vision and an institution progressing through such things as research and a successful athletic program inspires alumni to invest in their alma mater.
I believe the President has a very good vision. He’s upraised the school, not only in buildings, but in things that he’s invested in such as cancer research that’s going on at the campus. The basketball team and the football team, even though that really shouldn’t be that important, in America, that is what’s important in a university, and that’s what gets the name of a university on the tip of people’s tongues. So, now, when I walk through an airport and I have on a university tee-shirt, they say, ‘Oh! You all are the ones who made it to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and played the such and such’…So if you weren’t—if the school wasn’t growing and you weren’t investing, then the basketball program and the football program wouldn’t have improved to go from Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) to Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC) and be on TV and those type things. So as you invest in the school, as you invest in anything, and it improves, and if you’re associated with it, then it improves your worth. (Carrie, 1982)

Poor Communication

Carrie (1982) makes reference to her association with the institution; however, the participants indicate that many alumni are disconnected from the university because of poor communication on the part of the institution. They think that it is important that the university stay connected with prospective donors if they want to increase giving. The alumni also posit that it is difficult to solicit alumni participation when the university has
not cultivated a relationship with the donor. Worth (2002) defines cultivation as the process by which an institution develops a relationship with a prospective donor by providing information and involving the individual in the institution’s planning and events, with the goal of engendering that person’s commitment and support (p. 415). One alumnus shares a story of a man who is 100 years old and has willed his estate to the university, but the university has forgotten him.

This man told me a year or two before he went into the rest home, and it hit me like a ton of bricks. He served on the trustee board and [was] a very strong advocate of the university principles, very supportive, but when he took sick and got out of the mainstream of things, they somehow forgot about him. He said, ‘they don’t even send me a newsletter’. He said, ‘tell someone over there that I am still living’. It really got to me. (James, 1956)

Other alumni share their perspectives regarding facilitating giving through communication and keeping the alumni connected to the university.

I got a friend that lives in Florida that has not been back here since he graduated. He keeps saying he’s coming, but hopefully we’re going to get him back. I think once he comes back, you know, you tend to give once you get back involved. When you’re disconnected, I think that is the real thing, you don’t see the urge for giving. The main thing is how can we keep them connected with the institution. I think the more you have a connection with the institution, the more they give, and that’s the
hard part. (Larry, 1971)

If people don’t get information about giving, where the money is going to go, what it is needed for, they are not going to give. (Tina, 1984)

**Donation Amount**

However, even after a relationship has been cultivated, there are alumni who do not participate in giving. The informants collectively believe that the reason is that they do not have a large donation.

One thing [is] because the list of givers and the amount that they give is usually publicized within the alumni or that institution. Some might say that I can only give $25 and I am a little bit embarrassed to give $25 so I won’t give anything. (Lola, 1947)

Additionally, the Director of Alumni Affairs shares how the generous donation of a wealthy alumnus has impeded their solicitation efforts with other less affluent alumni.

What has been a blessing for us and also a thorn in our side just to be very honest with you is the support that we have received from [the attorney]. His support has been phenomenal. It is a blessing and it is also not a blessing because people see that he gave $10 million, [then they say] ‘you don’t need my $100’. But if we got his $10 million and your hundreds, we’ve got a hundred more than we had when he gave his. They don’t understand that it is an ongoing thing. They don’t understand that the university is operating under a $32 million budget. I think that is for the
year. So we are talking a couple of million dollars a month that we need in addition to the tuition that the students are paying. Students can’t carry the load. We, as the alumni, have to step up to the plate and help our alma mater. Trying to get them to understand that and move into, [Y]es, your little bit does help is the obstacle that we’re trying to get over now.

(Jasmine, 1988)

Financial Priority

Another impediment reported by the alumni was that participating in alumni giving was not a personal spending priority of individuals. They stated that there were other obligations that took precedence over giving which entailed preoccupation with obtaining a job, transportation, and housing, family, and debt.

Sometimes I think that when many of our students first leave college they have their minds really concentrated on getting a job and then, of course, once they get the job they’re interested also in getting transportation and then later on maybe housing or that kind of thing…(Lola, 1947)

I think a lot of it, too, is that some people have families. You get married; you have a family and start having kids and your money starts going other places. It could be debt. (Erin, 1986)

I think a lot of times when you have children they tend to maybe take more out of the budget than normal, especially if people are trying to think
about saving for their education. And then they purchase a home and I think all those things overshadow. You know in the back of your mind you need to give to your alma mater but you got all those things coming…(Rebecca, 1954)

**Strategies to Facilitate Giving**

The alumni revealed numerous reasons for not participating in giving; however, they also espoused several factors they believed would facilitate giving. There were two resounding strategies reported by the alumni: increased communication by the institution and education of students regarding giving. Additionally, opposing view points regarding whether publishing the donor list would facilitate or impede alumni giving is illuminated in this section.

**Increased Communication**

Most of the alums indicated that communication was an area where their alma mater needed improvement. The strategy reported by several alumni was increasing the correspondence informing alums about events on campus.

I think there needs to be more communication. Let me compare TU to [where I received my Master’s which was a majority institution]. [They communicated] at least twice the number of times per year [as compared with TU] regarding giving or just information. [TU] could send a folder or flyer saying
something about a program [or] about what’s going on. (Rebecca, 1954)

I guess more personalized communication. Maybe a phone call once a quarter or once a semester calling you to let you know what’s going on back at the ranch. [For example], the choir is giving a concert, the band is giving a concert, maybe someone is giving a book signing, or are there any new programs they are setting up at [TU]? We might want to come back and take classes back there if we knew something was going on. But if I don’t know about it, I can’t take it. (Erin, 1986)

Additionally, the Director of Alumni Affairs shares her strategy for keeping the alumni informed through ensuring that her data base is updated.

Information is key. When I got here a lot of people complained about they didn’t know what was going on. And of course my first response was, ‘Are you on our mailing list?’ And I would say six times out of ten, if I turned to the computer and pulled up the person, we didn’t have a good address for them. [The alumni response would be] ‘Oh, I haven’t been at that address in ten years’. [And my response is] ‘Well, we have been here for 140 years and so what’s the problem here. You’re the one moving around. You have to let us know’. So, we have done, I think, a
really good job of updating our database. Every two to three years we publish a list where we put all the names and all the addresses and their class year. We get so many people calling, ‘Well, here is an address I have for…’ Or they’ll call [and say], ‘they told me I was on the list, and I need to come off that list’. So, that helps us keep the database intact. (Jasmine, 1988)

As reported by the alumni, communication by the institution is a factor that both facilitates or impedes African-American participation in alumni giving.

**Education of Students Regarding Giving**

Education was also another collective strategy that the alumni reported that would facilitate giving. They indicated that educating the students regarding the importance of giving during their tenure at the university could possibly facilitate giving after graduation.

When we were in college, I don’t remember one time the university talking to us as a student body about giving back.

Whereas in my graduate school, which was a White university, that was all they talked about. So, we’re not educated into giving. (Stella, 1997)

I don’t ever remember anyone sitting down with me or sitting in class or a lecture or anybody instilling the importance of philanthropy and giving back to colleges. So, I think if you start
early, then, the [HBCUs] would see improvement in giving.

(Nina, 1990)

**Alumni Donor Publication**

Finally, the data revealed two opposing responses regarding publishing alumni donor amounts. One alumnus believed that the giving list should not be published because it would impede giving.

Maybe one [strategy] would be if the school would not always publish the donor list…. [L]ike I was saying to you earlier, most of the time we have classes of givers and some people might would give less, but they wouldn’t want their names to be on a list where most everybody’s giving a lot (Lola, 1947)

Conversely, another alumnus believed that publishing or highlighting the names of alumni who gave would inspire a competitive nature of giving.

I think one of the things they could do is highlight alumni each time they publish the magazine, giving an example of someone who is giving back. Sometimes that encourages [alumni to give] because people are competitive by nature, so when they see someone else doing something, then, maybe that makes them think, ‘You know, I should be doing this. I could do this’. People will look inside themselves and say, ‘Well, what can I do?’ It might not be what this person did, but I could do something’.

(Nina, 1990)
The strategy reported by the previous alumnus is inconsistent with the aforementioned factor reported by the alumni as a reason for not giving which was that alumni did not have a large donation to give.

Role of Alumni in the Continued Existence of their Alma Mater

In addition to the strategies for facilitating giving, each alumnus was asked what they believed their role was in the continued existence of their alma mater. The collective responses included to continue support financially and to recruit students. Furthermore, the alumni emphasized the importance of ensuring the survival of not just their alma mater but all HBCUs.

Support Financially

Several alumni believed that their role was to continue to provide financial support to their alma mater. James, a 1956 graduate, believes that his principal role is to give money to the institution.

I believe my number one role as an alumnus is to be a supporter.

The number one thing is money. You don’t want to say it that way, but when you start understanding, I realize that my number one role is to give money to [LU]. Then those other things come, like attending events, helping with things they need, and helping sell tickets. All that helps the university, but the more money I can give the better off [LU] is going to be.
**Student recruitment**

In addition to monetary support, the majority of the alumni reported recruiting students as their responsibility to the institution. Marie, a 1962 graduate, shares her story of recruiting only the best students to attend her alma mater.

I believe my role is to talk to some good students to encourage them to go to [TU]. Especially in my job, I run across good students and in other places. For instance, my family had its family gathering in Miami last summer, and we had a tour. One of the young ladies was an intern with the tour guide—I just thought she was so impressive. And so, I decided I would talk with her. She was a rising senior, and I asked her where she was planning on going to school. She hadn’t heard of [TU]. I told her all about [TU] and gave her contact information. And she said, ‘I’m going to ask my counselor about this’. When I run across students—it sounds awful, but students I am impressed with, I will tell them about [TU].

Additionally, another alumnus indicates how integration has made recruiting African-American students with a high academic status competitive.

I think it’s vital for me to recruit students to attend [TU]. Spread the word about my experiences there. One thing that I think HBCUs are struggling with, today, is the fact that integration has evolved, and so, they don’t get a high caliber of
academic students anymore. We have to compete with the
majority institutions. (Nina, 1990)

Finally, Nancy, a 1969, graduate believes that the HBCU provides African-American
students with the skills crucial for success.

I think my role for sure is going to be finding a way to convince
parents in the community that the best thing they could do is send
their students to an HBCU--at least for those four years. Because
we know if they go on to graduate school or professional school,
it’s going to be a majority school. And I think the HBCU gives
African-American students the exposure and the experience
and the foundation that is so crucial for success in any arena. I’m
talking about leadership and confidence, of being resourceful and
being able to deliver.

**Ensure the Survival of the HBCU**

Finally, the alumni indicate that the HBCU continues to be a powerful leader in
the education of African-Americans; hence, they believe that their role is not only to
ensure the survival of their alma mater, but to ensure the survival of all HBCUs.

It is important for LU and the LUs of the world to not only continue to
exist but to thrive. This institution was there for us when we couldn’t
even be a student at TWIs. Those schools still don’t want us. They will
take us, especially if it enhances their well being, and it does; they don’t
want just any student, they want the best. And they want our athletes, so
they can win the championship and so forth. They want our good students so that their average SAT score will go up and so forth and so on. But, the HBCU, these schools were here for us when nobody else would take us. And they still provide an excellent education. So, we need to be here and we need to be supporters. So that’s my role. My role is to be an example, a positive example of what one can do that will help the university be the best it can be. (Charle, 1968)

Alumni recruit students and they view this action as a major role for them to ensure the survival of the HBCU. According to the literature, it is imperative to the survival of the HBCU that they must progress from being solely dependent on tuition and the government (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown & Hendricks, 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Rowland, 1997). The most salient alteration to fund-raising at HBCUs is to increase alumni giving (Fields, 2001; Hunter, 1999; Mercer, 1998; Paschal, 2001; Ramsey, 1992; Yates, 2001); hence, to ensure the survival of the HBCU the African-American alumni must re-evaluate and understand that their major role is fund-raising and giving monetarily (Mercer, 1998).

**Giving Black**

The previous sections reported the analysis of African-American alumni perceptions of giving to HBCUs. However, these collective perceptions of the alumni did not have a racial connotation. Alumni were asked how race influences participation
in giving. Their responses can be viewed through three themes: intergenerational wealth, financial planning, and consumer spending.

**Intergenerational Wealth**

Shapiro (2004) defines intergenerational wealth as wealth within families and across generations. These resources are transformative and can put a family on an economic and social path beyond the means of their salaries (Conley, 1999; Shapiro, 2004). The data revealed that alumni were taking care of their immediate families as well as extended family. They reported financially supporting parents, siblings, nieces and nephews.

The other causes that I support are my family. I consider that a cause. My parents are elderly and I’m from a family of 10 and I’m the youngest. So my parent’s are of grandparent age. As in most older people, they didn’t work for the large corporations and so forth so they don’t have retirement and things that, let’s say, the majority of white people have. My niece and nephew, I actually take them on a trip every summer. (Carrie, 1982)

I think that when I graduated if my mother had been able to say, ‘Oh, here is your little car, honey, and when you find a house, I’ll help you out,’ it would be different. But, I had to do all those things on my own…We kind of help our sisters and brothers and everybody else in the family to make it. (Dorothy, 1971)
The alumni in this study indicate that African-Americans do not have the advantage of intergenerational wealth, and as a result, there is less disposable income which limits their capacity to give back to their alma mater.

**Financial Planning**

Another racial factor reported by the alumni that restrains alumni giving is lack of financial planning. Alumni reported that African-Americans live year to year with no plan for the future.

What I find so crazy is that [African-Americans] live one year at a time with no prior planning. And when their darlings get ready to go to school they’ve got no money for that either, because they’ve spent everything on conspicuous consuming. (Dorothy, 1971)

Similarly, the Director of Alumni Affairs characterizes planned-giving as a difficult area to stimulate African-American participation.

Planned-giving is a tough area for African-Americans. I think we as a people, we don’t like to plan for later. We don’t like to talk about it, we don’t want to deal with it right now. Planned-giving is a whole entity in and of itself and tax laws and all those different things and charitable trusts. It is major. African-Americans are just now getting to the point where it is like, ‘I’ll think about it.’ And if you look back at how Chapel Hill and Duke and Harvard are successful, it is because people planned to help them when they weren’t here. So, we have got to get our people to understand that this is what we need to do. This is how, this is why they
have things that they have and we don’t. ‘Well so … and so has got this.
Why don’t we have this? We don’t have it because we don’t have the
money to do it. Now, you want to help us get there?’ Now that puts a
whole different spin on it when you turn it back to the person that is
asking the question, ‘What are you doing to help us get there?’ (Jasmine,
1988)

According to Conley (1999) and Shapiro (2004), the reason that planned-giving is
a difficult area for soliciting participation from African-American alumni is a matter of
assets and not race. After the Emancipation Proclamation, African-Americans owned 0.5
percent of the wealth in the United States, and by 1990, 135 years later they owned only
1 percent of the wealth (Conley, 1999). Thus, if the majority of African-Americans are
asset-poor there will be limited participation in planned-giving.

Consumer Spending

As reported by the alumni, African-Americans are unable to plan to give to their
alma maters because they are engaging in what Dorothy, a 1971 graduate, termed
“conspicuous consuming.” The alumni believe that African-Americans are selfish and
materialistic.

I think that African-Americans do not come from a family with stuff. And
so, you graduate and grow up dirt poor, and you’ve finally got some
money and you’re starting to care about me. ‘I need this’. Because even
poor Blacks are just trying to get stuff. (Dorothy, 1971)
[M]aybe if a person has not been accustomed to having certain things, maybe these individuals or these persons will say, ‘well I’m going to get this thing because I haven’t had this before. I haven’t had this kind of car or that kind of car’…(Lola, 1947)

Many of them won’t even help their own families. They take whatever they have and do as they please. That’s one of the things, ‘I have everything, I don’t need you’. One person calls it ‘litis’. There is too much ‘litis’, and that’s most unfortunate. (Bessie, 1953)

This theme of consumer spending appears to include the historical-cultural concept of the Sambo mentality which explains the African-American behavior regarding consumer spending. Akbar (1996) elaborates on this phenomena.

[T]he slave was permitted to own nothing or very little. Property and the finer material objects such as clothes, jewelry, etc. were reserved for the slave master. The slave master’s fine house, beautiful landscaping, exquisite clothes and objects were associated with his power and status. In the same way the slave looked upon his master with hatred and resentment, he also resented and envied the master’s possessions because those possessions were associated with freedom and the power to direct one’s life, family, and community. Slavery produced an unusual attraction to material objects. The cast-off hat or dress passed down from the ‘Big House’ to the cabin, became a symbol of pride and status. By wearing
'Massah’s’ old hat or ‘Missis’ old dress one could play at being Massah or Missis for a few fanciful moments. The legacy of such experience with property and materials, has made these objects powerfully influential in the lives of many African-Americans. Large sums of money are thrown away yearly on expensive flashy clothes and cars. Uncomfortable, impractical and showy items of furniture drain budgets and fail to satisfy the longings and persistent wish to look like the slave master. (pp. 6-8)

Socio-economic Status and African-American Alumni Giving

In addition to the influence of race as a variable of giving, the alumni also shared how they thought that class influenced giving. The sub-themes of this section included class parity and class disparity.

Class Parity

Several of the alumni, most of whom matriculated through their institutions before integration and during the Jim Crow Laws of the South, thought that class had little to do with giving. They indicated that regardless of class level individuals could give. Additionally, the alumni stated that more individuals from the low-middle/middle class participated in giving than the upper class. Bessie, a 1953 graduate and also a retired English/French teacher, reports that she is on a fixed income and believes if it were not for the low/middle class alumni giving, the percentage of giving would be less.

If it weren’t for those of us giving $100 monthly or every other month, or
$50 here, $25 there, I think there would be less giving than there is. We can think of those schoolmates who make plenty of money and they have every kind of material object that one can have; [however], [LU] is just not what they choose to do.

Similarly, the alumni indicated that it was not how much one gives, but that one contributes and that the economy did not influence giving unless, of course, one lost their job. One alumnus shares his perspective regarding the economy not influencing alumni giving.

I don’t really think the economy has much of an impact on alumni giving now, obviously if a person such as myself loses his job, then, he’s not in a position to give very much. I’m sure some of our alumni have been among those who have lost jobs because we’re coming out of, according to the reports, an economic crisis. And lots of people have lost jobs in this state and other states, and I’m sure that some of them are alumni of [LU] and other institutions. So I imagine to the extent that a person would lose his job, that would have an impact because obviously if you don’t have a job you don’t have a salary. But those of us who are able to keep our jobs, who have been blessed to keep our jobs, really don’t have any reason not to give to our alma mater. (Charles, 1968)

A possible explanation for these individuals’ perceptions has historical-cultural ties. Before integration, the Jim Crow Laws of the South forced African-Americans into their own communities, for example, churches, schools, and restaurants. Hence,
regardless of the type of job, income, or education most African-Americans during that time operated on a certain level of parity with each other (Allen and Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Brown, et. al., 1997; Henderson, 2000; Kujovich, 1994; Millner, 1998; Rowland, 1997). Even today many of their viewpoints are based on that premise (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

Class Disparity

In contrast, one alumnus notes that class and the issue of disparity between black and white incomes have a major influence on giving. She contends that African-Americans have less disposable income at the end of the month once you factor in the cost of living and other expenses such as children.

Another issue we’re not probably considering is the fact that there is still a significant difference made in the income that a white person makes and a person who’s not white. I will never forget our first house on Glascock Street. Here we are, both college graduates, nobody on the street, none of those white folks were college graduates. They all had homes…We were telling my children the mistake of not going to college, and the little one said ‘well you and dad went to graduate school, and you’re still hustling’. And it was such a slap in my face. At first, I couldn’t think of anything to say in response to that, and then it kicked in, and I said, ‘and since we did and since we are hustling, what are you going to do without it? How do you plan to make it without it? ’ And I still think that the same rings true. I still think that there are discrepancies in the salary that a black person
makes and a white person makes, sometimes in the same position.

Doesn’t make any sense, and they have the nerve to act like it was beneath them to have a black person living on their street. Or next door to them.

You know what I mean? You know, like hey, we paid greater dues.

(Nancy, 1969)

Nancy’s story is illustrative of the disparities that Shapiro (2004) contends exist between the black and white middle-class in America. He posits that black middle class families with similar jobs, incomes, education, and accomplishments have considerably less financial resources than their white counterparts (Shapiro, 2004).

Power and African-American Alumni Giving

This section illuminates how the hegemonic structure of Western culture has marginalized African-Americans to the point of their becoming powerless; however, in order to increase the level of fund-raising influence with other funding sources such as corporations and foundations the alumni will have to increase their level of giving.

Invisible Man Syndrome

Because of the discriminatory treatment African-Americans encounter, for example, difficulty obtaining credit, redlining, and black-white income disparity (Conley, 1999; Shapiro, 2004), African-Americans experience what the researcher terms the “Invisible Man Syndrome.”

Whence all this passion toward conformity anyway?—diversity is the word. Let man keep his many parts and you’ll have no tyrant states…so
it is that now I denounce and defend, or feel prepared to defend. I condemn and affirm, say no and say yes, say yes and say no. I denounce because though implicated and partially responsible, I have been hurt to the point of invisibility (Ellison, 1952, p. 499).

These words are found in the perennially popular *Invisible Man*, by Ralph Ellison. This book conceptualizes the points of this section. Ellison’s (1952) novel relates the story of an African-American man’s nightmarish journey across the racial divide and how the nature of bigotry affects both the minds of the victim and perpetrators of bigotry. The protagonist in this story is portrayed as powerless or what the book terms “invisible,” hence the title of this section.

The plight of African-Americans as revealed by the study’s participants is one of powerlessness. The data from this study indicate that the African-American alumni are not giving the sizeable amount of money that can make significant change to the financial position of the HBCU (see Table 7, Appendix E). In addition, according to the participants of this study, until African-American alumni increase the level and amount of giving they will remain powerless in improving the financial position of the HBCU. Nina, a 1990 graduate, explains how she wrote a letter informing the alumni of the giving rates of HBCUs as compared to TWIs. In her letter she encouraged the alumni to donate.

I know I personally wrote up a letter comparing our alumni giving rate to schools like Duke and other HBCUs and how they had higher giving rates than us. I think that for a while we were pretty complacent, thinking [TU] is doing O.K., the alumni are doing O.K. I saw the numbers when I was
looking up [TU]’s ranking in the News and World Report. I noticed that we were below some of the schools. This is not right. We can do better. So, I wrote up something and tried to encourage other people to at least donate. It doesn’t have to be a lot. I mean, you spend $10 to go to a movie, you can certainly send $10 to your alma mater. So, those are the kinds of points I made in the letter.

Alumni-Giving as Leverage

The alumni indicated that the HBCU will have to increase its percentage of alumni who give if they want to solicit support from corporations and foundations. One alumnus shares his perspective on how increasing the percentage of alumni who contribute can be used as leverage to assist in the fund-raising efforts of the institution.

Now, I have come to understand that what an alumnus gives is not going to pay the majority of the budget. The [LU] budget is probably $40 million or $50 million in a small school like this. So, we’re not giving that kind of money, but the point is we are giving. What the [president] and his administration want to be able to say to philanthropists, the people with the big money, look at what our alumni are doing, look at the percentage. Now, they haven’t been able to do that because we haven’t had a good percentage. We’re trying to work towards that. So, what we want to do is influence people to give something, and all of us giving whatever can increase the percentage who are giving, and that is what the administration is shooting for. If the administration, for example,
could go to a Bill Gates and say 70% of our alumni are giving, they might not be giving much, but they’re giving. That’s impressive. 20% is not impressive, 15% and 10% is even less impressive. (Charles, 1968)

The HBCU, historically, has been dependent upon the church and the White philanthropists that founded many of these institutions. Currently, the support from the churches and White philanthropist has dwindled and the institutions are now dependent upon tuition and government, which has also cut funding (Rowland, 1997; Hunter, 1999; Peep, 1981). Thus, imperative to its existence, the HBCU must seek other sources of funding (Brown and Hendrickson, 1997). However, according to the alumni of this study, in order to solicit funding from corporations, alumni-giving levels must improve.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the concepts that arose from data sources based upon the process of discourse analysis. The data were grouped into nine main categories that addressed the research questions. The purpose of this study was to identify factors that facilitate or impede African-American alumni participation in giving.

The factors that the alumni perceived impeded alumni participation included negative alma mater experience, leadership and progress of the institution, poor communication, donation amount, and financial priority. The prominent strategies alumni indicated that would facilitate giving included increased communication, education of students regarding giving before graduation, and alumni donor publication. Furthermore, the most salient historical and cultural factors influencing giving included
the era into which the alumni were born, as well as the historical conditions of slavery and the influence of the church in social life. The race category indicated that African-American alumni-giving is influenced by intergenerational wealth, lack of financial planning, and increased consumer spending. The category of socio-economic status, as reflected in the comments on class parity and disparity, revealed two opposing viewpoints regarding class and the economy influencing alumni giving. The final section conceptualizes how power influences alumni giving and reveals how the limited resources and the discriminatory treatment of African-Americans constrain participation in alumni-giving. This chapter reported the findings, themes, and sub-themes that were identified from the study. Chapter Five reports conclusions, implications and recommendations regarding the study.
Chapter 5

Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

This chapter discusses the study’s conclusions as well as how this investigation informs both practice and research. The discourse of the interviews in this study as well as the data sources revealed important implications regarding the factors that influence the perceptions of African-American alumni giving to HBCUs. The most salient factors influencing African-American alumni giving are discussed and broken down into external factors, those factors that are considered beyond alumni control, and internal factors, those factors that are perceived to be within the control of the alumni. Additionally, under the guidance of institutional theory, this section addresses how the phenomenon of isomorphism influences resource development and offers suggestions for institutional advancement at the HBCU. Finally, this chapter discusses the need for more research addressing the issue of constrained resources at the HBCU and offers recommendations for further study.

Conclusions

The results of this study address one central question: What factors facilitate or impede African-American alumni participation in giving to historically Black colleges and universities? The alumni espoused several factors, both enabling and constraining, that influenced African-American participation in giving to HBCUs. A weakness of the extant research was the focus on the intrinsic factors influencing African-American
alumni giving while neglecting extrinsic factors (Hunter, 1999; *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 2000; Rowland, 1997). This study extends the scope of understanding of African-American alumni donor behavior by examining how the external factors such as history and culture, race, class, and power influence African-American perceptions regarding alumni giving. The data from this study are displayed in the following model (see figure 5.1). The components of the model include African-American perceptions regarding alumni giving to HBCUs and the most salient internal and external factors influencing African-American alumni giving.

The focus of the model are African-American alumni perceptions in that the dominant conceptualizations of this study are viewed through the distinctive lens of African-Americans’ experience of the world. The arrow to the left of the model indicates the significant impact that external factors have on African-American perceptions. These factors characterize those influences that are viewed as beyond alumni control. There are four of these factors.

1. **Historical-Cultural Context.** This factor encompasses the notion that individual behavior can be influenced by collective factors which are historically and culturally remote (Akbar, 1996). For example, this study revealed that the residual affects of slavery, the Jim Crow laws and the struggle for Civil Rights and the social influence of the church significantly impact African-American alumni perceptions. According to Akbar (1996), social positionality and oppression are all determinants of African-Americans ways of knowing and life decisions.
2. **Giving Black.** Race precludes African-American participation in alumni giving because African-Americans do not have the advantages of Whites such as intergenerational wealth or wealth within families and wealth across generations. The data of this study revealed that instead of receiving the head start from the resources of intergenerational wealth, many of the alumni were taking care of their immediate families as well as their extended families, and as a result there is less disposable income which limits their capacity to financially give back to their alma mater.

3. **Socioeconomic Status and African-American Alumni Giving.** Data from this study revealed disparate opinions regarding class. Several alumni, most of whom matriculated through their institutions before integration, indicated that class is an insignificant factor in alumni giving and that alumni were able to give regardless of class level. A possible explanation for these individuals’ perceptions is that before integration, the Jim Crow Laws of the South forced African-Americans into their own communities. Thus, regardless of the type of job, income, or education, most African-Americans during that time operated on a certain level of parity (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002; Henderson, 2000). Conversely, some alumni posited that the issue of income disparity between Blacks and Whites had a major influence on alumni giving. These alumni’s perceptions are in accord with Shapiro (2004), who posits that Black middle class families with similar jobs, incomes and education have considerably less financial resources than their White counterparts.
4. **Power and African-American Alumni Giving.** The plight of African-Americans as revealed by this study’s participants is one of powerlessness. Data from this study indicate that African-Americans are not giving sizeable donations to assist in improving the financial position of the HBCU, thus leaving the HBCU and its alumni both powerless and in a position to acquiesce to the government, corporations, and foundations. Similarly, the alumni of this study reveal that significant increases in percentages of alumni who give compared to the amounts given can be used as leverage to assist in the fund-raising efforts of the institution.

This study reveals that the external factors have a considerable influence on the perceptions of internal factors espoused by the alumni. Hence, the internal factors characterize those conditions and actions that the alumni perceive they or the HBCU can alter. There are six of these factors.

1. **Negative Alma Mater Experience.** The alma mater experience entails observation of or participation in events by the alumni during their tenure at the university. Out of the nineteen alumni interviewed for this study only one had a negative alma mater experience. Thus, the alumni from this study attributed a negative alma mater experience as a factor that impeded alumni giving.

2. **Progress of the Institution.** The perception of leadership and progress of the institution greatly influences alumni giving. According to the alumni from this study, leaders with vision for academic excellence and an institution
progressing through such behaviors as research and athletics inspire financial giving.

3. **Financial Priority.** The alumni indicated that alumni giving was not a personal spending priority of individuals and that other obligations such as family and debt take precedence over alumni giving.

4. **Communication.** The alumni from this study indicate that alumni are disconnected from the university because of poor communication on the part of the institution. Furthermore, the alumni posit that it is difficult to solicit alumni to give financially when the university has not cultivated a relationship with the donor. Hence, poor communication on the part of the university impedes alumni giving.

5. **Donation Amount.** The list of donors and the amount given are usually publicized within the alumni or institution. Alumni who do not have a large donation are embarrassed to give. Thus, the alumni believe that the publication of donor amounts impedes financial giving from the less affluent alumni.

6. **Education of Students Regarding Giving.** Several of the alumni indicated that they could not recall anyone from the institution educating them during their tenure as a student regarding the importance of philanthropy and giving back financially to the institution. Thus, the alumni believe that in order to facilitate alumni giving, the university is required to educate its students on the importance of donations to the institution as these students will become alumni.
Figure 5.1 Model of External and Internal Factors Influencing African-American Alumni Giving to Historically Black Colleges and Universities
The findings illustrated in figure 5.1 indicate that the external and internal factors of the model are interrelated. Since African-Americans experience similar external constraints, the internal factors reported by the alumni in this study were similar to those reported in the extant literature with the exception of one factor which was donation amount. According to Alain Locke (1955), a prominent African-American writer and philosopher, the chief bond among African-Americans has been that of a common condition rather than a common consciousness. However, African-Americans have had to abandon their philosophies and acquiesce to the paternalistic ethos of White America in order to survive (Allen & Jewell, 2002). As evident in the literature regarding HBCUs, these institutions were never left entirely alone by external entities such as governments and philanthropists (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown, 2002). The efforts to control and suppress the higher education and development of African-Americans were motivated by what W.E.B. Dubois refers to as “The Great Fear”—fear experienced because of oppressive forces of the moment “when a human being becomes suddenly conscious of the tremendous powers lying latent within him.” Dubois contends that “when that happens in the case of a class or nation or race, the world fears or rejoices according to the way in which it has been trained to contemplate a change in the conditions of class or race in question” (Aptheker, 1973, pp. 8-9).

Dubois believed that education represented an important tool for empowerment. However, the oppressive system of the White America was to educate African-Americans to “put their rights in the background; emphasize their duties—say little of ambition or aspiration [:]…if young men will dream dreams, let them be dreams of corn bread and
molasses” (Aptheker, 1973, p. 9). Hence, to maintain the status quo, Western hegemonic society requires African-Americans to adapt their behaviors accordingly, which explains the similarity of internal factors revealed in this study and the extant literature regarding African-American alumni giving.

The alumni’s ways of knowing is in part the result of the Western social construction of race, class, and power which has influenced their perceptions and life choices. African-Americans have lived in a country where oppression and discrimination have forced them into an inferior status and has influenced their framework for understanding their own experiences as well as those of others (Akbar, 1996). As the findings of the model above reveal, regardless of the African-American ethos or intentions regarding financial giving to HBCUs, there are external factors that foreclose African-Americans’ opportunities for reaching their full financial potential. These external constraints, as this study illuminates, lie in both historical and contemporary dynamics. For example, owning property was legally prohibited by most slaves (Akbar, 1996; Conley, 1999). After the Civil War, freed slaves were promised by the Freedman’s Bureau “forty acres and a mule” as reparation for slavery (Conley, 1999; Shapiro, 2002). The agency did not deliver on that promise. Other constraints such as the Black Code Laws and Jim Crow Laws were also barriers to asset accumulation (Conley, 1999; Shapiro, 2002). From a contemporary perspective, African-Americans do not enjoy the advantages, both socially and economically, that Whites enjoy and they continue to face institutional barriers to converting their income to equity such as discrimination in
housing and credit markets (Conley, 1999; Shapiro, 2002). Thus, the issues with which African-Americans have to contend include equity as well as equality.

As a result of the challenges African-Americans experience regarding financial equity issues, the data from this study reveal that African-American alumni do not give sizeable amounts of money that can make a significant change to the financial position of the HBCU. Hence, this study substantiates the extant literature by revealing that African-American alumni giving alone will not ameliorate the financial position of the HBCU. According to this study, an increase in the percentage of African-American alumni who give is important considering the amounts given by present donors is low. Similarly, the alumni of this study posit that significant percentages of African-American alumni participation can be used by HBCUs as leverage to assist in the fund-raising efforts of the institution, such as soliciting financial support from corporations and foundations.

As a result of the HBCU’s dependence upon government, corporations and foundations for financial support, these institutions experience institutional isomorphism, a constraining process which forces these institutions to acquiesce to the government, corporations, and foundations to which they are dependent for financial resources (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Thus, organizational change is a direct response to the hegemonic influence of government mandates and philanthropic interests which encourage homogenization, a process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). According to Winston (1999), higher education is a hierarchical industry. Schools at the very top of the hierarchy are accorded with great respect as institutions of
emulation even when they have little effect on the school’s market—how many schools label themselves as “The Harvard of … (p. 30)? However, unlike the TWIs at the top of the hierarchy, HBCUs have distinct characteristics. For instance, several private HBCUs have an open door policy which provides educational access and opportunity to all students who are not given a chance through mainstream educational institutions. Additionally, HBCUs provide an environment dominated by other African-Americans and can provide social, political, and religious leadership as well as shelter, comfort, and network for African-American students (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997). These institutions have been the centers to both preserve Black culture and to prepare Black students for the mainstream of American life (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997). However, the unique and valued characteristics of the private HBCU have been undermined by the organizational impetus towards homogeneity.

**Implications for Practice**

The push for homogeneity has dramatic implications for the practice of resource development. A major challenge for the HBCU is its identification as a Black institution in a country where race has a significant role in everyday life. According to Mercer (1998), “the need for Black colleges may be generally accepted these days, but that does not mean that these institutions have the same fund-raising clout as predominantly White colleges” (p.3). Furthermore, unlike TWIs, the HBCU has not had a legacy of alumni-giving and such action is the primary source of financial support for most colleges (Yates, 2001). The findings of this study revealed that African-American alumni giving
exclusively will not improve the financial position of the private HBCU. Therefore, private HBCUs should implement a comprehensive approach to resource development which includes alumni giving as well as a focus on increasing other donative resources such as corporation and foundation giving and increasing the endowment. Donative resources are a significant factor in attracting quality students to higher education institutions (Winston, 1999). The greater the donative resources, the greater the institution’s control over student quality and as a result, there is more excess demand for these institutions by students (Winston, 1999). However, because of the meager donative resources of the lower hierarchy of higher education institutions such as the private HBCUs there is less excess demand, and as a result these institutions encounter problems selling their services which can lead to excess supply such as empty classrooms and dormitory beds (Winston, 1999). Hence, donative resources or charitable contributions compared to sales revenue such as tuition are important to the long-term survival of higher education institutions (Winston, 1999).

According to Winston (1999), higher education institutions are essentially part church and part car dealer—devoted partly to charity and partly to commerce. The dilemma for most university administrators is deciding which behavior is appropriate for their institutions (Winston, 1999). Imperative to the existence of the HBCU, it is critically important that the presidents and administrators of HBCUs understand the dynamics of donative-commercial fund-raising and decide to embrace more of the church (or donative) model of fund-raising which not only includes increasing donative resources but also includes improving the quality of the educational services they supply.
and the equity with which they are provided: that is, “prestige maximization” (Winston, 1999, p. 16). Additionally, this prestige maximization and increase in donative wealth have significant implications for alumni giving. According to Winston (1999), higher student quality implies higher postgraduate incomes which induce more generous alumni giving, further augmenting the case for increasing donative wealth.

Alumni giving is an important donative resource for higher education institutions (Yates, 2001). Thus, there is a continued need to understand the experiences of African-American alumni. The understanding of the perceptions of African-American alumni at HBCUs by alumni offices can lead to the discovery and change of faulty strategies that are insensitive, ineffective, and ultimately a waste of time and resources. Fund-raising is not about just money but about cultivating relationships with people; therefore, knowledge about donor behavior and motivation is critical (Worth, 2002). According to Sparks (1998), “only by going directly to the specific individuals whom we hope to understand can we truly know how people have organized the world and meanings they attach to what goes on in the world” (p. 258).

The model from this study revealed several salient external and internal factors regarding giving that may be transferable to other HBCU alumni offices to aid in creating strategies regarding increasing alumni giving. The alumni officers should keep in mind that external factors such as history, culture, race, class, and power have a significant impact on African-American perceptions and life choices and that regardless of the African-American alumni’s intentions regarding giving to HBCUs, these external factors hamper financial giving. With this in mind, there were several salient internal factors
from the model that the alumni officers could use to create strategies to increase alumni giving which include communication, donation amount, and education.

Communication was an area that HBCU alumni offices needed to improve. The infrastructure of most private HBCU alumni offices is small and there are limited financial resources (Worth, 2002). Hence, the suggestions to improve communication reflect this condition. The alumni suggestion included increasing the correspondence informing alumni about events on campus by updating the e-mail list serve. Additionally, a publication showcasing the current state of affairs of the university can be published biennially—fall and spring semester. According to Webb (2002), the time and resources that have been invested over the years to keep alumni in touch with and actively interested in their alma mater produce substantial dividends, both from their loyalty and the funds they contribute.

Another recommendation from the alumni was that alumni donor amounts not be published. The alumni indicated that those individuals who do not have a large donation to give are embarrassed. Thus, these alumni do not give because they do not want their contributions publicized within the alumni or the institution. Hence, according to this study, it is recommended that alumni offices at HBCUs publish the donor names that give and not the donor amounts.

The final suggestion from the alumni concerned education. Several alumni shared that they could not remember any one teaching them about the importance of giving back to their alma mater. Thus, the alumni indicated that the alumni offices as well as the institution should educate the students during their tenure which would create a spirit of
philanthropy before graduation, since African-Americans have not had a history of philanthropy. Additionally, the alumni stated that the reason that most African-American alumni do not give back is because of selfishness and a loss of a sense of community. Worth (2002) contends that greatest threat to philanthropy is the lost of a sense of community. Therefore, education of students regarding giving can be accomplished by creating pre-alumni associations, student giving campaigns, and student volunteerism programs. By valuing, demonstrating, and advocating the qualities of community and a public responsibility in its environment, the HBCU can ignite this spirit of philanthropy in its students who later matriculate to become alumni.

Finally, this study is timely given that several HBCUs have been sanctioned by the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools and have lost their accreditation due to financial position. Since its inception the private HBCU has had to contend with the issue of survival stemming from financial position (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Despite the limited fiscal resources, HBCUs continue to educate African-Americans and they are the primary producer of African-Americans with professional degrees (Brown & Freeman, 2002). “Historically Black colleges and universities are a historic and distinctive characteristic of American higher education” (Brown, et. al., 1997, p. 95). However, according to several scholars, the question may be asked: Should historically Black colleges remain an important part of U.S. higher education in the 21st century (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997; CNN, 2003; Cross & Slater, 1994; Henderson, 2000; Homan, 1970; Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1995; Rowland, 1997)? Brown and Hendrickson (1997) contend that it would be a travesty to close the HBCU in the name of Black
progress and equality when empirical evidence indicates that these institutions continue
to remain a vital part of the higher education system (Brown & Hendrickson, 1997).
Nonetheless, operating under constrained resources and legal sanctions, the existence of
the HBCU is in jeopardy.

Implications for Research

Survival due to constrained resources is a critical issue for the HBCU. However,
the extant literature reveals that there is a paucity of empirical research addressing this
dilemma. According to Brown and Freeman (2002), there is a need for empirical and
exacting research on HBCUs, and because of the void in the literature, neither educators
and policy makers nor higher education researchers have been able to cite current
academic thinking about the practices, successes, and challenges of Black colleges.
Thus, this research provides a much needed contribution to the extant literature and
current research on HBCUs and offers new scholarship in the area of institutional
advancement, specifically responding to the issue of survival regarding private HBCUs
by examining donor behaviors and motivations of African-American alumni giving to
HBCUs.

In addition to contributing to the field of institutional advancement, this study
offers a clear application of critical race theory. “Theory gives meaning to the
phenomena observed, organizes mode of inquiry, and shapes the analyses and application
and research that informs policy and practice” (Brown & Freeman, 2002, p. 239).
Lincoln (1991) posits that research problems in higher education do not address the
issues of social injustice and democracy. Therefore, more research that emphasizes a critical agenda is recommended. A critical agenda uncovers concealed hierarchies as well as dominations, oppositions, inconsistencies, and contradictions in Western society (Creswell, 1998). In a similar vein, this study reveals how race, class, and power foreclose African-American opportunities to realize their full potential and addresses how these factors are deeply ingrained legally, culturally, and even psychologically into American life.

Additionally, research on the HBCU that uses a critical perspective is important because such an investigation can change the perception of the HBCU as an inferior institution. The HBCU continues its historical mission of providing access to education for everyone; however, as a result, there is an inescapable public perception of inferiority. Hence, this critical perspective reflects a need for the presentation of more voices in qualitative inquiry, especially those who have been marginalized and have not been part of the dominant discourse. This study contributes a discourse of criticality that is grounded in the traditions and culture of African-Americans and illuminates the unique and valued characteristics of the HBCU. The experiences shared by the African-Americans in this study can help to overcome ethnocentrism and the unexamined conviction of viewing the world in one way (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). As a result, such awareness can lead us to the knowledge that different and inferior are not synonymous.

Furthermore, this study focused on those alumni who were already participating in giving and were active in their alumni associations. Consequently, many of these
participants had difficulty at times responding to the question of why other alumni did not participate in financial giving. Thus, further research using alumni who do not give is needed to compare and contrast the responses of these alumni to the alumni from this study. Additionally, donative wealth is an important factor in influencing charitable motives of donors (Winston, 1999). Hence, further research should be conducted regarding the influence of donative resources, such as endowments, on the perceptions of African-American alumni giving. Donative wealth also includes organizational prestige. Hence, further research focused on comparing and contrasting the giving amounts of African-American alumni over-time can reveal significant trends, for example, as donative resources and organizational prestige increase or decrease at HBCUs what are the African-American alumni financial giving levels?

Finally, there is a paucity of qualitative research regarding alumni giving in HBCUs. While the purpose of qualitative research is not aimed at qualitative generalizations (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1998; Rowland, 1997; Yin, 1994), research such as multi-site case studies can be conducted to reveal additional patterns regarding African-American alumni giving to the HBCU. Thus, more qualitative research of this type is warranted. Historically Black colleges and universities evince objectives, populations, philosophies, and environments which are worthy of scholarly investigation (Brown & Freeman, 2002).
Writer’s Final Comments

As an African-American female growing up in the South, my formative years did not include the Jim Crow laws, segregation of schools, or the fight for Civil Rights. Similarly, my formal school training was in institutions that were predominantly White. As a result, if some one had used the acronym “HBCU,” I would not have known to what they were referring. Ironically, my first job after graduate school was teaching at an HBCU. Upon my arrival on campus, I immediately realized the disparity that existed in comparison between the HBCU to the TWI. At the campus in which I taught, the technological infrastructure needed updating, the facilities were dilapidated and were in need of renovation, and financial resources were limited. Thus, my having to operate with limited resources was a challenge. Ultimately, my experience at the HBCU did not make me resentful; instead the experience made me inquisitive.

Initially, I knew that my dissertation would address some issue concerning the HBCU, although I did not know the exact nature of the issue. Nonetheless, my investigation of the HBCU began. After my exploration, I saw one pivotal dilemma that the majority of HBCUs had to contend with and that was financial position. Furthermore, at that time Morris Brown, a well known HBCU, lost its accreditation due to financial position. To lose any sister Black institution was a significant setback for all HBCUs. How could an institution that has existed for over 100 years be in jeopardy of closing its doors due to financial instability? The answer to this question lies in resource development. Imperative to its existence, resource development is a survival goal for the HBCU.
Finally, prior to obtaining my present job at an HBCU, I taught at a large TWI as a Teaching Assistant. In comparison, teaching at an HBCU has been a cultural awakening for me. I am an African-American female encountering one of my first institutional Black experiences. The only other situation where I had experienced a predominantly Black setting was church. Thus, working at an HBCU has been transformational for me in a positive way. After understanding the reason for their existence, I realized that without HBCUs, similar to millions of other African-Americans, I would not have been able to attend a TWI. My work at an HBCU has given me the opportunity to be a part of an institution with a dignified and clearly relevant African-American history, and the experience has enabled me to see increased potential for my development through African-American role models and mentors. Had it not been for the encouragement and inspiration of several of my colleagues at this institution, I would not have considered pursuing a doctoral degree. Despite the many challenges with which the HBCU has to contend, they have been conduits for large numbers of African-Americans both historically and contemporarily. To ensure that this legacy continues African-Americans must give back to their institutions.

I conclude this study with the following poem by Dudley Randall (1972) entitled *Booker T. and W.E.B.* Washington and DuBois were historically prominent African-American leaders who had antithetical philosophies regarding the educational destiny of African-Americans. Even though their ideals significantly influenced the educational model of the HBCU, this poem captures an illusion of freedom. The outcome of the
debate was largely decided by those with the power and resources, the White-controlled state governments and the White individual and corporate philanthropists.

**Booker T and W.E.B**

by Dudley Randall

“It seems to me,” said Booker T.,

“It shows a mighty lot of cheek

To study chemistry and Greek

When Mister Charlie needs a hand

To hoe the cotton on his land,

And when Miss Ann looks for a cook,

Why stick your nose inside a book?”

“I don’t agree,” said W.E.B.

“If I should have the drive to seek

Knowledge of chemistry or Greek,

I’ll do it. Charles and Miss can look

Another place for hand or cook.

Some men rejoice in skill of hand,

And some in cultivating land,

But there are others who maintain

The right to cultivate the brain.”

“It seems to me,” said Booker T.,
Booker T. and W.E.B. (continued)

“That all you folks have missed the boat

Who shout about the right to vote,

And spend vain days and sleepless nights

In uproar over civil rights.

Just keep your mouths shut, do not grouse,

But work, and save, and buy a house.”

“I don’t agree,” said W.E.B.

“For what can property avail

If dignity and justice fail?

Unless you help to make the laws,

They’ll steal your house with trumped-up clause.

A rope’s as tight, a fire as hot,

No matter how much cash you’ve got.

Speak soft, and try your little plan,

But as for me, I’ll be a man.”

“It seems to me,” said Booker T.—

“I don’t agree,”

Said W.E.B.

(Black Writers of America: a Comprehensive Anthology)
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## Historically Black Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/Founding Date</th>
<th>City and State</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALABAMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Alabama A&amp;M University (1875)</td>
<td>Normal, AL</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alabama State University (1874)</td>
<td>Montgomery, AL</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bishop State Community College (1927)</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>Private, 2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concordia College (1922)</td>
<td>Selma, AL</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miles College (1905)</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>Private, C.M.E. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oakwood College (1896)</td>
<td>Huntsville, AL</td>
<td>Private, Seventh Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Selma University (1878)</td>
<td>Selma, AL</td>
<td>Private, Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stillman College (1876)</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td>Private, Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Talladega College (1867)</td>
<td>Talladega, AL</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tuskegee University (1881)</td>
<td>Tuskegee, AL</td>
<td>Private, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARKANSAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Arkansas Baptist College (1884)</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Private, Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Philander Smith College (1887)</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Private, Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Shorter College (1886)</td>
<td>North Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Private, A.M.E. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (1873)</td>
<td>Pine Bluff, AR</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science (1966)</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Delaware State University (1891)</td>
<td>Dover, DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Howard University (1867)</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University of the District of Columbia (1851)</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bethune-Cookman College (1904)</td>
<td>Daytona Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Edward Waters College (1866)</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University (1879)</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Florida Memorial College (1879)</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Albany State College (1903)</td>
<td>Albany, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Clark Atlanta University (1989)</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta University (1865)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark College (1869)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fort Valley State College (1895)</td>
<td>Fort Valley, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Interdenominational Theological Center (1958)</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Morehouse College (1867)</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Morehouse School of Medicine (1975)</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Morris Brown College (1881)  Atlanta, GA  Private, A.M.E. Church
33. Paine College (1882)  Augusta, GA  Private, C.M.E. Church
34. Savannah State College (1890)  Savannah, GA  Public, Land-grant
35. Spelman College (1881)  Atlanta, GA  Women-Private, Baptist

**ILLINOIS**
36. Chicago State University (1867)  Chicago, IL  Public

**KENTUCKY**
37. Kentucky State University (1879)  Frankfort, KY  Public, Land-grant

**LOUISIANA**
38. Dillard University (1869)  New Orleans, LA  Private Methodist
39. Grambling State University (1901)  Grambling, LA  Public
40. Southern University at Baton Rouge (1880)  Baton Rouge, LA  Public, Land-grant
41. Southern University at New Orleans (1959)  New Orleans, LA  Public
42. Southern University Shreveport/  Shreveport, LA  Public
   Bosier City (1964)
43. Xavier University (1915)  New Orleans, LA  Private, Catholic

**MARYLAND**
44. Bowie State University (1865)  Bowie, MD  Public
45. Coppin State College (1900)  Baltimore, MD  Public
46. Morgan State College (1867)  Baltimore, MD  Public, Methodist
   Episcopal
47. University of Maryland  Princess Anne, MD  Public, Land-grant
   Eastern Shore (1886)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Lewis College of Business (1874)</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Alcorn State University (1871)</td>
<td>Lorman, MS</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coahoma Community College (1949)</td>
<td>Clarksdale, MS</td>
<td>Private, 2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinds Community College (1954)</td>
<td>Raymond, MS</td>
<td>Private, 2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson State University (1887)</td>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi Valley State University (1946)</td>
<td>Itta Bena, MS</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rust College</td>
<td>Holly Springs, MS</td>
<td>Private, Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tougaloo College (1869)</td>
<td>Tougaloo, MS</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Harris-Stowe State College (1857)</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln University (1866)</td>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Barber-Scotia College (1867)</td>
<td>Concord, NC</td>
<td>Private, Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett College (1873)</td>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>Women-Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methodist Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth City State University (1891)</td>
<td>Elizabeth City, NC</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fayetteville State University (1867)</td>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson C. Smith University (1867)</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>Private, Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livingston College (1879)</td>
<td>Salisbury, NC</td>
<td>Private, A.M.E. Zion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State University (1891)</td>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University (1910)</td>
<td>Durham, NC</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Saint Augustine’s College (1867)</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>Private, Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Shaw University (1865)</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>Private, Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Winston-Salem University (1862)</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Central State University (1887)</td>
<td>Wilberforce, OH</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Wilberforce University (1856)</td>
<td>Wilberforce, OH</td>
<td>Private, A.M.E. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OKLAHOMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Langston University (1897)</td>
<td>Langston, OK</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENNSYLVANIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Cheyney State University (1837)</td>
<td>Cheyney, PA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Lincoln University (1854)</td>
<td>Lincoln, PA</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Allen University (1870)</td>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td>Private, A.M.E. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Benedict College (1870)</td>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td>Private, Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Claflin College (1869)</td>
<td>Orangeburg, SC</td>
<td>Private, Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Clinton Junior College (1894)</td>
<td>Rock Hill, SC</td>
<td>Private, 2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Denmark Technical College (1948)</td>
<td>Denmark, SC</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Morris College (1908)</td>
<td>Sumter, SC</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>South Carolina State University</td>
<td>Orangeburg, SC</td>
<td>Public, Land-grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Voorhees College (1897)</td>
<td>Denmark, SC</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENNESSEE

82. Fisk University (1867) Nashville, TN Private
83. Knoxville College (1875) Knoxville, TN Private, Presbyterian
84. Lane College (1882) Jackson, TN Private, C.M.E. Church
85. Lemoyne-Owen College (1862) Memphis, TN Private, Baptist
86. Meharry Medical College (1876) Nashville, TN Private, Methodist

87. Tennessee State University (1912) Nashville, TN Public, Land-grant

TEXAS

88. Hudson-Tillotson College (1876) Austin, TX Private, Methodist
89. Jarvis Christian College (1912) Hawkins, TX Private
90. Paul Quinn College (1872) Dallas, TX Private, A.M.E. Church
91. Prairie View A&M University (1876) Prairie View, TX Public-Land-grant
92. Southwestern Christian College (1949) Terrell, TX Private
93. Texas College (1894) Tyler, TX Private, C.M.E Church
94. Texas Southern University (1947) Houston, TX Public
95. Wiley College (1873) Marshall, TX Private, United Methodist

VIRGINIA

96. Hampton University (1868) Hampton, VA Private
97. Norfolk State University (1935) Norfolk, VA Public
98. Saint Paul’s College (1888) Lawrenceville, VA Private, Protestant
99. Virginia State University (1882) Petersburg, VA Public, Land-grant
100. Virginia Union University (1865) Richmond, VA Private, Baptist
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WEST VIRGINIA

101. Bluefield State College (1895)  Bluefield, WV  Public
102. West Virginia State University (1891)  Institute, WV  Public, Land-grant

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

103. University of the Virgin Islands (1962)  St. Thomas, USVI  Public, Land-grant
## Table 1

Financial Statistics (Total Revenue), 2001-2002, in thousands of dollars
4-year private historically Black colleges and universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Institutions</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>601,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>662,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>66,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>10,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>278,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Return (gain or loss)</td>
<td>-6,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Activities</td>
<td>8,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>228,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and Other Sources</td>
<td>272,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(National Center for Education Statistics, 2002)
Subject’s Consent Form

Title of Project:  
*African-American Alumni Perception Regarding Giving to Historically Black College and Universities.*

**Principle Investigator:**  Nicole Reaves-Barnhill

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study is to provide information, which may be useful to development offices, regarding issues associated with African-American and alumni giving to Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

**Information**

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to allow the researcher to observe you while you interact within a particular setting (i.e., your Alumni Association meeting). Field notes including informal talk relevant to the purpose of the study will be kept. You could possibly be asked to participate in an interview. The interview should last one hour not to exceed two hours. You will be asked a set of questions relevant to the purpose of the study. The interview will be tape recorded and transcribed verbatim.

**Risks**

You will be asked questions regarding your religious beliefs and economic status. Confidentiality and anonymity will be essential factors in minimizing the risks of public examination. Identifiers such as numbers will be used in place of names during data analysis. All audio tapes will be securely stored and destroyed by recording over them at the conclusion of the study.

**Benefits**

The information gained from this study will be useful to development offices by giving them knowledge of donor behavior and motivations as it relates to African-Americans and alumni giving. An increase in alumni giving will contribute tremendously to the financial security of the HBCU.

**Confidentiality**

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.
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Compensation
For participating in this study you will receive no compensation.

Contact
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, principal investigator Nicole Reaves-Barnhill at 919-546-8337 or 919 235-2865. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Ms. Debra Paxton, Administrator IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research, at Box 7514, NCSU Campus, Raleigh, NC 27695 or (919/513-1837)

Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

Consent
I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject’s signature ___________________________ Date ______________

Investigator’s signature ______________________ Date ______________
Appendix D

Interview Guide

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:

For all interview subjects:

1. Educational background
2. Employment background
3. Age, gender (optional)

(Interviewer briefly describes the research project and has the interviewee state their name and date of graduation).

1. Describe your feeling about your alma mater?
2. In the past, what ways have you given support to your alma mater?
3. What does philanthropy mean to you? What causes do you support and why?
4. What issues do you feel influences alumni giving?
5. How has the church-affiliation of specific HBCUs influenced giving?
6. What other cultural issues do you feel influences alumni giving?
7. What benefits do you feel that you will receive from participation in alumni giving?
8. How does the economy influence alumni giving to HBCUs?
9. Explain how class/affluence impacts participation in alumni giving?
10. What strategies do you believe the institution can implement to facilitate alumni giving?
11. Explain what you believe your role is in the continued viability of your alma mater?
Table 2

Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Student Population Fall 2005</th>
<th>Major Degree Offerings</th>
<th>Approximate # of Living Alumni as of 8-30-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal University</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Education, English &amp; Humanities, Divinity, Religion &amp; Philosophy, Business, Science: Natural, Computer, Math, Journalism &amp; Communication, Performing Arts, Allied Health: Speech Pathology and Audiology, Recreation, Therapeutic Recreation, Kinesiotherapy, Athletic Training</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical University</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, Science: Natural, Computer, Math, Business, Journalism &amp; Communication, Liberal Arts &amp; Education</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Alumni Association Meeting**  
**Liberal University**

| Agenda | 1. Invocation  
|        | • Baptist affiliation  
|        | 2. Introductions  
|        | • Name  
|        | • Class graduation date  
|        | 3. No Previous Minutes  
|        | 4. Treasurer’s Report  
|        | • $6,330.33  
|        | • Dues $65  
|        | 5. Alumni-giving  
|        | • Time vs. Money  
|        | • Corporate giving  
|        | • % giving vs. dollar amount  
|        | • Encourage other alumni to give  
|        | 6. Updates, Information Sharing  
|        | • Career Development Task Force  
|        | • CIAA tournament activities  
|        | 7. Scholarship Committee Report  
|        | • (2) $1000 scholarships available  
|        | • Criteria for eligibility  
|        | 8. No New Business  
|        | 9. Announcements  
|        | • Raffle ticket dead-line  
|        | • Sick/deceased  
|        | 10. Adjournment  
|        | • Sang School Song  
|        | 11. Attendance  
|        | • 37 females  
|        | • 4 males |
# Appendix E, continued

## Table 4

**Alumni Association Meeting**

**Technical University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>1. Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NAACP crisis magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bank Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading of Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did not have access to minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Treasurer’s Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• $4, 293.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• List of individuals who paid dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dues $35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alumni News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Football games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deceased Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chapter Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College Fairs, Student Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scholarship $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fund-raising, entertainment books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adjournment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 7 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical/Cultural Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Sankofa Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Sambo Mentality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African-American Alumni Demographics and Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Degrees and Employment Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alumni Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Generational Giving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African-American Alumni Perception of Philanthropy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition of Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Causes Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Factors Impeding African-American Alumni Giving |
| 1. Negative Alma Mater Experience            |
| 2. Leadership and Progress of the Institution |
| 3. Poor Communication                        |
| 4. Donation Amount                           |
| 5. Financial Priority                        |

| Strategies to Facilitate Giving             |
| 1. Increase Communication                   |
| 2. Education Regarding Giving               |
| 3. Alumni Donor Publication                  |

| Role of African-American Alumni in continued existence of Alma Mater |
| 1. Financial Support                          |
| 2. Recruit students                           |
| 3. Ensure the survival of HBCUs               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intergenerational Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consumer Spending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic Status and African-American Alumni Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class Disparity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and African-American Alumni Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Invisible Man Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alumni-Giving as Leverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E, continued
### Table 6
Alumni Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GRADUATION DATE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>DEGREE/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>ALUMNI-GIVING AMOUNT (ANNUALLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A. English/French; Retired English/French Teacher</td>
<td>$100-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Mathematics/Computer Science; Executive Programmer</td>
<td>$1000-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.S. Business Administration; Supervisor Dept. of Labor</td>
<td>$2,500-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Accounting; Retired Senior Auditor Electric Co.</td>
<td>$25-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Math; Technical Support Analyst</td>
<td>$200-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.S. Business Education; Retired High School Business Education Teacher</td>
<td>$200-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.S. Physical Education; Retired Professor/</td>
<td>$25-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Business concentration: Accounting and Public Administration; Accountant/ Part-time Teacher</td>
<td>$25-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A. Radio/Television; Director Alumni Affairs</td>
<td>$250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.S. Physical Education; Retired Public School Teacher/Coach</td>
<td>$500-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A. English/Social Studies; Retired Public School Teacher</td>
<td>$25-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A. Music Education; Retired Music Teacher, School Counselor</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A. English; High School Counselor</td>
<td>$65 (alumni dues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GRADUATION DATE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>DEGREE/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>ALUMNI-GIVING AMOUNT (ANNUALLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Electrical Engineering; Quality Engineer</td>
<td>$2000/ set-up $10,000 scholarship/ endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Chemistry; Retired Computer Corporation (Sales)</td>
<td>$2,500-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Elementary Education; Retired Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>$500-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Math; Retired Public School Math Teacher</td>
<td>$25-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Speech Pathology/Audiology; Non-profit Counselor</td>
<td>$65 (alumni dues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.S. Business Management; Unemployed</td>
<td>$65 (alumni dues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>