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ABSTRACT

An Exploratory Case Study of the Felt Effect of Race on the Job Satisfaction of Black Administrators in the Five College Area of Amherst, Massachusetts (August, 1978)

Richard McDougal O'Daniel

B.A., Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
M.B.A., New York University, City of New York
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Robert Wellman

This dissertation concentrates on the study of the felt effect of race on the job satisfaction of Black Administrators working in predominantly White institutions of Higher Education. It examines the felt experience of Black Administrators in the five college institutions of Amherst, Smith, Hampshire, and Mt. Holyoke Colleges, and the University of Massachusetts. The job satisfaction characteristics of twenty-seven Black Administrators are examined as to demographics, management and supervisory relationships, work satisfaction, and social living environment.

In addition, an in-depth empirical analysis is made of the history, organization, and conceptual problems affecting Black Administrators and Educators in general, in White institutions of Higher Education. This study attempts to trace, from a very broad organizational aspect such as institutional design, to a very specific aspect such as job satisfaction, the effect of race on Higher Education and more specifically Black Administrators in White institutions of Higher Education.
This study is intended as a constructive examination of what is hoped to be institutions in transition. It is not a condemnation of the necessary integration of institutions of higher education. Rather, this study is intended to provide a clear perspective of where White institutions are in their stage of development and transition from the past to the envisioned goals, dreams and hopes of the future. Perhaps through this study and others like it, a clear prescription can be written and implemented for eliminating racial bias, and the general circumstances whereby human oppression takes place in institutions of American higher education.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This study is an exploratory case analysis of the felt effect of race on the general level of job satisfaction as experienced by Black Administrators working in the five college institutions of: Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mt. Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts. As the five college institutions of higher education have slowly increased the number of Blacks on their campuses, the problem of racism has been given a great deal of attention. Ten years since the first Black Administrators were hired, the problem of racism within the above-mentioned institutions can perhaps be best described in the words of Mt. Holyoke College's president, David Truman, in his 1976 convocation address.

I am not talking about structural institutionalized discrimination, in admissions of employment, for example. I am talking about what is in our minds--prejudice--and about individual behavior reflecting it. These are the heart of racism. Structural discrimination is all but gone from this place. Individual prejudice and prejudiced behavior are very much with us.

David Truman's description of racism on the college campus of Mt. Holyoke gives helpful insight into the illusive quality of this subject. He states that racism today is an individual act of prejudice, implying that it is as illusive a phenomena as the many values, attitudes and behaviors making up the different individuals in the environment.
Thus, the complexity of the problem is easily demonstrated but not the solution.

In an effort to help delineate the nature of racism and the consequenting social pressures affecting Black people in predominantly White institutions of higher education, this study focuses on the general job satisfaction of Black College Administrators. Exploration is made concerning the demographic profile, management and supervisory relationships, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, and the social living environment of Black college Administrators in the immediate five college area. In addition, research is done examining some of the circumstances, organizational, historical, and political important for understanding the environmental conditions surrounding the presence of Black Administrators on the White college and university campus.

**Theoretical Aspects**

Just as racism itself can be characterized as an individual act of prejudice, so, too, much its felt effect be understood as an individual experience whose effect can cause alienation, isolation, and extreme loneliness for its victim. What then, does it mean for a Black individual to work in a racially-often hostile environment? What are the aggregate patterns of effect and what significance on job satisfaction and general well being does racism have?

The Black Administrator on each campus in the five college area experiences a unique set of expectations, demands, tensions, and perceptions. All forming a very precarious environment in which to perform an often undefinable leadership role. Even if Black Adminis-
trators are unaware of the organizational complexities facing them, their survival and quality of existence are frequently linked to their ability for critical understanding and control over the Pandora's Box of organizational response and institutional conflict which the mere presence of minorities often triggers.

While there has not been a great deal of research on the effect of race on job satisfaction, two studies, one by Robert Miles (1976), and another by Bass and Turner (1973), raise significant questions concerning job ambiguity and the evaluation of Black workers. Robert Miles published his findings in the March, 1976 issue of the Academy of Management Journal. In his study, findings indicated that Black managers working in White organizations often feel threatened and a general satisfaction caused by anxiety resulting from three factors, i.e., role ambiguity, conflict and lack of self-determination. The Theoretical implications of his findings raise serious questions concerning Black Administrators who often work in racially tense environments.

Alan Bass and John Turner conducted a study in 1973 on the job satisfaction of Black bank tellers in a major New York metropolitan bank. They found in their study that the overall job assessment of Black workers' effectiveness was rated more stringently by harsh objective criteria than were their White counterparts. In other studies conducted by Shmid and Johnson, race was found to have similar effects on the peer assessment by Whites of Black workers.

The theoretical implications of these studies are immense. At the microcosmic level, several local questions concerning the work en-
vironment of Black Administrators in the five college area are raised. To what extent does race affect job ambiguity and job evaluation are but two queries one might raise.

However, in a broader macrocosmic context, perhaps, the examination of issues like these has little meaning if not understood within the theoretical field of knowledge concerning race and job satisfaction. There is tremendous need for further study and research by which to better examine the nature of racial impact on job satisfaction and organizational phenomena. From this study, clearer understanding of the conditions, stress, alienation, and conflict affecting Black people working in White organizations can be derived. Relationships between race and job satisfaction of Black college Administrators, however, has even greater implications if viewed from the perspective of strategies in change designed to constrain and eradicate the oppressive influence of racism in the evolvement of institutions of American higher education and the jobs and lives of the Black people in these complex systems.

**Definition of Terms**

Black administrator. Any Black person who holds a professional position within an institution of higher education and whose job title and function at least in part involves: Management, coordination, supervision, leadership and authority, development, planning, evaluation and/or implementing of programs administrative in nature, outside the classroom or usual faculty teaching function.
Dialectics systems theory. A combination of dialectics, synonymous with logical argumentation based on the notion of contradiction or opposed forces, and systems defined as those things within an organization or institution which tends to take on its own independent life cycles. Thus, dialectics systems theory considers simultaneously both systems and dialectics approaches for interpreting and observing phenomena.

Pedagogical phenomena. Related to Paula Frier's notion of pedagogy meaning actions which, while having one particular conscious motive, tend to produce an unpredictable and often opposite result from that which was intended. Phenomena which tends to result in a certain pattern of cause and effect relationships regardless of conscious motive or expectation.

Organizational behavior. The study of the behavioral traditional structure and values of an organization by determining through various theoretical approaches the significance of relationships between events within an organization or institution and attempting to explain the behavior of people and things or events in an organizational setting.

Power conflict theory. As defined by R. A. Schermerhorn and involved with analyzing various factors and factions which compete for limited resources within an institutional or organizational environment.

Intrinsic job satisfaction variables. Those human or internally motivating factors which affect work and job satisfaction such as mastery of achievement, level of enjoyment attained from work itself, relationships within the working environment, organizational interaction
with co-workers, etc. In other words, those feelings and experiences that develop within an individual in a given working environment.

Extrinsic job satisfaction variables. Those environmental or externally motivating factors which affect job satisfaction such as pay, standard of living, level of esteem by peers or family, opportunities for promotion, etc. In other words, those things which are not necessarily related to the feelings of satisfactions derived from actually doing the specific tasks involved in the job itself.

Motivator--hygiene. Refers to Frederick Hraberg's theory on work motivation in which motivating factors are described as being intrinsic in nature while hygiene factors are environmental in nature and, therefore, described as being extrinsic.

Management and supervisory relationships. Are defined as the behavior between an employee and his subordinates, peers, and supervisor. It focuses on the critical human interactions directly or indirectly affecting administration.

**Objectives of the Study**

The major purpose of this study is to explore the felt effect of race on job related perceptions and experiences of Black Administrators at each of the five institutions of higher education in the Amherst, Massachusetts area. This study purports to examine the environment of these institutions and the interactions of Black Administrators in them by collecting data and reporting the characteristics of informa-
tion in the following areas:

1. Demographic characteristics of Black Administrators in the five college institutions.
2. Management and supervisory relationships affecting the interaction of Black Administrators on the job.
4. The social living environment is researched in order to help delineate those characteristics in the community which seem to be felt effected by race.

Limitations of the Study

In this section discussion concerns the limitations of this study. In order to do this, the limitations of this study have been broken down into four general categories. Each category is analyzed in the following series of concerns:

1. An exploratory study by nature is limited in scope because the intention is not to test hypothesis but rather to collect data by which a hypothesis can be drawn. Consequently, the objective of this study limits itself to gathering data by which an overall picture of the environment can be presented. Compilation of the data provided by this study will enable future researchers to identify clearer hypothesis about the nature of the effect of race on job satisfaction.

2. Closed and small environments, when under investigation, although not the same as controlled environments, often behave as controlled experiments that are not well controlled. The closed
and small environment of the five college area, while specifically sought out for the smallness which at first seemed an advantage for collecting data, ultimately became a major limiting factor in data collection and analysis. Three primary limits resulting from the micriopic features of the environment were as follows:

a. Interpersonal interaction sometimes hindered data collection. Often familiarity with both the study and author by participants complicated their motive and ability to respond objectively.

b. Fear of reciprocity was expressed by several administrators in completing the questionnaire. In an effort to collect in depth demographic characteristics and job descriptions, although no names were collected, many people felt intimidated by the fact that demographic profiles might serve to identify respondents.

c. The limited total population of only 54 people, of which 27 responded by completing the questionnaire, not only constrained the statistical significance of the study, but also affected censureship of answers. Most of the respondents knew one another and many discussed this study with each other. Several participants felt some of the demographic data was too personal and might cause embarrassment amongst peers. It should be noted that in conducting interviews, this seemed more a concern of people
working in private and not public institutions.

3. Unanticipated problems of instrument design and analysis also limited the findings of this study. The questionnaire instrument was designed to collect data on the overall interaction of Black Administrators in White environments. However, one or two participants expressed confusion because the instrument made no delineation between the interaction of Blacks to Blacks as opposed to Blacks to Whites. This was a valid concern for a few administrators because much of their work is divided between working with Black people in Black settings and programs, as well as, the overall general White environment. However, rather than probe this question "ad infinitum," this study only intended to examine Black Administrators as they interact with Whites in White environments. Consequently, analysis of data is limited because distinctions were not always clear between Black administrators who work in White settings as contrasted to Black settings or who had Black supervisors, colleagues and subordinates, or some integrated combination.

Another unanticipated problem resulted from the hesitancy of some administrators to participate. This had particular significance because of the proportionately fewer Black administrators in the private colleges as compared to the university. As a result, contrast between the private and public sector was limited.

4. Racial studies and studies concerned with the organizational effect of race for the most part, almost always compare the
characteristics of Black to White people. However, this study attempts to focus on the experience of Black people by Black people and thus limiting the theoretical elaboration drawn from existing research.

This study delineates the characteristics of aggregate behavior as experienced by Black administrators in the five colleges area. Examination is limited to only four general areas: Demographic characteristics, management and supervisory relationships, job satisfaction and the social living environment. Thus study limits its purpose to exploration, by which to build a clear understanding of racial phenomena as it is felt to affect job satisfaction. Its purpose is not to investigate the differences between the behavior of work environments toward Blacks as compared to Whites but to more specifically locate and isolate the effects of racism in the working environments within White institutions of higher education.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a review of the literature pertinent to a study of Black administrators working in White institutions of higher education. The chapter is divided into four sections:

a. A review of literature on the background and history leading up to the presence of Black administrators in White institutions of higher education;

b. A review of literature concerning research on Black administrators in White institutions of higher education;

c. A review of literature on job satisfaction;

d. A review of literature on race and job satisfaction.

Because there is not a great deal of literature in these last two categories and because the circumstances surrounding the presence of Black administrators is so complex, the first section of the literature review encompasses a broad range of topic areas. It is the intention of the literature review to probe in an in depth analysis the effect of race and the major significance this factor has played in the social and educational environment of Black people. From the literature review, the reader should be able to draw a clear understanding of the complex issues of higher education and, more importantly, how they
affect the job satisfaction of Black administrators today.

Section One: The Background and History Leading up to the Presence of Black Administrators on the White College and University Campus

Introduction. An especially important part of this proposed study is this section of the review of literature. It presents several aspects of historic background, as well as, some of the social, economic and political influences which have set the stage for Black administrators in predominantly White colleges and universities.

The literature review develops a conceptual framework for the study, encompassing notions of organizational behavior, systems flow, and power analysis necessary to achieve a fundamental understanding of the institutional environment as it is experienced by Black administrators on predominantly White campuses.

This section of the review of literature will be divided into the following parts:

Part I--History Background on Higher Education for Black People in the United States.

Part II--Social and Political Movement Affecting Higher Education for Black People.

Part III--Elitist Design of American Higher Education.

Part IV--Blacks in White Ivory Towers: The Emerging Environment for Blacks on White Campuses.

Works of Paul Buck, H. A. Bullock, Martin Carnoy, W. E. B. DuBois, and Ralph Ireland are among the books and articles to be examined in Part I of the literature review which will provide an in-
depth account of the circumstances surrounding higher education for Black people from the early founding of Black colleges to the more recent integration of White colleges and universities.

In the second part of this section of the literature review, the period of recent history surrounding the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision is studied, beginning with the 1950s civil rights movement, through the 1960s civil legislation and the Black Power movement, leading lastly to the 1968 assassination of Martin Luther King and the subsequent token integration of exclusively White institutions of higher education. Authorities to be cited in this part include Julian Bond, Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton, Tom Hayden and others.

The third part of this section of the literature review incorporates books and articles from a variety of sources, including David Horowitz, Wirnbaum, Samuel Bowles, Lewis Carlson and George Colbrun, Julian Bond, Spiro Agnew and Michael Katz, in order to analyze the important organizational issues of institutional elitism, the educational mission or purpose, and changing directions in higher education.

The fourth section will focus on the dynamics of the institutional change process which developed as the proportion of Blacks increased at previously all-white colleges and universities. The following works, among others, will be used to examine the system flow, organizational behavior, bureaucratic process, pedagogical phenomena and power conflicts characteristic of newly-integrated educational institutions of the early 1970s: Between Two Worlds (Bowles and DeCosta), Comparative Ethnic
It is intended that this section of the literature review provide a historic and conceptual summary of many of the notions, propositions and ideas, involving the environment of Black administrators in White institutions of higher education. It explores various philosophic views in order to examine some of the broader implications of the Black experience in the White institutional change process which is incumbent for understanding the racial alienation and organizational social inequality often typical of modern institutions of higher education.

This part of the literature review recounts some of the experience and research concerning Black and other minority educators in higher education in order to make comparisons and gain insights into this previously unexplored environment of Black administrators in predominantly White schools.

Part I. Background: the education of blacks in the United States.

Four social policies towards blacks: education in each stage.

One only needs to look at the social policies instituted in this country to come to a fairly clear understanding of the status of Blacks in American higher education. For Blacks, America's social policy has been characterized by four stages: slavery, segregation, integration, and now assimilation. While each stage reflects a changing historic circumstance, it should be understood that changes in law have not always reflected changes in the society. Nor have these various stages drastic-
ally altered the problems or issues facing Black higher education in this country. Higher education for Blacks, as has Black status in the United States, has been continually faced with the problem of second class citizenship. It has been the dual dilemma of social status and education in general which has most affected the emergence of Black higher education today.

Throughout American history, education in the United States for Blacks has been transcended by factors of socio-economic support, hostile-racist control and policy. Although these various factors have had differing historic importance, they are in 1976, still the major problems facing Blacks in higher education. In order to understand the role each has come to play in shaping the institutional colonialization of Blacks in colleges and universities across the country, a brief historic overview of Black education in this country is presented.

Slavery, 1609-1863--slavery and education of Blacks. During the era of slavery, education for Blacks can be attributed to three major influences. Blacks' cunningness, as expressed in Fredrick Douglass' autobiography, whereby many slaves actually tricked their masters and their master's children into revealing the meaning of various words, eventually learning to read. Benevolent masters, which are cited in Genovese in Roll, Jordan, Roll and Allen Bullock, Author of A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present, were willing to help favorite slaves in many ways. However, the Nat Turner Rebellion in 1830 quickly put an end to such generosity. The third and far more important occurrence for early Black education was
the freedman's efforts to educate himself and his children. It should also be kept clear that the notion of benevolence must be understood as it truly existed, for the conscience of whites was not at play, but in actuality their paternal grandeur. In actuality, two forces were entwined within the so-called benevolent master. First, was the paternal drive to legitimize obvious evil doing under the pretense of salvation. The white masters often felt compelled to assume justification for the harsh conditions of slavery for which they were fully responsible, creating a myth of saving the savage by Christianizing him. This most often entailed reading the Bible, attending religious meetings, etc.

The other force at play, and far more dominant, was the African himself. Benevolence most often merely reflected the degree to which slaves were actually able to negotiate with their masters, for African tradition had always relied heavily on family structure and apprenticeship as the institution of education. In fact, there is direct correlation between suppression of education and attempts by slave master society to destroy the African family unit. In most cases, education for slaves tended to reflect the survival of family structure either as African or assimilated via Indian or White interbreeding. For many slaves, education was merely a function of how closely they were related to White overlords and able to bargain for apprenticeship slave assignments with skilled tradesmen or clerks or maintain family structure and relations.

The struggle for education of the American Black, although assisted by Northern Church-related support, was largely a consequence
of his own grave sacrifice. As Genovese gives account:

Northern white support played an important role, but the extent to which Blacks with few resources and little experience scraped to pay for schools and teachers stands out like a miracle.4

One of the major constraints facing Blacks during the period of slavery was the law. In almost all of the southern states, with the exception of a few border states and the District of Columbia, it was forbidden even to teach slaves how to read and write. Several of these states also forbade the education of freed slaves. Yet, the conditions in the North were little better. Some northern states excluded Black pupils while others established segregated schools. Even private schools which admitted Black pupils were subject to harassment and violence by local communities.4

There was no public money available for Blacks during slavery. In fact, most public expenditures went towards the suppression of Black education. However, with the growing abolitionist movement in the North, education for Blacks in many states was eliminated. The Mississippi Black Codes which emerged during slavery to disfranchise free Blacks, eventually spread throughout the South to legally limit Black freedom and prevent any real change in status from that of a slave. Bullock gives further accounts of Black education being constrained in South Carolina where Governor Stanley closed the Freedman's School of Vincent, South Carolina in 1862, citing as grounds the Black Codes restriction making the teaching of Negroes to read and write illegal. Similar actions are recorded in North Carolina, Virginia, and several southern states.5
The era of slavery was marked by two periods of educational repression for Blacks. Prior to 1830, even with the existence of Black Codes and the illegalization of teaching slaves to read or write, states were lax in enforcement of such restrictions. Furthermore, these conditions were rarely carried out against free Blacks. However, with growing pressure from free northern Blacks concerning abolition and the escalated slave revolts symbolized by Nat Turner's Rebellion in 1830, southern whites took harsh steps to further limit Black education. From the period 1830-1863, as the Civil War drew nearer and abolitionists louder, Black education underwent ceaseless assault.\(^6\)

Not limited to the south, repression of Black education could be found in New Haven, when in 1831, citizens voted 700 to 4 against permitting Blacks from establishing a college for the education of colored people. Later in 1835, Noyes Academy in Canaan, New Hampshire, was leveled to the ground by local residents angered by the enrollment of fourteen Black students.\(^7\) Although more examples exist, sufficient evidence here indicates that the repression of Black education during the last thirty years of slavery reached heightened proportions.

**Segregation--1865-1954.** For the next one hundred years after slavery, Blacks were to undergo a redefinition of the old slave patriarchal system. Although removed from shackles by emancipation, the incipient process of legal repression and de facto oppression has continued even into modern day. The long struggle for the American Black during this period is, indeed, a brutal and saddening account. Yet, Blacks had an unceasing drive to obtain that which was seen as most
threatening by the White power structure, vis-a-vis, education.

**Reconstruction--1865-1890.** With the founding of the Freedman's Bureau in 1865, Blacks for the first time, had access to government support for their education. The Freedman's Bureau, together with the American Missionary Society, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Church groups, came into the South to educate Blacks with both material and people. Yet, the Freedman's Bureau, with its limited staff and funds could hardly meet the needs of newly emancipated Blacks. During the era of Reconstruction in some cases, Blacks attended White institutions. However, when the state governments passed into the hands of the Democrats in 1872, such attendance was made illegal. It was during this period of Reconstruction that most schools for Blacks were established.

But, Genovese points out, the destruction of slavery did not mean an end to paternal control of Blacks. What education had come to mean during this era was still defined by the relationship of labor and capital. For Blacks this meant continued subjugation and inferior status in the society. Consequently, education for Blacks came to mean little more than the preparation for existence in an antebellum economy.

The Freedman's Bureau, however, went out of existence in 1872. From then on, things began going downhill for Black education in America. With its decline, an official hardening of the lines regarding Black education in all the southern and border states took place. The withdrawal of federal troops in the South meant Blacks were once again to enter an era of unparallelled political and education repression.
The Negro Public School system fell victim to white state structures. As a result, Blacks received an irreducible minimum of tax support. This handicapped any attempt at development and effectively limited the quality of Negro education. In many states, even with Black majorities, merely one dollar to every four or five that went to support White education, went to Blacks.\textsuperscript{13}

With the Supreme Court decision of 1896, in Plessy vs. Ferguson, segregation was firmly entrenched throughout American society. For the next one hundred years, Blacks would find the doctrine of separate but equal, a menacing tool in preventing the educational and social economic development of his community.

The overburdening effect of White dominance in controlling Black education is expressed by DuBois in the following address given at Fisk University in 1933:

\begin{quote}
In the first place, we have to remember that here in America, in the year 1933, we have a situation that cannot be ignored. There was a time when it seemed as though we might best attack the Negro problem by ignoring its most unpleasant features. It was not and is not yet in good taste to speak generally about certain facts which characterize our situation in America. We are politically hamstrung. We have the greatest difficulty in getting suitable remunerative work. Our education is more and more not only being confined to our own schools, but to a segregated public school system, far below the average of the nation, with one-third of our children continuously out of school.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

The role Black education served was almost totally for maintaining a segregated society. For Blacks, education was considered a menace to their economic role in the United States. Although this role would change slightly in the course of two World Wars, it was not until 1954, that de jure segregation came to an end in the United States.
Integration and assimilation. With the Brown Supreme Court decision of 1954, Blacks entered a new era of struggle for education. However, discussion here is brief because the particular phases of integration and assimilation are considered to great length in the following sections of this paper. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that, as Bullock asserts, in 1960, segregated schools had been declared illegal for six years. But, nine out of every ten Negro school children attended racially segregated schools and classes. De facto segregation took up where de jure segregation had left off.15

The subsequent era of sit-ins, protests, marches and assassinations is a recent period in American history. What distinguishes the periods of integration and assimilation, is merely the de jure legislation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, making the birth of the assimilation stage. Only, as in the case of integration, the democratic values as related to the Negro population, was not internalized by the American people. Consequently, failure of this internalization has resulted in forms of public resistance that have rendered the changes in public democracy virtually inoperative.16

The following portions of this paper, deal with the emergence of Higher Education. Its focus, through systems and dialectic analysis, is on those factors in the origin, structure and workings of Higher Education, making it one of the most resistant institutions to real social change and education for Blacks. In fact, in the author's opinion, Higher Education's role in fostering racism and discrimination towards American Blacks is merely a reflection of the colonial role it has played historically and today in the subjugation and social
resignation of Blacks to inferior status in the American society.

Development of Black colleges. The early origins of Black colleges go back to slavery. Although Lincoln University in Pennsylvania (1854) and Wilberforce University in Ohio (1856), are attributed to be the first colleges for Negroes, they actually represent the successful end of a long and bitter struggle.

Long before 1854, two groups in American society spearheaded the movement for establishing a college for Negroes. One group represented largely by the American Colonization Society, regarded the education of American Blacks as a useful means for preparing Negroes to play a critical role in the colonization of Africa. More precisely, this group felt the satisfactory solution of the Negro's problem in the United States resided in African and South American Negro colonization.17

The other group which was more fully representative of the Black freedmen's movement such as the Convention of Free People of Color, advocated abolition and saw the role of Higher Education to prepare Black ministers and teachers for greater service in the American society.18 What they envisioned was the use of the Black colleges for the uplift and development of Blacks from slavery to freedom.

The colonist movement attempted to establish schools in New Jersey and Connecticut. However, lacking the support of free Blacks, they eventually folded.19 While many attempts by the abolitionist free colored movement were aborted by hostile White repression throughout the United States, Connecticut, North and South Carolina, and Pennsylvania made some progress in alleviation of the barriers. There
was successful effort to establish the Institute for Colored Youth which, in 1902, after undergoing several changes, moved to Cheyney, Pennsylvania and eventually became Cheyney State College for Negroes. 20

Whether inspired by abolitionists or colonialist motives, most private colleges for Blacks were founded during Reconstruction, 21 backed by the Freedman's Bureau and various philanthropic interests as noted by Carnoy:

In regards to Black education, we conclude that the role assigned Blacks was tied to Northern Capitalists, as well as, to Southern Planters' interest. While northern capitalism has been associated with humanitarian elements present in philanthropic efforts during Reconstruction and around the turn of the century, humanitarianism was always secondary to capitalist economic needs. Rather than liberating Blacks from oppression by southern Whites, northern liberals eventually changed the conditions of oppression from a rural to an urban servitude. 22

It was, in fact, as Frank DeCosta and Bowles assert, the newly emerged economic interest of the southern public education system for Blacks which finally enabled Black institutions, after nearly one hundred years, to move from the status of impoverished primary and secondary schools to colleges. The demand for teachers after the Morrill Act of 1890 brought the establishment of seventeen land grant colleges for Negroes which corresponded to one in each of the seventeen southern and border states.

Within the Black community, Higher Education was divided between two schools. The accommodationists, led by Booker T. Washington, advocated education for Blacks as a vocational training ground. They saw Higher Education as a means for preparing Blacks for domestic and
agricultural work within the current American economy.\textsuperscript{24} On the other hand, the abolitionists movement, which came together in the Niagara Convention, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, envisioned Higher Education for Blacks as an opportunity for scholarly development and the training of the finest Black minds for cultivation in arts and sciences. From DuBois' point of view, the Black college was fast becoming a means by which southern Whites could stymie the development of American Negroes.\textsuperscript{25} Needless to say, the philanthropist foundations weighed the advantages towards Booker T. Washington. A point which Horowitz asserts happened again during the 1960s as the NAACP and conservative Negro college presidents condemned militant radicals who eventually came to head the Black Power Movement of 1967.\textsuperscript{26}

The economic deprivation of Blacks obviously obliterated the emergence of any large endowment of independent alumni funds for the Black college. Thus, they were totally subservient to foundations, state, and limited federal funding, which were carefully monitored by local White control.\textsuperscript{27}

Economically destitute, Black colleges paid less for faculty, had inferior facilities and generally were considered by the economic system as second-rate. White it was never intended for Black colleges to actually enter the academic mainstream right up until the 1950s, they educated most of the Black professionals in the United States. Prior to the Higher Education Act of 1965, with its extensive programs for undergraduate student aid, most Black colleges enrolled approximately 2.4 percent of the nation's college population while receiving 1 percent of the federal funds available for college education. At that
time, eighty percent of the Black college student population attended Black colleges.\textsuperscript{28}

Unable to compete economically with White counterparts, Black colleges entered the era of integration and assimilation at an incredible disadvantage. Eddie Morris, in his article on "The Contemporary Negro College and the Brain Drain," expresses the consequence of this:

In the last few years, we have witnessed many changes in Higher Education. Many of the changes have impinged upon or had ramifications for predominantly Negro colleges, these changes include many that involved the desegregation and integration of colleges. For the most part, this has consisted of Black students and Black professors making the transition from Black colleges to White ones, with few White students and White professors making the transition to Black institutions.\textsuperscript{29}

The Black college during the 1950s and 1960s, however, played even a more critical role in American society than the education of Negroes. Catalyst for the Civil Rights movement and Black Power struggle, the Black campus was to become a critical institution in shaping American society. Social pressures from within and without began to affect the environment which many Black schools provided. For the first time, Black institutions found the necessary external and internal support to vocally question its unequal status.

Consequently, the movement of Black institutions into the modern era can be best understood after the 1950s by a concentrated look at the Black revolt of the 1960s.

The Black student revolt, which as Orde Combs asserts in the March, 1974, \textit{Change} magazine, has brought Black colleges to a new effort for excellence.\textsuperscript{30} Perhaps more than any other single factor, we see the emergence of today's Black campus in a bitter struggle for
excellence on campus and quality of life off. It is on this note which, in the author's opinion, can best explain the Black college struggle today. For what we find in 1972 is that there are 120 Black colleges of Higher Education. Most are still located in the South. Eighty-four of them are private and account for more than one-third of all the Black students. In total, they still educate about half of the 500,000 Black college students attending college today. Yet today, as in the past, they receive meager federal support and limited foundation and state money. The struggle for excellence in these schools has, as in the past, become a bitter battle against discriminated funding and a depressed Black economy.

Part II. Impact of the Black revolt on higher education.

Civil rights, urban riots, Black nationalism, and militancy in higher education. It all started with a bus ride. Although difficult to remember, the author was about ten years old when Mrs. Brown refused to move to the back of the bus. Little did it seem that ten years later, when the author was entering college, that the awesomeness of so insignificant an act would radically change the lives of so many Americans. DuBois wrote in 1933:

We suffer a social ostracism which is so deadening and discouraging that we are compelled either to lie about it or turn our faces toward the red flag of rebellion. It consists of the kind of studied and repeated emphasized public insult which during all the long history of the world has led men to kill or be killed. And in the full face of any effort which any black man may make to escape this ostracism for himself stands this flaming sword of racial doctrine which will distract his effort and energy if it does not lead him to spiritual suicide.

This, perhaps more than any single expression, conveys the
general mood of America in 1950. The Black man had just come back from World War II. He was being recruited for the newly escalating war in Indochina. Yet, unable to find employment, he was further humiliated by a presence of racial oppression more debilitating than poliomyelitis. DuBois, in this statement, catches both the rage of George Jackson's charging elephant and the apathy and despair of Ellison's Invisible Man.

The Civil Rights movement was in its early stages when four students at the North Carolina A and T College in Greensboro, North Carolina, walked into Woolworth's and sat down at its all-white lunch counter. At this point, the hitherto Civil Rights movement under the NAACP and Urban League, with white foundation control and conservative influence, first began to emerge as a Black dominated and student-controlled struggle.

While the Brown Supreme Court decision had ended de jure segregation, it was the Black students with this action in North Carolina who first began the long struggle in which Blacks are still engaged, against de facto discrimination. As almost every southern city power structure soon learned, the students were not playing. Inspired by the moral courage of students and the illegalization of segregation, Black students soon gained the support of conservative Negro professional and proprietary classes. Presidents of Negro colleges across the country failed to yield to growing White pressure. And so it came that Negro colleges soon became the catalyst for coordinated combat against hostile and, even sometimes, military resistance to Black liberation.
It did not take long for the sit-ins to escalate. Armed with a new tactic, a young Black professor named Vivian Henderson organized a massive boycott in Nashville, Tennessee. Before one month had passed since the first sit-in, over 1,000 students and community supporters had been arrested. The student movement had moved Black strategy from one of ignoring the problem as DuBois comments, to that of active and coordinative resistance. During the Spring of 1960, students representing more than eight southern states convened in Raleigh, North Carolina. It was from this conference that S.N.C.C., The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was formed. And, as Bullock points out, these efforts broke White resistance to desegregation of public accommodations long before the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Indeed, the students achieved in short time what all the years of legislation in the courts had failed to do for more than one hundred years.

It did not take long for the student surge in public accommodations to move into new areas of civil rights. Protests and marches began to occur for voting privileges, to protest inadequate housing and employment. In the period of 1960 to 1963, students had organized Afro-American and African students from coast to coast. The emergence of Black Power movements and the explosions of Watts, Newark, and Detroit transformed these student organizations into nationalist enclaves and gave the Black student movement new dimension.

It was during this period that White power structures began to realize that the Black student movement of the 1960s was not dying off as traditional collective movements had in the past. What Black students began to realize, in the author's opinion, was that the struggle
for civil rights was not a legal matter so much as a question of power. Convinced by the hesitant enforcement of Civil Rights Acts and the continued oppression of de facto segregation and discrimination, the sit-ins of the early sixties easily mushroomed into the Black Power movement. It was clear to Black students, at least at Lincoln University in 1965, where the author attended undergraduate school, that the passage of the Civil Rights Act would again become meaningless legislation without continued Black assertion and power.

Self-determination and Black colleges. Thus, in the era immediately following the Civil Rights Act, which spelled out for Blacks those rights already guaranteed by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, a Black cultural revolution took over Black campuses. The new wave of cultural revolution brought Negro against Black and both against White. Essentially, there were those who saw the struggle in nationalist terms and those who, as in the past, exposed accommodationist views. From one end of the country to the other, classrooms, corridors, auditoriums, stadiums, student unions and dormitories became the staging grounds for a campus civil war.

In massive shows of force, institutions like San Francisco, Central State, South Carolina State, Tuskegee, Morgan, Cheney, Howard University and others were shut down. During this same period, there was a continued—and largely unreported—civil war in almost every major big city school system. At stake was a battle for the mind. An attempt to gain control over the cultural apparatus which defined reality and shaped man's thinking.

The battle for civil rights had begun to attack the corporate
state education structure. With increasing enrollment of Blacks in White institutions, there were few refugees from the cultural upheaval. As Hamilton and Carmichael assert:

Whatever the consequence, there is a body of Black people determined to "T.C.B."--take care of business. They will not be stopped in their drive to achieve dignity, to achieve their share of power, indeed, to become their own men and women--in this time and in this land--by whatever means necessary.\(^{12}\)

The movement grew out of a polite, non-violent student protest. But as America did not respond, the movement grew into a small "civil war."\(^{13}\) At first, when southern Whites attributed the social unrest to outside agitators, it was dismissed as irresponsible raving. While the movement was contained on Black campuses and southern public accommodation issues, there seemed little need for national alarm. However, as Black students, through continued demands for admissions into previously exclusively White institutions, and as the protests for housing, jobs, and equal rights began disrupting northern cities and White institutions of learning, the once irresponsible ravings of southern sherriffs became a national philosophy. Increasing self-determination in Black colleges and the new penetration by Blacks of historically White institutions resulted in a new era for government repression.\(^ {14}\)

The overall significance of Black self-determination and penetration of White institutions had several consequences. One was the urgently sought after National Anti-Riot Law, giving the F.B.I. and the Pentagon jurisdiction to quiet Black and newly emerging anti-war protests on a coordinated and national level.\(^ {15}\) A new wave of repression was then begun against national Black movements.
Coincidental to the 1968 Anti-Riot Act was the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. Carl Rowan, in his recent article "Is There a Conspiracy Against Black Leaders," likens the period to the emergence of an era of political repression and disfranchisement against American Blacks parallel to the period at the end of Reconstruction.16

Although White economic interests still had a stranglehold on Black institution purse strings,17 the volatile confrontation by militant Blacks brought about changes in administration, faculty and curriculum. The Black college campus which served as the polis for minority civil rights activities was fast becoming more assertive and instrumental in the growing demands for the socio-economic development of Black communities across the country. It was apparent then as now that the legal victories of the NAACP and civil rights era had not effected the basic situation of Black people. As Melvin Steinfield asserts:

Lunch counters can be integrated, and so can busses, but the society as a whole remains segregated. Black people, especially if they are middle class Negroes, can find accommodations in the Disneyland Hotel, but the residents of Watts are not finding accommodations in education, housing and employment.18

Crashing the gates of the White ivory towers. The struggle for Black self-determination was carried on in two fronts. The Black college movement soon crashed the gates of White ivory towers. Students were torn between the need for a regular formal education, part of the socialization process that we are told everyone needs in order to seek an acceptable role in society and his need to carve out a new
education experience, one that is meaningful to him as a Black person. In an effort to gain a better point of entry into the socio-economic system, Blacks began pursuing admittance into White institutions. Ironically, the near crisis in Black colleges which was foremost in the minds of the populace was upstaged. The rhetoric formerly given to problems and progress of Black institutions was displaced in the education journals and media by the new issues of prestige. The novelty of Black Studies and non-negotiable demands by militant Blacks and their radical supporters came to surface in predominantly White institutions.

While the exodus of Black students and faculty had disturbing impact on the Negro college, the so-called "Brain Drain" came to be still another formidable obstacle to self-determination in education for Blacks. Yet, as dialectics have it, in the author's opinion, with the integration of White campuses came a sharper realization amongst young White students that as Sam Yette Points out:

When the decade of the 1970s began, the United States government was officially--but unconstitutionally--in the midst of two undeclared wars: (1) a war of attrition (genocide) against the colonized colored people of Indochina, and (2) an expeditionary "law and order" campaign (repression--selective genocide) against the colonized colored people of the United States.

Although nonaligned, both colonized groups had much in common. They were, in fact, victims of the same war, though in different theaters.

What Blacks in their assault on White institutions learned was that moral motives by no means guarantee moral outcome. The movement of the 1960s had in the 1970s come to a grinding slowdown as Shite institutions began to absorb them. For as Black presence
emerged on White campuses, White radical youth and America on the whole witnessed the ethical crisis in academia. As Black students and growing concern for the war in Indochina mounted, Kent State, perhaps the most drastic exhibit for White America of moral decay, both in the society at large and academic community occurred.

In the author's opinion, the presence of Blacks heightened the contradictions in American elitist and racist institutions of Higher Education. Martin Luther King's assassination had caused Whites to open, or, at least seemed to crack the door for minorities to enter the mainstream of Higher Education. Kent State opened their eyes to the fact which Black presence had come to reinforce in very real, hands on attention, at every local level. The role of education in the moral decadence and decline of American social democracy began to come into full view.

What has followed in the half decade since 1970 can be understood more clearly as one examines the historic elitist origin of Higher Education and the incipient role it plays in corporate bureaucratic control of American society. It is easily demonstrated through the cooptation of Black assertion for self-determination in the socio-economic system which Higher Education serves.

In summary, it should be understood, however, that the historic circumstance of the 1960s and early 1970s did not necessarily give Blacks much latitude in strategy. Blacks were discovering that for minorities, the general conditions of oppression throughout the educational system, from elementary, secondary, college and graduate studies, were seriously similar. Consequently, Black students had to
attempt a strategy which would enable them at one time to effect the various aspects of colonial political, social, and cultural control.25

As Spring points out in Education and the Rise of the Corporate State:

The hard shell of bureaucracy provided protection for school systems that were basically hostile to their environments and to large numbers of people they served. The so-called Black Revolution of the sixties and fifties clearly exposed the degree to which schools had become unresponsive to the needs of the community. It was only through demonstrations, violence and strong political pressure that the Black population was able to gain improvements and change. Extreme measures were used because all other channels of influence had been effectively closed by previous school reform. The ostensive removal of the school from politics left Blacks with no other choice except the tactics of confrontation. Only through the use of these techniques, could he gain access to the instruments of power. Confrontation established lines of communication where none had previously existed and proved effective in cutting thick bureaucratic structure.26

For the minority student, the hard shell of bureaucracy in Higher Education meant the harsh circumstance of traditionally dealth exclusion. Nothing seemed more important for effecting institutional change than access. Access was not, however, motivated so much by Katz's notion of the myth of social mobility through equal educational opportunity, addressed in Class Bureaucracy and Schools,27 but a question of survival. The explicit purpose of widening the narrow channels of strictly regulated social mobility was not a question of myth nor control, but dire socio-economic circumstance. Although Blacks found, as Ridgeway asserts in The Closed Corporation, "undergraduates for the most part lie in holding pens, off the labor market."28

To Blacks, this would not seem a bad alternative. For where
the university may have traditionally served as holding pens for
Whites, they were an improvement over the segregated Black ghettos,
prisons, and the military which generally served the same purpose for
Blacks.

Yet, one final note of editorial comment should be understood
in viewing Black revolts in Higher Education. This is the fact that
Blacks addressed the problem of oppression in a way which reflected
a genuine belief in the principle of American institutional democracy.
It was believed then, as perhaps now, that American society could be
changed through the internal working of its institutions. It should
be kept clear that Black revolts were not aimed toward anarchy but
adequate institutional response to their concerns. Concerns which
since the early founding of America and the educational system within,
have been categorically ignored. It should be lastly understood by
the reader as Grier and Cobbs state:

To have maintained a fervent interest in education and a belief
in the rewards of learning required a major act of faith. Black
people in America have been nothing if not idealist and devotees
of the American dream. It is a source of wonder where such un-
ending faith had its origin.29

Part III. Elitist design of American higher education.

Historical development. In order to understand the impact
of Blacks on these institutions of Higher Education which had pre-
viously been the exclusive preserve of Whites, one must have some
knowledge of their historic development and the interest they have
represented.

The development of modern American universities was not left
to the natural bent of those within its ivory towers. Like the Black college, early White institutions of Higher Education arose out of capitalist and philanthropic interest. It was shaped by the ubiquitous charity of the foundations and the guiding mastery of wealth.¹

During the first two decades of Higher Education and even to large extent into the present, especially in the private sector, foundations played the same function in American society as the ministry of education in most other countries.² Private colleges and universities emerged as racist elite institutions preserving, expanding and safeguarding elite valued and bourgeois interpretation of the world.³

For more than one hundred years, admittance into these institutions was virtually impossible. While fostering the racist doctrines of Edward East, Ellsworth Huntington, Robert Bennett Bean,⁴ Harvard, Yale and other Ivy League institutions denied admittance or research facilities to DuBois, Woodson, Wesley, Locke, and other distinguished Black scholars. Not only were the early origins of American Higher Education elitist, but were implicitly involved in defining American Blacks as dumb beasts of burden.⁵ In the development of elite White institutions, it was not until 1941 that Allison Davis became the first Ph.D. ever hired to be a professor at the then exclusively White University of Chicago.⁶

At the start of the American university era, foundations gained easy dominance over avenues of prestige. In fact, as late as 1915, the total foundation expenditure towards Higher Education and re-
search was at least twice that of the federal government. These funds were mostly concentrated in some twenty institutions.7

The early foundation movement at the outset made a calculated decision to create a lead system of colleges. By virtue of their overwhelming prestige, these institutions set the standards and dominated the education scene.8

By the time of the industrial revolution, foundations controlled as much as two-thirds of the American endowment and funding for Higher Education.9 When the increasing demands for admission, resulting from increased economic and new technological growth, the American foundations controlled the avenues for new research and supported only those innovations which were ideological and practically useful to the system which it dominated.10

As the second generation middle class European movement expanded with the passing of the Morrill Act in 1890, the new land grant movement found itself totally subservient to the academic elite educational structure. In the words of Horowitz:

The foundations providing the principle access to influence in the outside world; wealth has inevitably exerted the most profound pervasive and distorting effects on the structure of knowledge and education in the United States. On paper, the contemporary American system of Higher Education looks wonderfully diverse, a vast sea of independent academic communities. The fact is, however, that the American system of Higher Education is a highly centralized pyramidal structure in which clearly defined escalating height intellectually dominates the levels below.11

In terms of influence, we find today that the foundations have developed a virtual monopoly in the academic structure. According to recent reports issued by the Educational Testing Service, Indus-
trial and Corporate Banking executives over fifty-five years of age, it found the same make-up on the Board of Trustees of most colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{12}

Totally dominant in Higher Education, elite values, traditions, and history were transferred to the emerging American middle class. When Blacks finally gained entrance, they found that the university considering itself superior, had an enormous investment, financial and psychological, in the notion of their superiority and were not willing to readily give it up or water it down.\textsuperscript{13}

In the author's opinion, by the mid 1960s and early 1970s, the elite traditions of White Higher Education had been well incorporated. Furthermore, what minorities encountered when entering these institutions was a complete and complex matrix of corrupt bourgeois dominance over every aspect of institutional life. And it was this tradition of racial superiority and chauvinistic elitism which set the stage not only for the development of public institutions, but the recent integration of these institutions as well.

Higher education and social control. American universities have always been an instrumental part of the social relations system of labor. Like the large corporations, Higher Education finds itself dominated by large bureaucratic, hierarchical structures.

Spring's Education and the Corporate State description is given of this bureaucratic hierarchy, as making the university operate from the top down. Asserting that the flow of policy, innovations and programs is rarely seen to emerge from the public most affected, but from the foundations and American corporate structure most removed.\textsuperscript{14}
Spiro Agnew, in an article written in 1971, states clearly the prevailing view of the corporate philosophy toward the university. He states:

Any attempt to subordinate the great universities of this country to social goals for which they are ill designed and ill equipped can only result in tragic losses to both these institutions and the nation.15

Agnew was writing in response to the then recent turmoil and student unrest.

In contrast to this view, we find calls for the methodic breakdown of the walls of academia, launching vast new programs aimed at the disruptions of our own un-American academic monopolies, i.e., "substantial transfer of power from White to Black from the more powerful to the less powerful."16

Sam Bowles cites the problem of "the radicalism of many young teachers, technicians, social workers, and other professionals as a response to the continuing failure to place the nation's productive capacities in the service of man."17

One of the characteristics of the education system is the macro-hierarchy which exists. Bowles calls it a multitetiered system dominated at the top by the Ivy League institutions, and the great state universities, followed by the state college and ending with the burgeoning junior colleges.18

Within the American society, this elite hierarchy has worked both to maintain the current social labor relations as well as, to coopt the Black movement of the sixties. It should be interesting here to look for a moment at what the current social labor relations
and bureaucratic hierarchy have come to mean for Blacks and other minorities. The situation minority students and leadership found themselves in is peculiar. It should be pointed out, as Ballard further states, that there has never been a voluntary concerted effort on the part of the university of the federal government to address the problems and needs faced by minorities in Higher Education. In fact, most states, the government and Higher Education fight hard for the maintenance of the status quo for minorities. Minorities find Ballard's statement true.

Across the board there can be no charitable explanation for the almost total exclusion of Blacks from the curriculum, faculty, administration and the student body. Nor can there by any justification for the role these universities played in creating scholarly rationale for the caste system that emerged over the past century. The extent to which the American university tradition was an active ally in the national policy of repressing African peoples should be made clear.

The predicament of minority leadership is a tyranny of both place and time. The paradox of oppression has many facets.

Caught between worlds, Negro education has not achieved full entrance to the world of White mass education with its increasingly mechanized operations and standards and fierce but muted competition of place and status. Nor has it left behind entirely the work of the segregated Negro community, with its standards and methods following the formal models of White education but adapted to the tolerance and expectations of an isolated culture.

What the minority is faced with in Higher Education are not only the institutional contradictions but those of the society at large. Samuel Bowles points out "the expansion of college enrollments has been in response to the needs generated by changing occupational structure." Even under the guise of affirmative action the new occupational structures for the minority reflects the same old racist paradox.
Although more than before minority college graduates find entry level positions into the corporate state, hardly ever does this privilege extend except beyond a select class. Furthermore, minority opportunity hardly ever affords equal status, renumeration, satisfaction, and opportunity. Additional dilemma lie in the tradition which had created the myth of greater democracy in education than the corporate world. Thus, many students entered the educational field anticipating a changing job market only to find great disappointment awaiting them.

What most minorities from the new student movement found, however, they did not find in four-year White institutions but from the walls of two-year colleges. As Ballard asserts, startling enough in 1970 of 500,000 Black college students, 7.9% were in two-year White institutions, 3.1% in public White institutions, and 2.4% in private institutions. While these figures may vary by a percent or so, the significance to minority students is the same. The vast majority of the minority college movement in white schools was absorbed by two-year institutions.

The reality which Sam Bowles calls a cruel hoax,

A community college was unlikely to effect occupational opportunities. Incomes of workers with less than four years of college fall far short of the opportunities open to four-year college graduates. Four-year college graduates are over twice as likely to end up in high status professional or technical jobs.

Caught in a paradox of unequal opportunity the minority finds his mere presence in Higher Education a growing contradiction. As Bowles further illustrates in Nightmares and Visions:

Concerns about poverty and racial discrimination and the desire to placate previously excluded middle and lower income families
without undermining the elite institutions have given increased impetus to the movement for a stratified system of Higher Education.26

The alarm of the situation must be further considered through Sam Bowles' analysis:

The vast majority of students in community colleges are programmed for failure, and great efforts are make through testing, and counseling to convince students that their lack of success is objectively attributable to their own inadequacies.27

But it would be unrealistic to pick out the two-year college as a new and independent culprit. As Ballard points out rather clearly:

The university today as yesterday is scarcely capable of adapting itself to the special needs of Black students. Like all institutions and persons, the American college harbours contradictory elements within itself while presenting an integral front to the outside world. The university is a federal structure that functions well when all of its keepers agree on common goals; it flounders and disintegrates when there is no concensus on goals, and the fragility of the academic structure and the latent disruptive power of its constituent part become apparent. When Black students enter this delicately balanced conglomerate of interest and their own accumulated grievances, disequilibrium is an inevitable result. Their mere presence demands a shifting and realignment of power distribution on the campus.28

Not only were Blacks as the Civil Rights Commission cites, shifting away from predominantly "House Nigger Colleges" toward predominantly White institutions, but as Bowles and DeCosta point out, "this transition has taken place without study, design, analysis, or even formal reorganization."29

The vicious circumstance which Higher Education imposes on minorities creates yet another paradox. No longer was the problem of obtaining a college education one of getting into college, but of getting out. For, unlike the previous eras of racial discrimination, minorities suddenly found that the threat which their difference posed to
education was no longer only being dealt with in classical ways of expulsion and exclusion but also by new strategies of admittance, programming, and placement, as well as cooptation.\textsuperscript{30}

The cooptation process in Higher Education had many socio-economic and political forces. Organizationally what was happening in Higher Education can be understood structurally. Loosely speaking, Higher Education has come to be divided between four vested interests, and thus power struggles. Students, administrators, faculty, and the state or public. Entry for minorities brought a new sub-group. A sub-group which, it must be kept in mind, had potential to transcend traditional vested interest division characteristic of Higher Education. The minority as a social force represented and sometimes even was a united caucus of aligned administrators, faculty and students.

The institutional response to these factors of potential threat were many. But for the most part as Palola brings into focus, the pressure is being put on the institutions to redefine their role in society, particularly in relation to current problems of war, racism, and the deterioration of the cities . . . Administrators stressed the narrow perspective of faculty in regard to institutional developments and problems. Faculty were seen as protectors of professions and departments, but generally ignorant and turned off by issues of institutional matters.\textsuperscript{31}

The institution of Higher Education is not evenly distributed and dependent upon the four areas of vested interest. While each part represents a component, for the most part, these components have different values and positions in the organization. The notion of corporate bureaucracy in Higher Education means consequently a faculty oligarchy in alliance with administrators, faculty, government and industry to maintain unfair position and thereby control over the stu-
dents and the newly emerging minority class.32

The process and significance of bourgeois bureaucracy in Higher Education has strange distinction which the author has witnessed while at Amherst College and then the University of Massachusetts between the private sector and the public university. The private institution more completely censures admissions, thereby attitudes. The effectiveness of bourgeois grandeur and tradition often serve to achieve what, in the university with its diverse interest groups and public pressures, is dependent on the mechanism of bureaucratic hierarchic control. Ironically, the very heart of the corporate bureaucratic bourgeoisie, e.g., the private college, often enjoys a seeming exclusive freedom from many of the bureaucratic working so strongly rooted in the public university. The distinction, however, has little effect on the common feelings of threat which the minority movement in Higher Education seems to pose.

Part IV. Blacks in the White ivory towers: the recolonization process.

The uninvited guest: alienation of Black students. Within the corporate bureaucratic educational structure of education, minorities find themselves oppressed by the new individualism which corporate values impose. Spring describes these corporate values as individualism which stresses cooperation and sacrifice to society, the rooting out of selfish individualism:

The development of the corporate man according to this definition was brought about by education training the individual for that specialized place in society. Only the popular educational phrases of individualizing instruction and meeting individual needs meant nothing more than educating a child for the role it was determined he would play or fill in society.1
For minorities these roles were rather sad. Yet, insulated at first by segregation, the minority student in Higher Education found surprising safety. Often the segregated environment removed the student from the direct daily tension racism creates in a totally alien racist environment as the university. Unlike today, segregated minority organizations were not totally subjugated to daily living encounter with hostile racial attitudes, prejudices, and censorship. This generally was reserved for the control level. Whites had little reason to enter the daily organization life of Black institutions. The urbanization of minorities quickly ended the conditions for such antebellum racial coexistence.

One of the major reasons minorities were introduced in scale to previously exclusive White Higher Education was in fact the so-called Black revolution. But one need not wonder in light of the clear absence of change what the motive for this sudden integration. Indeed, the bureaucratic bourgeois corporate structure realized that while they could impose structural assurance for limiting minority social mobility it would not insure attitude formation.

The question of attitude formation played a large part in Higher Education motive in recent integration. However, it is a question with as usual pedagogical consequence. While integration in Higher Education represented a movement by minorities into the mainstream of American life it also meant a flow into bureaucratic White corporate structure. No longer structurally segregated minorities found the tension of not merely racist control but daily censorship as well. White institutions posed environments which were racist
The Black revolution in this country opened the eyes of much of America. Corporate bureaucracy, when faced with the harsh defeat of its military and economic empire in Asia, suddenly discovered that as was feared in the nineteenth century, without some control of Americanization process of attitude control a rapid decay occurred in American institutions. Racial minorities, perhaps the largest ethnic group in America, stood at the doors of corporate bureaucracy with torches. While no one had actually planned to burn it down the threat became rather ominous. To the elite who controlled capitalist interest in American society, the minority youth and civil rights struggle of the 1950s and 1960s made it plain that segregated Higher Education was not creating the dependent submissive results for which it was structured. As Upton Sinclair points out, "Public secondary schools were organized to fit the child of the working class into the industrial machine making him both dependent and submissive to its structure." Minority youth suddenly had exploded this bond of dependency. Psychologically, the 1960s proved minorities in segregated structures were no longer controllable. This may have been alright in itself but this played a peculiar role in influencing American White middle and working class youth. The contradiction of racist societal values affected seriously the thinking of many complacent White youth. A whole spectrum of 'Apple Pie' and fair play was in sharp contradiction. And the combination of protest and war and racial oppression were simply too great for even corporate education to cover up. What was becoming clear to Americans was as Katz describes:
There is a great gap between the pronouncement that education serves the people and the reality of what schools do to and for the children of the poor. Despite the existence of free compensatory education, most poor children become poor adults. Schools are not the great democratic engines for identifying talent and matching it with opportunity. That fact cannot be explained either by genetics or by theories of cultural privation; it is the historic result of the combination of purposes and structure that has characterized American education for the past hundred years.

However, the new surge of federal action responding to social unrest could no longer tolerate segregation. Higher Education began a mad rush for minority admissions. It is also true that as Wilson Record, author of Some Implications of the Black Studies Movement for Higher Education in the 1970s states,

Few faculty at the time of the Black disruptions were planning or had planned to modify curriculum to accommodate the concerns of Blacks. In fact, most faculty became reactionary as new programs to accommodate Blacks were thrown into effect by various college administrators.

To the White institution the changing admissions policies and mass admittance of Blacks represented an intrusion of mammoth proportions. Trapped pedagogically, minorities found that the only means for effecting change, i.e., protest and confrontation, also triggered a system's response to their unwanted presence. Institutions across the board, even in rare instances of well meaning intent, found the Le Chatelier Principle which maintains that, "Any internal or external factor making for disruption of the system is countered by forces which restore the system as closely as possible to its previous state," an awesome force and even an ally to the interest of racist institution tradition and organization.

Minorities finally hurtling the barriers of exclusions found the entrapments of admittance a strange pedagogy. What was soon to
become clear was that for minorities the problem of White Higher Education would no longer be one of getting in, but soon to become one of survival once admitted and even more so a dilemma of getting out.

Once entered, the minority was caught. The pedagogical systems of bureaucratic control after admissions assumed a new stage of cooptation. The phase of negotiation became a painful and sometimes even torturist experience. However, viewing the minority entrance into Higher Education with a conservative systems theory of a Le Chatelier principle might distort and give too general a picture. For minority impact cannot be understood merely from a perspective of the whole to the parts as systems thinking implies, but it must also be considered from Lenski and Dahrendorf's power conflict theory. The latter is described by Shermehorn as being an approach involving looking at the parts and tracing interaction, conflict and change via the various interest groups and parts of a whole or system.7

At the center of power conflict theory is the notion of scarcity of resource. It concludes that institutional struggles are a consequence of conflict over control of the scarce resources. Conflict theory views each ethnic group as an embattled position, from which various interests battle over identity and prestige, and are subject to perpetual constraints that threaten its survival freedom and differentness.8

On the other hand, systems analysis views ethnic groups as sub-systems within a larger system. Conflict is analyzed as adaptive adjustments regulated by the norms and values of the institution that eventually become internalized by members of the ethnic group. Attention is placed on the functions and roles each ethnic group plays within
the overall systems performance.9

In the author's opinion, one needs both perspectives to accurately view minority movement into previously exclusive White institutions. A dichotomy of both the microcosm, perspective offered by conflict theory, as well as macrocosm view, afforded by systems, is essential in understanding10 the current dilemmas facing Blacks and other minorities in American Higher Education.

Institutional response. It should be pointed out in analyzing institutional response that a different set of constraints faced small private institutions than large public universities. One such aspect is the notion of scale or mass for what could be achieved, in the way of accommodating Black demands, at a small institution by the introduction of one or two new people represented whole programs or departments at a larger public institution.

Take, for instance, Hampshire College with its fifty-five some odd minorities, or Amherst and Smith Colleges with their eighty or so, as compared to the University housing 700 to 800 minority youth. The critical mass in private institutions, of minorities, rarely reached a level to legitimize large expenses often associated with integrating minorities, faculty, or curriculum. At Amherst College coincidental to minority admissions was a loss of over $100,000 in Alumni's support. However, isolated Blacks and minorities found themselves in public institutions, the predicament represented even greater dilemma in the private. The overall consequence of both small scale intrusion, as well as a lack of public interest present in any scale, at private institutions placed minorities in an even more peda-
gogical position. What became minority policy in many of these small private institutions reflected more truly Paulo Folier's notions of generosity by the oppressor than any real institutional or organizational change.\textsuperscript{11} Private institutions found it harder during early Black invasions and subsequent takeover, to rationalize the disproportionate cost needed to be expended for disadvantage minorities. Especially as the admittance of these students represented a contradiction to both tradition and mission of the institution as generally understood. However, the arguments and reactions of faculty in elitist institutions, whether public or private, had surprisingly similar tones.

With growing faculty resistance, instead of entering the mainstream, minorities found themselves in isolated colonies. Black Studies and special programs became synonymous with peripheral existence. The result of this created an even greater dependence between minority leadership and the hierarchy. Concerning minority leadership, almost all aspects became political rather than innovative. The dilemmas of institutional politics played havoc on more altruistic concerns such as radical education alternatives or institutional change. Faced not only with the Le Chatelier concept minorities have found as Krech and Crutchfield stated, "With respect to psychological organization, that cognitive structures will react to influence in such a way as to absorb them with minimal change to existing cognitive integration."\textsuperscript{12} In effect this is exactly Higher Education's reaction to their presence. The social movement which once forced confrontation of issues also served to trigger reactionary faculties into action. They who were once the
preservers of American values and knights of the meritocratic order now were suddenly sounding the horn of relevance. No longer were there certain ideals to which American Higher Education should speak. The coming of minorities brought also the threat of them actually affecting the traditional design and content of education. The once sacred experience and common curriculum were no longer important. Almost overnight requirements which had, for over one hundred years, been developed for their intrinsic value to society were thrown out and not to be replaced. This occurred simultaneously at small private as well as large public institutions. In fact it occurred less at the University of Massachusetts than its neighboring private colleges.

The overall organizational significance of this phenomenon alone could make a book. However, if even by accident or unintended motive, liberal education for the first time in most institutions of Higher Education became a mixture of tradition and relevance. However, relevance provided the loop hole by which Higher Education in spite of its recent changes could provide personal choices in curriculum which would not interfere with the traditional values and racial prejudices of most White students. Once more Higher Education had found a way out of becoming significant instrument of social change. Higher Education, for the first time with the minority invasion, became institutions of student centered learning. Academia, confident that the public school system would do its job in maintaining racial and class advantage, had taken the concept of individualism and created another obstacle for social change. But in some ways, with group power conflict at play, the scheme backfired. Departments which once commanded the
the presence of students were suddenly bankrupt. A shock which is 
only now coming to fruition in the large university and public college. 

Suddenly, new demands were creating new departments, courses 
and general competition for resources. In essence, the minority 
impact brought not only old players, playing old games but new 
players competing for the same old sacred cow. As Mrs. DuBois puts 
it, "The wind of change is blowing hard." The query is whether 
the straw houses of academia inside the concrete walls of universi-
ties can continuously exhaust resources which they hardly replenish. 

The academic excellence so precious to academia was mistakenly 
thought to be threatened. While minorities raised issues of value, 
content, motive and method of curriculum, conservative faculty fili-
bustered with rules of order. While one would have thought the new 
Black leadership would be warmly welcomed by White radical faculty, 
they, in fact, were not. As Allan Ballard points out:

"... the liberal veneer of radical White faculty disappears 
completely when such professors are faced with Black questions, 
for almost inevitably faculty radicals have an intense interest 
in the maintenance of academic standards and Blacks represent 
a threat to those standards."13

Cooptation of conflict. In Higher Education cooptation of 
minorities took three distinct stages: entrance, negotiation and as-
similation. During the first two stages of entrance or intrusion, 
depending on how you look at it, and integration or negotiation the 
forces most in play were outside socio-economic motives which involve 
not only the investment that tradition accrues, but real factors of 
profit, advantage, and socio-economic control. 

During the third stage of cooptation, the point at which one
adopts revolutionary versus assimilation strategies, the significant forces at play are no longer merely socio-economic and political but psychological. What begins after individuals have started to negotiate their way into the organization becomes not only a tyranny of place but the pinges of uncertainty, and obvious incongruence involves conflict between the personality and the formal organization. In fact, as Chrys Agryris points out in *Personality and Organization*:

A basic incongruence between the needs of a mature personality and the requirements of formal organization: 1. they are provided minimal control over their workday world; 2. they are expected to be passive, dependent and subordinate; 3. they are expected to have a short time perspective; 4. they are induced to perfect and value the frequent use of a few skin-surface shallow ability; 5. they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure.14

For minorities this phenomenon is especially acute. The alienation presented by membership into White organizations of Higher Education almost immediately presents minority with a complex identity dilemma. Not only are the value conflicts personally upsetting, a constant tug of war exists between jockeying for professional position and revolutionary values. Each crisis, and often even encounter, results in a change of position or negotiation of value.

Often the distinction between personality strategies can be easily seen simplistically in terms of willingness or ability to sacrifice value for position and vice versa. Eventually the phenomenon of position creates a new isolation. An elite minority colony begins to emerge separated and alienated from the experiences of the ghetto. New values begin to take control. Responsible for, and in most places this new elite serves to influence education policy, if even indirectly,
towards the advantages of the already advantaged. Caught almost helpless, even if engaged in innovative programs, the minority in Higher Education, especially within predominantly White rural institutions, becomes more isolated each passing day. In an interview with the Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts, it was pointed out that what academic success in Higher Education has come to mean for many Blacks is a loss of roots. No longer accepted by the ghetto community and no longer tolerant to the conditions and values of economic deprivation, for many minorities, Higher Education is a one-way street out of the Black Community.** Slowly attrition, despair, and structural design narrow non-conforming ranks. What minorities come to realize is that both preservation of position and value become a function of hide-and-seek strategy. Paradoxically, minorities serving as colonizers are colonized. It is as Robert Williams attributes,

It is irrational to base the premise of colonization solely on White racism. Colonization breeds Black colonizers, and White colonizers as well. Colonizers come in two types, human or individual colonizers and structural or institutional colonizers.15

The minority student, as does the minority leadership in Higher Education, finds himself not only structurally colonized, but by participation, results in colonization as a complicity process. It is in the third stage of cooptation that the final door is slammed. Here one is faced with the alternative of assimilation into the colonization process or leaving it in order to safeguard surviving revolutionary values. Revolutionizing the process of Higher Education is often set as the alternative but hardly comes to fruition. Pedagog-
ically, minorities find themselves entrapped in institutional colonization.

Characteristic mechanisms deny access to power to those outside existing organization values. Structural colonizers, the policies and practices derived from executive action of institutions contribute to maintaining the equilibrium of power distribution, and thus, the system of colonization. 16

Often there exists the trauma of humanization or dehumanization characteristic of colonization. Individuals both White and Black find the games of human intrigue in bureaucracy overwhelming. While others merely uncertain as to their organization identity find activities calling for decisive decision making, unduly stressful. The alienation in return which reflects mostly circumstance, could hardly be called militant. In fact, by all measurement, probably most conservative, survival strategic attempts to compensate for the organizational ambiguity laid on the minority experience. Although it should be clear that nowhere exists sharper potential militant resistance to problems of racism in American society. Yet, the realities of colonization for the minority in Higher Education take on rather ugly psychological overtones. Both structurally and strategically the minority incures the tension of living within colonized environments. What is effected by this adverse environment is both the personality of the individual as well as, the organization bonds between themselves and the larger group. Williams describes this phenomenon as having two consequences:

There are two types of colonizing forces, human colonizers as the individuals whose actions or inactions create the network of structural policies that now entrap the people of the colony. These two aspects of forces make for institutional colonization. Both forces are resultant from the fact that equal educational
opportunity, in the first place, is impossible in a society in which power is unequally distributed.\textsuperscript{17}

What we see in earth shaking consequence is that during the last stage of cooptation, the question of assimilation versus revolution is also an imbalanced question. Realizing that education is offered only as a strategy by corporate powers for racial control. Knowing, as Marx asserts, that the key to social change and cultural determination lies in the industrial organization of society. Colonized within Higher Education on new plantations or isolated in inner cities, minority youth face a bitter struggle for effecting control of the corporate state both in Higher Education and industry.

Professionally, the minority leadership in Higher Education finds the growing contradiction of racial discrimination both within institutions of education and society at large in heightened proportions. Faced not only with the intuitive realization that radical revolutionary moves at the individual level bring counter-organizational gains, it is understood that the long and arduous process to reach where one has gotten brings unequal and disproportionate rewards.

Beatrice Dinerman points out in her study on sex discrimination in Higher Education that:

One finds minorities plagued with inuendoes of inferiority, excluded communications and information, less likely to be invited to participate in situations making for opportunities, minorities find an unfair motivation and reward system.\textsuperscript{18}

However, the question of unfair reward had not been taken far enough by Beatrice. In fact, Robert Atthauser, Sidney Spicack and Beverly Amsel, in their work, \textit{The Unequal Elites}, substantiate real gaps in median and average incomes, and in job status separating equally
qualified Black and White men. Furthermore, these gaps are found to be wider for college men than those with less education. Moreover, the income value of several income-producing resources is distinctly less for Blacks than for White men in general. In short, the literature that has dealt specifically with reward from education suggests that at least in the past for Black people, completing increasing amounts of education has not provided clear effective relief from economic inequality. If anything, the acquisition of additional education has been associated with the maintenance of even an increase in the inequality of Black and White men. This situation flatly contradicts popular notions about the role of education in American society and its effectiveness in neutralizing racial discrimination.¹⁹

The psychological forces coopting Blacks and other minorities are many. Yet, in understanding White institutions' roles for creating new plantations, the door has only been cracked.

White institutions of higher education: the new plantations. Kerr points out that part of the problem of institutional change consists in the fact that,

The more the environment has changed, the more organized faculty has remained the same. It has been the greatest single point of institutional conservatism in recent times.²⁰

However, many of the problems facing minority students in Higher Education and minority faculty and administrators as well, concern the systems phenomena proposed by Angyal. He says that,

The relata enter into relationships by virtue of immanent attributes, while the constituents enter into a system connection not though their immanent attributes, but through their positional value which they have in the system.²¹
The question of whether minorities, in fact, represent relata or constituency in White institutions is incidental. Especially if we look at their less than 2% representation in Ph.D. faculty. However, it is important from a power conflict view to understand that the constituent position of minorities, since the ebb of revolution and the 1960s, has diminished. In fact, what is at play now are not the positional forces characteristic of the 1960s, but the conservative racist traditions which have always characterized minority status in American institutions.

In short, the system's forces which serve the structural oppression of minorities came into clear view. While physically it would be impossible to restore the system of Higher Education to its previous state, short of re-enacting slavery, the forces of change have been mostly outmaneuvered by the system's adaptations of power shifts conducive to maintaining psychological advantage over minorities. The motive and mission clearly have become control.

What integration has meant for the minority is not merely the overwhelming circumstance of being isolated, but the peculiar pedagogical contradiction of being dependent upon many of the very corporate bureaucratic processes serving to oppress them. As Wilson Record points out,

Although Black militant students might not have understood academic decision making very well, they did know that persuading departments to make the desired changes would be a long and drawn out process. Consequently, they went straight to the top confronting Deans and Presidents rather than departments, chairmen, and individual faculty members.22

Again, it might be interesting to point out that in talking
with several college presidents, minority issues still reflect a peculiar organization flow. What is characteristic of them is that they seem always to come directly to the president's offices, by-passing the actual departments or areas involved or being affected.

The phenomena of minority hierarchical dependency has several interesting aspects. For one is the fact which Paul Nash brings to light in his study *Authority Relationships in Higher Education*, "characteristic of hierarchical dependence is the dilution of ideological and value concerns by those of sheer political or leadership expediency."23 Wilson Record points to trends for hierarchical dependence as not necessarily a voluntary choice.

While becoming dependent on hierarchy, minority students did not neglect monitoring the classes of suspect White faculty, frequently challenging both their motives and competencies. Even if the departments had been more responsive, it is not likely that the Black students would have been satisfied, for the control of curriculum relevant to Blacks would have remained in the same old hands. However, it was not only in selecting faculty courses that this Black student power was exercised: but established professors came under heavy pressure if they offered anything deemed racially relevant by Black students.24

During the period of disruption, of course, this type of activity was possible. Therefore, during the early stages of minority entrance into elite Higher Education, both issues of leadership and values were examined. However, issues of leadership seemed to seriously outweigh issues of values. No apparatus was established to deal with this phenomenon. Consequently, when the conditions for this type of disruptive censorship vanished, for the most part, so did the censorship.

The process of cooptation, at this point, becomes very serious. For the central issues of leadership became a troublesome burden for
minority development in Higher Education.

Not only were the forces of bureaucracy burdensome through the structural apparatus of admissions, but the mere act of becoming admitted became a burden. As Wilson Record asserts,

We should resist the temptation to underestimate the capacity of the university to coop, embrace, and domesticate its severest racial and ethnic critic, whose goal may later be seen as gaining entry into the academic system rather than changing it radically.25

The dilemma of institutional process and minority leadership is serious. For the most part, minority leadership in Higher Education exists either in the below two percent margin in the faculty at large or in Black Studies Departments, administration, or special programs. What this then means in organizational terms is quite simple. For one is the point made by many Black Studies professors, recorded by Record in interviews:

If not for the Black Student Unions, I would not be here. And if it didn't support me, I would be fired. I don't have much clout, but without the Black students, I wouldn't have any.26

This interesting aspect of minority organizational position is important. Its significance has two edges. On one hand, the use of student expertise in formulating minority policy was and is widespread. However, in a conference held by an association of minority administrators, it was a popular opinion that students were used to undermine minority faculty leadership. Often it was indicated that various departments attempt to manipulate minority policy through the influencing of unsuspecting students. Often students were so unaware of the organizational consequence to issues, that minority
leadership around certain issues was effectively circumvented. And, in addition, many Black student unions, feeling this unusual power, have conflicted with minority faculty leadership, suspicious of being uprooted. This created an unusual rivalry for influence within the minority populations at large in the institution. In fact, the bureaucracy within Higher Education often used minority students' opinion not to egalitate the decision making process but as another structural strangle hold on newly emerging minorities, departments, and programs.

However, the problem was not of simple motive and intent. It should be kept in mind that there was not during the 1960s, and even today, enough critical mass of professional minority members in Higher Education to make minority opinion more than a voice in the dark. A voice which, if not for minority students, would have had little volume. The overall consequence of this situation resulted in many strategies for minority development in Higher Education falling victim to the political process between minority faculty, students, and administrators. Fearing complete cooptation, minority students felt an urgent need to censure minority faculty and administrators. In part, this resulted in young non-traditional faculty being put forth in the forefront of the campus movement. This, however, created a new problem.

Not only were most of these newcomers to Higher Education unfamiliar with the subtle workings of Higher Education, but positionally were little more than tolerated by fellow faculty. Most of the newly emerged minority faculty and administrators were untenured, and did not hold doctorate degrees. This meant that their overall status in
the organization was doubly weak. The faculty, for the most part, saw the new minority presence as a serious institutional change. But, as is pointed out in the Reluctant Planner, "faculty tend to be the most resistant to organizational change. The faculty are the greatest drag on academic planning and innovation in the university."27

Nonetheless, the newly emerged class, to many, represented a direct change. Not only had the sacred Ph.D. been put in jeopardy by their presence, but the reality of racial prejudice found in many traditional curriculums came into full view of discerning eyes.

Another aspect of the problem can be seen in the tension between faculty and administrators. The Reluctant Planner identifies this tension as the role played by each group.

Administrators take planning initiative, faculty playing reactive roles. . . . At issue is the legitimate involvement of various groups in the institutional decision making process.28

For the most part, minority presence on the campus was a result of administrative decree. Consequently, most faculty became reactionary as new programs and projects were quickly thrown into effect by various college administrations.

Another large issue of meritocracy also came into question as rationale for exerted faculty conservatism. The minority brought into full focus the role meritocratic rationalization was playing in creating a tool for elitist control of Higher Education. Thus, the emergence of Black leadership brought into question the legitimacy of meritocratic claims. For, if the university was indeed the model for the new meritocism, how had it so succinctly left out minority presence
and interest in institutional development.

What emerged on most college campuses was a strange power conflict and ethnic rivalry. Even within the various traditional groups, factional interest and response occurred. Although it is unlikely that anyone planned or could foresee what would happen, the overall effect of the new Black presence created an effective divide and conquer result.

College campuses which for generations were believed to have been exempt from the corruption and racial bigotry associated with the antebellum South, now began to emerge as a new plantation. A strange tyranny of place had taken shape. The overall socioeconomic role Higher Education had come to play in subduing the Black revolt and White radical protest of the 1960s and 1970s could be viewed complete. Issues of a new social order were totally submerged by confrontation, rivalry and conflict politics. The university had broadened its base of admittance, but it is unclear if the base of participation has had any widening consequence.

What minorities have discovered is that the affirmative action strategy which picked up where the protests left off, has brought grave disappointment. Discovering that it has been the federal government, not Higher Education, that has become the major enforcer for wide-range antidiscrimination. In fact, the effect of affirmative action as George LaNorie points out, must be questioned. "The academic professional employment process is so decentralized that it is quite possible to have some discriminatory and some non-discriminatory departments within the same institution."\(^\text{29}\) In all too many cases there is no way for the
administrations in Higher Education to impose on the faculty oligarchy federal law or rules. Once more Blacks, as in the days of the old plantations, find their well-being at the mercy of the plantation overlords. Only in this case, they are the same faculty who, for over one hundred years, have been able to exclude them. Again, the federal government, like a paternal arm, must try to penetrate the racist structures and institutions which are so characteristic of Higher Education's origin. In many ways, the university has come to be a modern plantation with all the rights, benefits, and safeguards one might expect to find on a plantation of modern times.

Section Two: Black Administrators in White Institutions of Higher Education

The problem of racial dependency. In this section of the literature review, concentration is placed on literature involving Black administrators in White institutions of Higher Education. Because of the limited availability of such research, an attempt has been made to encompass broad areas of racial study to formulate some understanding of how the two phenomena of race and administration interact.

In general, however, almost all of the literature reviewed in this section can be understood by a summary of Moore and Wagstaff's study on interactions of Blacks in White college work environments.

Although Moore and Wagstaff delineate the existence of many different problems facing Black administrators, they do not significantly qualify these delineations in terms of felt effect. Essentially, in the first part of the literature review, argument is made that the
general condition of Blacks in predominantly White institutions of Higher Education is that of being colonized. Or, more fully, the conditions Nkrumah discusses to great length in his analysis of Neo Colonization. Whether the reader is affected by such political terms does not diminish the organizational conditions of racism. The organizational conditions of racism identifying a tyranny or potential tyranny of New Colonization for Black people. Martin Carnoy's description of education and the institutions of education as a form of cultural imperialism; incorporating also the institutional paradox set forth in Ivan Illich's work calling for the Deinstitutionalization of Education, Katz, Gentist and Bowles, all have recent publications describing the influence of Capitalism on Education, clear proof of institutional colonization is given by each author mentioned. Is the condition in which a Black person both works and is despised a condition of colonization? Does the absence of social comfort and control diminish in a systemic manner the quality of life and fulfillment from work which is the White experience?

Many questions on the quality of the life experience of Blacks in White environments bear similar contrast to the conditions of Whites in Black environments. Few studies focus on the behavior of Whites in a Black environment. However, one contrasting piece of work, perhaps even more significant in western thought than Franz Fanon on the psychological dimensions of racism in the social, political and economic interaction of Black and White people, is the work of Oliver Mannoni, Prospero and Caliban, the Psychology of Colonization.

Mannoni in his examination of the institution of colonization
and racism establishes one resounding principle, holding significance to this study on Black administrators in White institutions of Higher Education. Perhaps, it is best generally expressed by Mannoni in his study published in 1950, page 127—of the Malagasy and European, "after living together for a period during which any difficulties which arose were resolved by an arrangement which appeared to lead to a better understanding, suddenly awoke to find themselves seriously at odds with each other."—"The principal reason for this was that experience of colonial life altered them both."³

Mannoni, in his analysis of the problem of institutional racism, forecasts the manifestation of this dilemma on modern institutions in the following way. Although he refers to racism in the following Freudian Marxist dialogue of the 1950s inferiority complex, his depiction is quite accurate today in many ways. Mannoni, "Naturally, the fact of escaping the inferiority complex so easily by taking advantage of the presence of a whole dependent people is in itself psychologically a loss. For through compensation for such a complex is fraught with dangers. The only hope of human progress lies in a vigorous and manly liquidation of inferiority. Inferiority (racism provided it is resolved in good time) is the main driving force of western man, and provides him with the energy which sets him apart from all other peoples in the world. It underlies almost all the life stories of our great men. And, I think, it would not be overbold to foresee in the distant future the development of a new kind of White, or near White humanity, over almost the whole southern hemisphere of the ancient world, a type more different psychologically from that
of the north than any of the northern peoples are from each other from east to west. If national (Nationalistic-Racist) psychologies remain as constant as appears to be the case, we can already forecast what the main characteristics of this new type will be: Lack of originality and creativity, a distant taste for feudal types of organization, and a lively desire to avoid infection from the complexes of the Northern hemisphere. Long-term prophecies of this kind must of course be seen for what they are--namely, a way of defining our institutions about the present situation rather than a precise forecast of an unknown future. In any case, the new White, or near White (White enough at any rate not to feel inferior in the Southern hemisphere) human beings I have envisaged, would on the whole, be far less worthy products than are Europeans, unless as a result of having to grapple with fresh difficulties, they acquired some qualities other than mere pride in the race of their birth."

Mannoni's analysis is analogous to this study on the Black administrator in White institutions of Higher Education. However, it is ironic first that to some extent, the situation of the Black and White people is in reverse, that in Mannoni's study, the White person was generally the administrator not the minority. Ironic also is his detailed description depicting the behavior of Whites which is characteristic of the behavior observable today on the White college campus.

It is vital in understanding the felt influence of race on job satisfaction to have at least minimum acquaintance with Mannoni's analysis of racial dependency complexes. In essence, racial dependency, as he describes it, results from a complex interplay of inferior-
ity complexes both on the part of Whites and Blacks. This complex is manifested in a need to distort either positively or negatively the interaction of difference as it negociates a homogeneous environment. Race becomes then a difference within which homogeneous racist institutions such as the White college campus become an element with pedagogical consequence and dependency.

Race, often perceived as the vehicle for entrance by Blacks into White institutions of Higher Education, becomes, at the same time, that particular aspect which makes the Black administrator stand apart as alien to the environment. Whether this factor of difference is responded to negatively or positively, it serves as a dependency mechanism through which the individual must interact with the environment. To what extent in fact, do Black administrators find race a dependent factor in their job interactions is a central focus of this study. However, the dilemmas which race generate for Black Administrators on White college campuses is far more complex than the White colonial situation of Madagascar. The Black Administrator comes to the environment not only as an administrator, but "native" as well.

A more specific understanding can be grasped of the role race plays for Black Administrators by moving from Mannoni's work in 1950 to William Moore and Lonnie Wagstaff's 1974 study on Black Educators in White Colleges.

Moore and Wagstaff examine Black educators in White colleges. Their text provides an excellent update on Black administrators and educators on the White college and university campus. This is fortunate because outside of a few recent dissertation studies, the
literature specifically addressing Black administrators in White institutions is limited.

Moore and Wagstaff's study on Black educators in White colleges provides an excellent overview of the patterns of racial discrimination on the White college campus in America today. In their study, Moore and Wagstaff look at the regional and geographic dispersement of Black educators, job dispersements within institutions, leadership styles of Black Administrators, affirmative action and many special issues affecting Black people in Higher Education.

Moore and Wagstaff report startling data concerning the national dispersement of Blacks in Higher Education. They reveal through their study that almost half, 48% of the two year colleges of this country have no Blacks on their faculties or in their administration. They report almost as many Blacks working in Higher Education in the single state of Florida (162) as in the combined number for New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Additionally, their data indicated that the number of Blacks working in Florida's junior colleges was actually five times the number found in junior college systems of all New England.10

Only seven states reported having more than fifty Blacks in the junior college system, New York 83, Florida 162, North Carolina 196, Washington 52. Although this information is not conclusive, it raises many questions concerning the job opportunity and environment for Blacks in White institutions of Higher Education. In fact, they described the condition of Black Administrators as being alien in a promised land:
To say that Blacks find themselves alien in a predominantly White institution is not an unsubstantiated claim. Ken Mommsen found (1972) that 94% of the Black faculty members in White colleges and universities believed that racial discrimination was existent with regard to hiring.

Our findings support Mommsen's data; only 5.5% of the sample did not view racial discrimination a problem in hiring. . . .

To many Blacks, higher education was perceived as the promised land. In reality, they found it to be a fortress--almost unpenetrable to all but Caucasian males. . . . Some do not attack it but instead indictate that they regard the continued elitism and historical pretensions as discriminatory and anachronistic, they talk about its inevitable collapse with ironic detachment.11

In this statement, Moore and Wagstaff identify the two root causes of most difficulties experienced by Black people in White institutions attributable to race, "first, the problem of racial discrimination in hiring, i.e., affirmative action and second, survival after having been hired, i.e., quotas, special programs, qualifications, quality, compatibility, and most of all, perseverance."

Blacks in the academic market place are discriminated against in as many varieties of ways as there are different people with racial prejudice in that environment. Unfortunately, however, for most Black administrators in White colleges and universities, the job is the primary relationship by which they interact with the college environment. Working in the five college area for most Black Administrators entails also living there as well. The Black Administrator in the five college area is particularly dependent upon his job not only for work satisfaction but social, cultural and economic satisfaction as well.

Racial discrimination has many complex manifestations in the neo-racist institutions of White Higher Education. Affirmative action is but one good example of how institutional racism creates strange
organizational paradox, involving a complex interdependency of racial pedagogy. As ineffective as affirmative action is, it represents the only vehicle for Blacks to combat faculty and institutional discrimination. Organizationally dependent on affirmative action, Black Administrators see affirmative action as a necessary evil. Moore and Wagstaff describe affirmative action as: "Used by a few Blacks both as a thrust and a mechanism to combat faculty and institutional resistance, but is has had little impact on selection and hiring. White women have been more successful than Blacks of both sexes in using affirmative action to secure equal employment opportunities and the accompanying benefits." "Perhaps no single procedure to eliminate inequality in hiring in higher education has surfaced the attitudes, fears, anxieties and bigoted behavior of academicians as has affirmative action." 12

Being hired for many Blacks represents racial dependency. The Black Administrator often finds not only is race a factor, but the roles and expectations demanded are influenced by race.

For many Black Administrators, being hired represents a multi-dimensional racial dependency. Not only does the Black Administrator find race a factor in getting a job, but the roles and expectations demanded of them are influenced by race as well.

"Becoming a bastard merely by accepting the job" in Wagstaff and Moore's words hold many implications.

"The Black Administrator never ceases to ask himself, and it is as much a problem for him as for his lack of authority, why was he hired? The Black Administrator in extreme roles as diplomat or
militant often finds day to day managerial relationships for instance, such as those with secretarial personnel an added burden. Many secretaries come from a background which has shaped their behavior and attitudes in ways which are antithetical to Blacks; the submissive 'assistant to' serves at the pleasure of these people. He can expect sloppy work, imprudence, a lack of confidentiality, hostility, maternalism, and other contemptuous behavior or eccentricities that he is expected to tolerate. . . ." The militant 'assistant to' "does not encounter such on the job experience, secretaries do not openly treat him with contempt, hostility, or inform on him, they would not dare. However, his brusque manner is likely to embarrass his less aggressive Black colleagues, and because he has no respect for their timidity, he is contemptious of them also."13 Of course, many Black Administrators adopt various styles for dealing with the ambiguity of "why me?"

The complexities in White institutions encompass a broad range of phenomena and response. The felt effect of race in the job is a complex problem requiring a multiple perspective.

An added perspective of the problems facing Black Administrators is conveyed by two dissertation studies done at Harvard University. One was research by Dr. Alvin Pouissant, well reknowned theoretician of racial psychology, and the other by a John Young, Fullbright Scholar. In both their studies, the plight of Black Administrators is approached by examining aspects of behavior in the White environment which discriminates in the treatment of Blacks compared to Whites.

Young, in his study, focuses on a comparative analysis of Black-White leadership in the administration and executive of senior
academic jobs. Although the data in Young's study do not substantiate any hypothesis, he does raise four questions which help characterize dilemma many Blacks find in their jobs on the White campus. Young describes these four basic problems as:

1. The Black Administrator will appear generally to be or to have less credibility in initial acceptance and respect of his leadership.

2. The Black Administrator will have to constantly challenge and disprove the above in order to maintain role legitimacy and leadership.

3. And, therefore, in terms of his role function, he will experience a greater amount of deprivation of his space, time, and energy.

4. That, in fact, in order for him to succeed, he has to work harder and be more committed to his task whereby requiring more uses of his energy and time than his White counterpart.14

Young suggests that the Black Administrator, because of racism has a unique and different set of problems than those encountered by his White counterpart. Essentially, Young's study reinforces the notion of a racial dependency complex, i.e., racism, through which Blacks must negotiate in order to gain authority, credibility and meet responsibilities.

Alvin Poussaint, another Harvard scholar, also examines "the Black Administrator in the White University," in the September, 1974 Black Scholar. Poussaint describes in psychoanalytic terms the harsh
conditions and deprivations faced by Black Administrators on the White campus.

Poussaint describes the problem in basic aspects:

1. Affirmative action, which he feels carries "the innuendo of incompetence," is one of the more insidious psychological pressures. Because Black Administrators were especially recruited for their positions there is the implication that they did not merit their job.

2. Loneliness and isolation of Black and other minority groups. College administrators on a predominantly White campus find it to be too much to bear to come together to discuss mutual problems, give mutual support and develop strategies for improving their status.

3. Organizational positioning, "in fact, a prominent Black educator described many of these new positions as neo-segregation. Several minority affairs officers felt that many of their duties had a separatist quality. . . . It seems almost impossible for anyone to conceive of or to accept the fact that a Black man might fill a position near the top of a major institution, be it corporate or educational, without having the label minority attached as a delineating factor to his influence, or the reach of his authority and responsibility.

4. Black college administrators are not entirely satisfied with the new doors opened to them: "White boards of trustees have recently been astonished to discover more than a few
Black professors rejecting job offers with prestigious and illustrious titles, intended to seduce any reluctant Black with even a modicum of faith in the American dream. The reasons Black professionals retreat from these positions may be unspoken, but they are not mysterious."

"It is clear from a brief survey that the disenchantment and complaints of many Black college officials and profoundly revealing of the unique complexities of American race relations." 15

It is clear from the literature that Black Administrators face a unique host of problems. But how can a hands-on approach identify and delineate in what ways the oppression of racism is felt in day to day work. In order to better clarify organizational behavior, and the felt effect of racial dependence, this study has focused on the general job satisfaction felt by Black Administrators in White institutions. This is done first by examining the theoretical construct by which job satisfaction can be studied. Upon establishment of a fundamental understanding of job satisfaction, this study, in its literature review, then explores aspects of racial influence on job satisfaction. It is intended that with the two last sections of the literature review, an added dimension for understanding the problems of racism can be grasped. In these last two sections, an attempt is made, after having described the overall environment, to develop a vehicle or model by which examination can be made of specific racial phenomena as it interacts organizationally and impacts the daily work lives of Black Administrators.
Section Three: Literature Review on Job Satisfaction

In this section of the literature review, the works of Herzberg, Mausner, Snyderman, 16 Likert, 17 Bullock 18 and others are examined to develop a concrete understanding of job satisfaction and methods for studying it. After a brief synopsis of the literature on job satisfaction, this study will then focus on literature surrounding the felt effect of race on job satisfaction.

The cornerstone for understanding modern thinking on job satisfaction is Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman's book, The Motivation to Work. It is in their work that the two contrasting schools of thought represented by Taylor and Mayo in management are brought together. Taylor's 1911 work on the job and work satisfaction studied physiological performance of work. The intrinsic satisfaction of work comes from optimalization of utility, as opposed to Mayo's later notion of workers' well being. On one hand, the satisfaction of workers is viewed in terms of output and maximization of productivity. In other words, how best to do a job given the logistics and the mechanics of a task. The notion of human well being, however, is a more recent concept. Mayo, 1930, developed the idea that human productivity is a function of well being, happiness and control. It was not until World War II and the ebb of the modern cultural revolution that the concept of human satisfaction was considered an integral part of job measurement.

Herzberg is more generally associated with his dual motive theory. Basically, he proposes that job satisfaction is a consequence of both intrinsic and extrinsic experiences. That, indeed, satisfaction
can be translated into more human terms if viewed in relationship to intrinsic rewards, i.e., those satisfactions derived from doing a job, and extrinsic rewards, i.e., those satisfactions derived environmentally from work such as safety on the job, or the living environment affordable from income earned by working.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman identify 16 factors which significantly influence the job satisfaction of workers. Listed here the sixteen factors are: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, salary, possibility of growth, interpersonal relationships—subordinates, status, interpersonal relationships—supervisors, interpersonal relationships—peers, supervision, technical, company policy and administration, working conditions, personal life, and job security. These sixteen factors are significant aspects for assessing job satisfaction in this study.

But, Herzberg's insight into satisfaction must be understood as important to this study for two reasons. First, the delineation of these sixteen work factors, but also for his motivation and hygiene theory of the human well-being derived from work. Perhaps, these aspects are best summarized by the following passage:

The factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization in his work. . . . Man tends to actualize himself in every area of his life and his job is one of the most important areas. The conditions that surround the doing of the job cannot give him this basic satisfaction; they do not have this potentiality. It is only from the performance of a task that the individual can get the rewards that will reinforce his aspirations. It is clear that although the factors defining the job context serve as goals for the employee, the nature of the motivating qualities of the two kinds of factors are essentially different factors in the job context meeting the needs of the individual for avoiding unpleasant situations in con-
trast to this motivation by meeting avoidance needs, the job factors reward the needs of the individual to reach his aspirations. These effects on the individual can be conceptualized as actuating approach rather than avoidance behavior. Since it is in the approach sense that the term motivation is most commonly used, we designate the job factors as the 'motivators,' as opposed to the extra-job factors, which we have labeled the factor of hygiene. It should be understood that both kinds of factors meet the needs of the employee; but it is primarily the motivators that serve to bring about the kind of job satisfaction sought for the work force.20

Is Herzberg here describing creative energy versus passive energy, or exactly what are the full implications of this philosophic proposition? Nonetheless, for this study, both concepts of job satisfaction, hygiene on one hand, and motive on the other, narrow down to intrinsic factors influencing the work motive through satisfaction from the work itself. From the point of view used for this study on job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction is seen as a principal factor influencing job satisfaction. Although both hygiene and job performance factors are also held to have particular significance in work motive influences. Herzberg's notion is important because it introduces two fundamental dimensions by which to perceive job satisfaction. However, in an attempt to examine further the social implications of being Black in a White environment, i.e., viewing the effect of race on job satisfaction, this study expands its theoretical examination on job satisfaction by looking at the work of Robert Bullock on social factors related to job satisfaction. For obvious reasons, socially-related factors are an especially essential aspect in examining racial influences on job satisfaction.

Bullock's study on social factors related to job satisfaction focuses on the importance of human relations in job satisfaction. Al-
though Bullock's study involved pre and post testing of his sample, the basic design of his study is helpful in developing an understanding of the significance of social interaction within a job.

Bullock examines, through the use of a very broad range of social correlates of job satisfaction, the theoretical framework involving the general assumption that work behavior is largely determined by attitudes and sentiments, shaped or influenced by the worker's adjustment or lack of adjustment to the informal structure and culture of the employing organization and the family and community associations of the employee. Although the findings of Bullock's study are inconclusive, his instrument provides helpful insight into various aspects of social factors influencing job satisfaction, while also raising critical questions concerning the method for collection of valid data.

In summary, Bullock's instrument attempts to view social factors related to job satisfaction through the following correlations: (1) A job satisfaction scale of ten items in which description is obtained concerning feelings about jobs while on the job. (2) A social factor questionnaire of 75 items which obtains descriptions of a job. (3) A social factor opinion scale in which the opinions to 30 items critical to organizational social interaction are obtained. (4) Personal background of 24 items.

Herzberg's dual motive work theory provides an excellent model by which to perceive the behavior of job satisfaction. His notion of motive versus hygiene factors influencing work gives vital insight into the intrinsic and extrinsic phenomena influencing job satisfaction. When Herzberg is considered in combination with Robert Bullock's
research on social factors related to job satisfaction, it becomes apparent that the felt effect of race on job satisfaction is potentially a very complex dilemma. Because racism is such a socially-dependent factor, Bullock's study holds particular relevance to this study.

The final issues raised in this section of the literature review concern job satisfaction as a problem of measuring complex causal relationships within a given management and organizational environment. The peculiar significance management and organizational phenomena play in measuring causal phenomena is examined in greater depth by Rensis Likert. In order to present a clear description of the causal dilemma in studying job satisfaction, Likert's work is reviewed by looking at two of his books, *The Human Organization* and *New Patterns of Management*.

Likert, in his 1961 study on *New Patterns of Management*, found that many factors influenced individual performance within an organization. Likert found that leadership within an organization affected directly the level of productivity of workers and was dependent upon factors such as job centered supervision, supportive managerial behavior, supervisory behavior, attitudes and freedom in productivity.

Likert also found that the group process influenced job and organizational performance. The group process in Likert's study was measured by viewing various factors of group loyalty, and identity of workers while interfacing with peers, subordinates, and supervisors.

Communications was also found by Likert to have considerable influence on organizational performance. Likert's examination of communications entails a broad view of two general categories of informa-
tion; competitive material related to facts, problems, progress, goals, ideas, experiences, policies, etc., and motivational and emotional materials such as emotional climate and atmosphere, attitudes and reactions, loyalties and hostilities, feelings of support, appreciation or rejection, goals and objectives. Likert indicates that performance and satisfaction are closely dependent on vertical and horizontal communications within an organization.23

Likert also delineates in his study characteristics of work satisfaction from work repetitive in nature as contrasted to varied work. He describes the differences between the two as: "An entirely different situation exists for repetitive work--work which is machine-paced or is highly functionalized and for which specific ways of doing each job have been established and time standards have usually been set." Likert also points out the organization and cooperative motive of a job can influence job performance and satisfaction.24

Another caution Likert raises in assessing causal relationships within an organization are problems relating to intervening variables. He points out that the choices made by respondents are often true selections of their assessment of a given factor but often are influenced by various intervening variables such as expectations, influence of one variable over another, group influences, organizational motive, reward and politics which often filter the ability and desire of a respondent to reply honestly.25

New Patterns of Management reviews a broad range of organizational factors with causal relationships on job performance and satisfaction. However, Likert raises still further pertinent questions
regarding the measurement of causal relationships within an organization and management environment in his 1967 study on The Human Organization. Likert describes one basic problem of hierarchical influence on causal studies done within an organizational setting. "The capacity of an organization to obtain accurate measurement of the causal, intervening and end result variables is greatly influenced over time by the manner in which these data are used. All levels of hierarchy in an organization except the very top, fear management evaluations which are used in a punitive manner by their supervisors. To protect themselves, they tend to resist covertly, if not overtly, the collection of such data. They also try, and often successfully, to distort the measurements in ways to favor or protect themselves."26

The most significant contribution of Likert to this study, however, is Likert's profile of organizational characteristics by which to assess causal relationships of performance in an organization and the idea of a continuous variable measurement whereby different factors are assessed in accordance with a continuous measurement from the extreme at one end to that at the other. The advantage of the Likert scale principle for measuring causal relationships within an organization are several. First, it provides an evaluative method whereby respondents are able to express more accurately their assessment of a particular factor. It also enables respondents to rate different factors by a common continuous variable, providing comparative and cross assessment of factors. Lastly, the respondent is able to select from a range of responses which call for reflection, analysis, and assessment of relationships, and comparing various causal factors with one another.27
Section Four: Race and Job Satisfaction

Introduction. This section of the literature review focuses on the causal relationship between race and job satisfaction. The literature reviewed in this section is divided into three general categories: literature concerning the relationship of race to supervisory and management factors of job satisfaction, literature concerning racial differences in job factor preference and satisfaction, and literature concerning the influence of race on job evaluation and assessment of workers.

Race and supervision. In this section of the literature review, discussion is focused on the causal relationships of race to supervisory and managerial effectiveness. Primarily important to this section is W. S. Parker Jr.'s work on "The Black White Differences in Leadership Behavior Related to Subordinate Reactions." However, consideration is also given other research such as J. C. Taylor and D. C. Bowers (1972), Bowers and Seashore (1966), Richards and Jafee (1972) and A. R. Bass and J. Turner (1973).

J. C. Taylor and D. C. Bowers' studies on supervisory and managerial effectiveness provide a basic research model by which to examine administrative behavior. Taylor and Bowers identified four critical categories by which to examine managerial leadership behavior: managerial support; goal emphasis; work facilitation and interaction facilitation. Bowers and Seashore (1966) support the significance of these factors for measuring managerial effectiveness with their findings that these four leadership behaviors must be present for ef-
Taylor and Bowers describe these four general areas in their model as ten critical concerns for measuring supervisory and management relationship. They examine the extent and effectiveness of supervisors:

1. Friendliness and approachability;
2. Attention and support of what workers say;
3. Willingness to listen to subordinate's problems;
4. Encouragement to subordinates to give their best effort;
5. Demonstration of how to improve performance;
6. 
7. Offers new ideas for solving problems;
8. Encourages team work;
9. Encourage open opinion giving;
10. Has confidence and trust in subordinates.33

Parker reports that race had a positive influence on certain aspects of leadership and management relationships while having a negative influence on others. He found that the four areas of managerial support, goal emphasis, work facilitation and interaction facilitation were all racially dependent factors for Black managers and supervisors. In Parker's study Blacks were reported to have a significantly higher rating of managerial efficiency in areas of work facilitation. However, he found that in the areas of managerial support, goal emphasis, and interaction facilitation race often seemed to have a negative influence.34

In reviewing Taylor and Bowers' ten managerial effectiveness
measures, Parker found Black managers receiving higher rating than White managers in demonstrating how to improve performance, offering new ideas for solving problems, encouraging team work and encouraging open opinion giving. \(^{35}\) Besides Parker's research on racial significance in managerial relationships, the research of Richards and Jafee (1972) on Blacks supervising Whites in a laboratory study involving a group of students also found race an influencing factor on managerial and supervisory relationships. Using Bales (1950) Interaction Process Analysis, Richards and Jafee (1972) determined race to be a circumstantial factor influencing managerial and supervisory relationships. \(^{36}\)

A. R. Bass and J. Turner (1973) in their study on Ethnic Group Differences in Relationships Among Criteria of Job Performance, found clear evidence of racial dependency in the supervisors and managers' evaluation of Black workers. In their study they found that racial bias has favorable influence in the evaluation of Black workers by White supervisors. Bass and Turner imply in their research that White supervisors are more formal and objective in their interaction and evaluation of Black workers. Although their study holds greater significance in examining the influence of race on job evaluation, which shall be discussed in the last part of this section of the literature review, one very interesting quote from their study gives insight into how race is traditionally interpreted when having a positive effect on supervisory interaction between Whites and Blacks.

In a laboratory study, Rotter and Rotter found that White raters generally gave higher ratings to Blacks than to White workers when performance was poor, but found no difference in ratings given to Black and White workers when the performance was good. They interpret these results as suggesting that
evaluators experience guilt over a low rating given to a minority group member, so that to avoid guilt feelings the evaluator leans over backward to be fair or lenient when rating poor performance of minority group workers.\cite{Note37}

Of course this statement does not consider demographic factors which might indicate a need for this type of sensitivity or the complex matrix of possible other motives rooted in human behavior, organization positioning and fundamental tradition of insecurity where race is concerned.

However, this statement does for the most part express accurately the paternal interpretation most people give favorable racial bias in managerial and supervisory relationships.

**Racial job factor preference and job satisfaction.** In this part of the literature review discussion is centered around racial distinctions in job factor preference and satisfaction. In order to probe this aspect of the effect of race on job satisfaction, examination is made of authors such as: S. W. Alper (1975) "Racial Differences in the Job and Work Environment Priorities Among Newly Hired College Graduates," P. C. Smith and J. Rollo (1974) "Factor Structure for Blacks and Whites of the Job Descriptive Index and Its Discrimination of Job Satisfaction," Jugoslav Miluinovich and Angelos Tsaklanganos, "The Impact of Perceived Community Prosperity on Job Satisfaction of Black and White Workers," O'Reilly and Roberts (1973) "Job Satisfaction among Whites and Non Whites: A Cross Cultural Approach," and lastly C. N. Weaver, "Black White Differences."

S. W. Alper found in his survey of newly hired college graduates that there was a difference between White and Black respondents
concerning job factor priority. In his study he found evidence supporting earlier research by Bloom and Barry (1967) of Herzberg's motivation hygiene dichotomy that Blacks are more concerned with hygiene-economic factors of work and have less expectations of intrinsic job satisfaction.38

Jack Fieldman, in his 1973 study of Black-White job factor preference, contradicts the traditional hierarchy of need outcome. In his study he found a few similar trends to Alper's finding but overall reported that Blacks wanted the same basic things as White from job satisfaction.39 Of course, it is difficult to interpret findings of studies as these because while Black-White preferences are the target of research, great uncertainty exist concerning the degree of class, education or other demographic biases influencing results.

There is no doubt that in our modern economy the major motive for work is economic reward. For Blacks this has generally had even a greater significance because of the overall special economic deprivation of their community. That Black people on an average earn fifty percent the income of their White counterpart, perhaps gives some explanation for the general disparity between White and Black community prosperity. There is little wonder why researchers examined to great length the consequence of economic need and community deprivation on Black workers.

Some other contributing authors to this concern of job satisfaction are Charles O'Reilly and Karlene Roberts in their study on cross cultural differences of White worker job satisfaction. They provide an interesting method and add significant findings to the study
of racial influence on job satisfaction. Utilizing a G. H. Facer Scale Job Description Index, participants are required to project rather than describe work experiences. In the Job Description Index, five aspects of satisfaction are identified: (1) the work itself, (2) satisfaction with co-workers, (3) satisfaction with supervisors, (4) satisfaction with pay, and (5) satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. In addition they describe Whites as having significantly more satisfaction than non-Whites in all the areas. They reported also that non-Whites indicated greater concern with the social factor of a job than Whites.40

One explanation offered for these findings is the Bowerman, Campbell (1965) and Stephensen (1957) findings concerning high school students. In their studies, they discovered evidence to support the notion that Black workers are more functionally motivated. Levels of upward striving were reported to be dependent upon practical concerns. Reporting that overall Black high school students had high aspiration but low expectations, O'Reilly and Roberts seem to feel that this unique motivational pattern holds significant consequence for White-Non-White difference in job satisfaction preference. In their study, they site "that non-White workers are more likely to prefer high income but only half as likely as Whites to prefer that work be important and give a feeling of accomplishment" (pp. 295-299.41

Another study closely related to O'Reilly and Roberts, examined last in this section of the literature review, is Charles Weaver's study on Black-White Differences in Attitudes Toward Job Characteristics. Weaver agrees with O'Reilly's findings that there is a significant dif-
ference between White and Black peoples' job preference characteristics. From two national surveys, Weaver found, as did O'Reilly and Roberts, that Blacks were more concerned with income than feelings of accomplishment from work.42

It is a curious problem understanding research on racial phenomena. On one hand patterns which have clear racial patterns are not race related, but reflect basic socioeconomic factors, reflective of racial economic discrimination, while on the other hand there seems to be evidence of racial distinctions in regard to job factor preferences. To what extent can one explain these behaviors as cultural or circumstantial is difficult to discern. Added to the complexity of explaining racial phenomena is the peculiar role social expectations play both in gathering and interpreting data of this sort. Whatever the need for special understanding when attempting to interpret the influence of race on job preference characteristics, it is clear that the basic significance of race does effect this aspect of job satisfaction, just how and in what ways is an important consideration in this study.

Race and the evaluation of work. In this part of the literature review discussion is centered on the influence of race on job evaluation and assessment of performance. In order to do this the research of the following authors is examined: Alan Bass and John Turner (1973), "Ethnic Group Differences in Relationships Among Criteria of Job Performance," Frank Shmidt and Raymond Johnson (1973), "Effect of Race on Peer Ratings in an Industrial Situation," and lastly Jack Fieldman (1973)
"Race, Employment, and the Evaluation of Work."

Alan Bass and John Turner (1973) provide interesting insight into the discrimination of job performance characteristics between White and Black workers in their study of New York City bank tellers. They found race to influence significantly the priority job evaluative criteria. Their findings suggest that correlations between supervisory ratings and objective criteria measures tend to be higher for Blacks than for White employees. 43

Although Bass and Turner interpret this phenomena as reverse discrimination, a closer look at this job characteristic permits another interpretation. An interpretation with special significance if one reviews the overall behavior found in regard to affirmative action and evaluation of Black workers. Bass and Turner's findings seem to support the notion that Blacks encounter a much more formal and rigid code of censorship than their White counterparts. Even, in fact, lending some explanation for why a Black person with a bachelor's degree might expect to compete with a White high school graduate as government studies and the research of Althauser, Spivak, and Amsel suggest in their work.

The unequal elites. Additionally, Bass and Turner found that there was a higher correlation between increases in an objective criterion for Blacks than for Whites in assessing merit for salary increases. This is an especially interesting phenomena because given all the research on the special economic conditions facing Blacks that in salary considerations there is no evidence of information relaxation
of criteria to adjust for these special circumstances.

Whatever, the interpretation of why Blacks might be generally evaluated on more objective criteria, the significant thing to understand is that there is a difference in the application of evaluative standards and criteria for Blacks than for Whites. Thus, establishing even the basic system upon which merit, reward and recognition are based to be racially dependent and biased. This of course, holds interesting implications for the study of the felt influence of race on job satisfaction.

Frank Shmidt and Raymond Johnson's study on the effect of race on peer ratings in an industrial situation is another very pertinent piece of research. In their study several unique characteristics influencing the delineation between the assessment of White contrasted to Black workers.

In their study Shmidt and Johnson found evidence supporting the research of Cox and Krumboltz in 1958 and Dejung and Kaplan in 1962, that peer ratings of workers showed racial bias in their studies. Raters gave significantly higher peer ratings among members of the same racial groupings. They also found that the numeric imbalance of Blacks to Whites affected the results of peer evaluations.

Frank and Shmidt site the research of Campbell and Fisher (1959) in their multitrait-multimethod matrix study on the influence of race on peer ratings. They collaborate Shmidt and Johnson's findings that the evaluation of future success of a worker showed racial bias according to the racial identity of participants, i.e., evaluator and evaluatee. Overall Blacks were found to be rated overall higher
in areas of drive and assertiveness.

The last research given consideration in this section of the literature review is the work of Jack Fieldman in his study on race, employment and the evaluation of work. In his study Fieldman found that Blacks evaluated work differently than Whites. While he did not find Blacks' assessment of work factor criteria as Maslowian hierarchically dependent, as most other authors, he did report significantly high concern by Black workers for good pay, a good boss, opportunity for promotion, work enjoyment, responsibility, debt and savings, purchase power, boredom, family respect, respect of friends, trust and support. However, these traits, according to Fieldman, do not differentiate Black workers from White workers in any significant manner. According to Fieldman, Black workers evaluate the quality and satisfaction derived from work in much the same way as their White counterparts.

**Review and Summary of the Literature Review.** Literature reviewed in this section of the study has been intended to present an understanding of the environment and conceptual considerations affecting Black Administrators in White institutions of Higher Education. In the first two parts of the literature review, discussion was focused on the historic significance of race and the treatment of Black people in Higher Education. This section explores the historic organizational and conceptual dilemmas affecting Blacks in Higher Education. The third portion of the literature review focuses on the conceptual and organizational significance of race and experience of Black Administrators in
White institutions of Higher Education. In the last section of the literature review, basic research is presented looking at various approaches and methods for examining job satisfaction. This section then explored specific aspects of racial significance on job characteristics such as job factor preferences and the evaluation of work and workers.

It is the intention of the literature review to encompass a broad range of circumstances and concepts necessary for understanding the environmental and organizational interaction of Black Administrators as they attempt to derive satisfaction from their jobs on the White college and university campus.
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CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter III is a discussion of the methods and procedures which were followed in conducting this study. The chapter consists of a definition of the population, a description of the instrument and a procedure used to obtain the data and a review of the procedure used for analyzing the data.

Population

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study are Black administrators employed in the five college institutions of higher education: Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith Colleges and the University of Massachusetts. Since it is estimated that a total of only forty persons fall into this category an attempt was made to include them all however, only the combined views of twenty-seven Black administrators within the five college area case environment are reflected in this study.

Interview Questionnaire

The interview questionnaire developed for this proposed case study was refined through field testing and evolved to its present form after undergoing modifications based on three rounds of field testing with approximately fifteen administrators.

Following the first round of field testing, the first modification made was in response to the desire by those interviewed for a more
concise format. Several people also indicated that they felt threatened by some of the questions regarding personal profile.

When field tested a second time, the questionnaire omitted category headings and mixed various aspects together in order to create enough ambiguity to generate new areas of concern from those interviewed. This technique proved successful.

People found it easy to respond to the Likert type diagnostic scale used in the questionnaire because it was generally regarded as a non-threatening way to respond while still providing an accurate assessment of a relationship, attitude, or situation in the working environment.

In the third questionnaire, which resulted from the second round of field testing, category headings were reinstated along with some sub-headings. The instrument was then field tested a third time with ten administrators in the five college area.

In this way, a modified quasi-matrix technique or successive dicotimization was used in which information from the first field test was incorporated into the second questionnaire, which was then examined in the second round of field testing and so on, until the questionnaire underwent several modifications based on the input of approximately fifteen educators, most of whom reviewed the instrument in different rounds of field testing at least twice.

About 80% of the field test sample were Black. Special efforts were also made to include Non-Black ethnic minorities and women, as well as the views of some White administrators. This sampling accounted for approximately 20% of the field test participants.
After three preliminary rounds of field testing, the interview instrument was satisfactory for administering to the Black administrators in the area.

The interview questionnaire contains four sections:

1. Demographic and career background
2. Management and supervisory relationships and the work contract
3. Work satisfaction index
4. Social living environment assessment

The first part of the questionnaire, collecting demographic and career background, has been developed in order to determine any links which might exist between these variables and various aspects of work satisfaction. Boris Blai's seven demographic indicators which he identified as having a significant correlation to job satisfaction are included in this section, as well as, several other variables which were felt to be important by interview subjects.

The next section of the questionnaire begins the heart of the proposed study. It probes significant supervisory relationship and begins to explore the actual organizational setting in which the Black administrator works. This section establishes the ground work for the following parts of the questionnaire which examine closely most of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction for Black administrators.

An overall purpose of the third and fourth sections of the questionnaire is to gather basic information concerning the relationship between various environmental factors and personal experiences as they affect job satisfaction among Black administrators. These two parts collect data on a broad range of organizational and job
3. Conduct a follow-up search for all unreturned questionnaires. Arrange for and conduct the interview whenever possible.

**Analysis of Data**

Since this is an exploratory case study in an uncontrolled environment, most of the data analysis consist of banking, compiling, tabulating the data, then summarizing it by standard frequency distribution charts. Areas of significance shall be cross-correlated in order to determine any inter-dependencies or other types of relationships that might exist between various components of the study. In general, the data analysis will not be extremely comolex because the purpose of the study is to collect exploratory data rather than to test a hypothesis within a significant sampling.

**Method of Analysis**

The data are analyzed to determine the strength of certain propositions and to help develop an understanding of the various relationships among many of the exploratory notions put forth in this study. The strength of the data is determined by frequency ratios and averages of individual items compared to the mean occurrences of those items in the total case population responses.

The data shall be examined with respect to the following:

1. Demographic trends among population, and variances which correlate to sex or other personal profile information such as marital status, age, income, etc.

2. Differentiations between the University of Massachusetts and other smaller private colleges in the five college area, i.e., Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke and Smith.
3. Cross-correlation and comparisons between significant question categories to determine important relationships concerning racial dependency and the felt influence of race on job satisfaction.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Chapter IV is divided into four parts. Part one of this chapter contains a descriptive comparative analysis of the demographic concerns concerning selected career and personal background factors of the twenty-seven respondents such as age, education, titles, supervisors, institution, career aspiration, income, family and living arrangement. Part two contains a descriptive comparative analysis of the data concerning the felt effect of race upon selected environmental, supervisory and managerial job factors of the twenty-seven respondents such as attitudes, rapport control, conflicts ambiguity, communications, authority and additional supervisory and managerial information. Part three contains a descriptive analysis of the data concerning selected intrinsic and extrinsic work satisfaction factors of the twenty-seven respondents such as satisfaction, responsibility, clarity, comfort, values, goals, ability, interest and additional work satisfaction factors. Part four contains a descriptive analysis of the data concerning selected social factors related to job satisfaction such as general racial attitude in community, peer relationships, job market, housing and additional information concerning the social living environment.

Part I: Analysis of Academic, Career, and Personal Background Characteristics

Of the twenty-seven respondents, 66% were employed by the
University of Massachusetts while the remaining 34% equally distributed amongst private institutions of the five college area.

The ratio of the respondents in the public university was two for every one in the private sector, eighteen respondents from the University of Massachusetts and nine respondents from Smith, Amherst Mount Holyoke and Hampshire Colleges. The division of the respondents into the following five job categories resulted in thirteen being deans' office related, seven special program related, two faculty related and three business office related.

Among the total group 51.9% held masters degree while 33.3% reported doctorate degrees, leaving 14.9% bachelor degrees or unreported. 59.3% of the respondents held their highest degree in education while humanities and social sciences had a combined 18.5%, leaving science and math with 7.4% and 14.8% unreported.

Only 3.7% of the respondents reported working in their present administrative position more then ten years, 14.8% of the respondents reported working in their present administrative position for more then six years, with 33% of the respondents working less then two years in their current position, leaving a remaining 48% of the respondents working from three to five years in their present administrative position.

The present career aspirations of the twenty-seven respondents indicated that 37% wished to stay in their present position, 22.2% desired to teach in college while 25.9% indicated that they plan to leave college administration, which left 14.8% unrecorded.
The ratio of males amongst all of the respondents was 60% male to 40% female. The age dispersion of the respondents revealed that 22% were in their twenties, 33% were between the ages of thirty to thirty-five years old, while 18.5% of the respondents were over thirty-five years old. However, only one respondent or 3.7% indicated their age to be over forty-five years.

Almost three fourth of the respondents indicated that they were married while 33% reported being single or divorced (11.1%). Corresponding results indicated that 33% of the sample have no children while the remaining 67% reported having children.

74% of the respondents own a house or are planning to buy a house in the immediate area, while 26% of the respondents reported that they do not own a house nor intend to buy one in this area.

40% of the respondents have a spouse working in the area. In addition, 44% of the respondents reported not having children attending school in the area with 37% not responding. 55.6% of the respondents also reported being enrolled in graduate school in the five college area.

18% of the respondents reported having other relatives in the area while 77.8% reported having no other relatives in the area.

When asked whether work would be sought in this immediate area were they to leave their present position, 25% of the respondents indicated they would seek work in the immediate area while 66% of all the respondents indicated that they would not seek work in the
Graph of Demographic Characteristics

1. Type of Institution
   - Public: 48%
   - Private: 24%
   - Other: 14%

2. Job Classification
   - Deans Office: 48%
   - Faculty: 25.9%
   - Special Programs: 11.4%
   - Business Office: 11.4%
   - Degrees: 7.4%
   - Masters: 5.1%
   - Other: 59.9%

3. Highest Degree
   - Bachelor's: 11.1%
   - Masters: 11.1%
   - Other: 4.4%
   - E.D. or Ph.D.: 7.4%
   - PhD: 7.4%

4. Field of Highest Degree
   - Humanities: 14.8%
   - Social Science: 7.4%
   - Education: 11.1%
   - Other: 3.7%
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Graph # 2
Graph of Demographic Characteristics

1. Number of Children

- 0: 33.3%
- 1: 22.2%
- 2: 18.5%
- 3: 3.7%
- 4: 3.7%

2. Own Home

- No: 74.1%
- Yes: 25.9%

3. Spouse Working

- No: 40.1%
- Yes: 59.9%

4. Marital Status

- Single: 22.2%
- Married: 44.4%
- Divorced or Separated: 11.1%
- None: 18.5%
The largest income bracket was constituted by the 10 to 20 thousand dollar range and comprised 48% of the total reported. 14% of the respondents averaged 20 to 25 thousand dollars with 26% of the respondents indicating salaries above twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

Part II: Felt Effect of Race on Work Environment

Analysis of data in part two concerns the felt effect of race as experienced by the twenty-seven respondents in their work environment. 37% of the respondents reported race as a sometimes and usually positive factor influencing their rapport with other workers. 25% of the respondents reported race to negatively influence their rapport with workers and 25% expressing neutral feelings concerning the effect of race on worker rapport. In addition, 7.4% of the respondents felt race to be sometimes positive and sometimes negative influence on rapport with workers.

37% of the respondents felt race had no influence on control over areas of responsibilities, while 29.6% of the respondents reporting positive influences of race upon control, and 23% of the respondents reporting negative influences of race upon control over their areas of responsibility. Only 3.7%, one person, felt race influenced sometimes both negatively and positively the control they had over their areas of responsibility.

40.7% of the respondents felt race influenced positively the attitudes of colleagues toward their work.
TABLE # 1

TABLE OF MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIPS CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY FACTORS:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rapport with workers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Control over areas of responsibility</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes of colleagues towards your work</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of reward and recognition</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conflicts in job</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of ambiguity self</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of ambiguity by co-workers</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of openness and trust</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communication</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Free and honest self expression</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Authority over responsibilities</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Authority over subordinates</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Authority outside office</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goal emphasis by supervisor</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: 0 - No Answer 4 - Sometimes Positive
1 - Usually Negative 5 - Usually Positive
2 - Sometimes Negative 6 - (1+2) Negative
3 - Neutral 7 - (4+5) Positive
8 - (6+7) Positive and Negative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIPS CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY FACTORS: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Approachability of supervisor with work related problems</td>
<td>7.4 7.4 0 37 18.5 29.6 7.4 48.1 55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Approachability of supervisor with personal problems</td>
<td>25.9 7.4 3.7 40.7 3.7 18.5 11.1 22.2 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervisor confidence</td>
<td>11.1 3.7 3.7 29.6 14.8 37 7.4 51.8 59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Support by supervisor</td>
<td>3.7 3.7 7.4 40.7 18.5 25.9 11.1 44.4 55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Evaluation by supervisor</td>
<td>7.4 3.7 3.7 3.7 18.5 29.6 7.4 48.1 55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Supervisor's honesty and frankness</td>
<td>3.7 3.7 7.4 37 11.1 37 11.1 48.1 59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dependency on supervisor</td>
<td>14.8 7.4 3.7 51.9 3.7 18.5 11.1 22.2 33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: 0 - No Answer  4 - Sometimes Positive  1 - Usually Negative  5 - Usually Positive  2 - Sometimes Negative  6 - (1+2) Negative  3 - Neutral  7 - (4+5) Positive  8 - (6+7) Positive and Negative
37% of the respondents felt race a neutral factor in reward and recognition from work while another 37% of the respondents felt race to influence positively factors relating to reward and recognition. Only 15% of the respondents felt race influenced negatively reward and recognition for work.

However, only 26% of the respondents felt neutral concerning the effect of race on conflicts in carrying out their job. 37% of the respondents felt race to have a positive influence on conflicts in carrying out their jobs. Another 22% of the respondents felt race had a negative influence on conflicts in carrying out their jobs. Some 7.4% expressed mixed reactions indicating that race influenced conflicts in carrying out their jobs sometimes both negatively and positively.

A relative high percentage of respondents felt race to influence negatively the level of ambiguity by co-workers towards their work. 32% of the respondents expressed negative influences of race upon the level of ambiguity by co-workers towards their work, while 40% of the respondents expressed neutral feelings concerning the influence of race on ambiguity by co-workers towards Black administrators' jobs while another 10% of the respondents felt race to have positive influence on the level of ambiguity perceived by co-workers towards their work.

44% of the respondents felt race a neutral factor in their own level of ambiguity towards their job, however, 26% felt race effected positively their level of ambiguity toward their own work, with another
15% of the respondents indicating that race had a negative effect on their level of ambiguity toward work. Only 3.7% of the respondents felt race to influence self ambiguity toward work in sometimes both positive and a negative manner.

In regard to the level of openness and trust, 41% of the respondents felt race sometimes negatively effected openness and trust, while only 26% felt race had neutral influence upon level of openness and trust at work, still, 22% felt race influenced positively the level of openness and trust experienced by the respondents.

Ratios seem to differ amongst the respondents concerning the effect of race on free and honest expression of view points at work.

22% of the respondents found race to negatively influence free and honest expression of points of view. However, 37% felt neutral as to the influence of race on free and honest expression, while a remaining 23% felt race positively influenced free and honest expression.

Communications of important information was felt to be effected negatively by 22% of the respondents while 30% felt race had a neutral influence and 37% felt race to have positive influence on the communications of important information.

Only 14% of the respondents felt race had a negative influence on the general response to their authority. Roughly 26% felt race had no influence on the general response to their authority. However, almost 50% or actually over 48% of the respondents
indicated that they felt race to have a positive influence on the general response to their authority in the work environment.

The level of support given by supervisors was only reported by 11% of the respondents to be negatively influenced by race, over 40% felt race had a neutral influence, while over 44% of the respondents thought race effected positively the level of support given them by their supervisors.

Similarly, only 7% of the respondents indicated that they felt race negatively influenced recognition and communications of evaluations by supervisors of their work. While 37% of the respondents felt race to have a neutral influence on the recognition and communications of evaluations by supervisors, 48%, almost half the respondents, felt race influenced positively the recognition and communications of evaluations by supervisors.

The influence of race on the level of encouragement and goal emphasis by supervisors was felt by the respondents to be identical to results regarding recognition and communications of evaluations by supervisors. Only 7% of the respondents indicated a negative influence of race on the level of encouragement and goal emphasis while 37% of the respondents felt its effect to be neutral and 48% of the respondents felt race had a positive influence on encouragement and goal emphasis by supervisors.

Identical also were the respondents feelings concerning approachability of supervision with work related problems. Again, 7% felt race to negatively influence supervisor's approachability, while 37% felt race to neutrally influence this factor, and still, 47% felt
race to positively influence supervisors' approachability with work related problems.

Regarding the approachability of supervisors with personal problems, 11% of the respondents felt race had a negative influence while 40% felt race had a neutral influence, 22% felt race had a positive influence and 30% gave no response to this question.

Supervisors' confidence towards the respondents was reported by 7% to be negatively influenced by race. 30% of the respondents felt race had a neutral influence on supervisors' confidence, while a very high 52% indicated that race had a positive influence.

Only 11% of the respondents felt race negatively influenced the level of authority experienced in areas of responsibility. In contrast to this some 44% of the respondents indicated a positive influence of race on authority in areas of responsibility while 33% of the respondents reported a neutral influence.

In viewing authority with subordinates, roughly 15% of the respondents felt race had a negative influence, 37% reported a neutral influence and 34% of the respondents indicated that they had a positive influence on authority with subordinates.

Roughly, 11% of the respondents felt race influenced negatively the level of honesty and frankness in communications with supervisors, 37% reported a neutral influence of race and 48% seemed to feel race had a positive influence on honest and frank communications with supervisors.

11% of the respondents also felt race had a negative influence on the level of dependence on supervisors, a large 51% felt race to
have a neutral influence on the level of dependency on supervisors while 22% felt race had a positive influence on the level of dependency on supervisors.

In summarizing managerial and supervisory relationships as they are influenced by race we find some slight differences in the range of reported responses. More negative influence was reported overall by the respondents in regard to managerial relationships, by this we mean those relationships concerning the management environment then in regard to supervisoral relationships.

Additionally, on an average, more than 45% of the respondents reported positive influence of race on supervisory relationships. In contrast to this only 30% of the respondents on the average felt race a positive influence on managerial relationships such as worker rapport, communications, openness and trust, etc.. A relative high percentage of the respondents, in fact about 20% on the average, reported feeling that race had a negative influence on managerial relationships.

Consequently, from the reported data it is possible to detect a slight trend indicating race to have more negative significance on managerial relationships while race tended to be reported by the respondents to have a more positive influence on supervisory relationships.

Part III: Job Satisfaction Index

In this section of the study the respondents were asked to rate various intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction factors. The range
of response available consisted of six categories, no answer, excellent, very satisfactory, adequate, poor, and not applicable. For the purpose of this study we shall examine only those responses which fall within the excellent to poor category. This section does not attempt to assess the felt effect of race on the following areas of job satisfaction but rather is designed to ascertain general feedback concerning the feelings of satisfaction by the respondents directly influenced by the job and work environment.

The overall level of satisfaction towards the work environment was reported by 11% of the respondents to be excellent. 33% of the respondents felt the work environment to be very satisfactory, while 37% of the respondents rated the work environment as only adequate. Only 7% of the respondents felt the work environment was poor. The remaining 11% of the respondents reported no answers or felt the question not applicable.

In examining the level of satisfaction the respondents felt towards their work, the percentage of excellent ratings increased slightly over the ratings of the environment. 18.5% of the respondents rated their level of satisfaction towards their work as excellent. 37% of the respondents reported a very satisfactory rating of their work while just under 30% felt the work was just adequate. Again, only 7% of the respondents reported a poor rating of satisfaction towards their work.

The overall level of satisfaction towards clarity of responsibility and lines of authority within the institution were reported to have similar levels of satisfaction. 18.5% of the respondents reported
an excellent rating of clarity of responsibility and lines of authority to their specific job, while 41% of the respondents rated this area as very satisfactory. An additional 15% of the respondents reported an adequate rating, and 18.5% felt clarity of responsibility and lines of authority in the specific job were poor.

Slight changes in a more positive direction were revealed by the data concerning the respondents assessment of control over areas of responsibility. 33% of the respondents reported an excellent rating for their level of control over areas of responsibility and an additional 30% reported being very satisfied. In contrast to these high percentage of positive responses, only 15% of the respondents indicated an adequate rating of control over areas of responsibility and only 15% of the respondents felt that control over areas of responsibility was poor.

The respondents rated the overall receptiveness to their leadership very similarly to that of control over areas of responsibility. 26% of the respondents felt that the receptiveness to their leadership was excellent. An additional 37% of the respondents felt very satisfied at the level of receptiveness to their leadership. Only 15% of the respondents felt receptiveness to their leadership was just adequate while another 15% of the respondents felt receptiveness to their leadership was poor.

37% of the respondents indicated that the respect they received from supervisors was excellent. An additional 15% of the respondents were very satisfied with the level of respect from supervisors. 18.5%
of the respondents felt the level of supervisors respect was adequate. 15% of the respondents indicated that respect from supervisors was poor. 4% of the respondents felt that respect from supervisors was a combination of sometimes very satisfactory and other times poor.

The level of social comfort felt on the job was felt to be excellent by 18.5% of the respondents. 30% of the respondents were very satisfied with the social comfort on their job while some 33% of the respondents felt social comfort to be adequate. Only 11% of the respondents reported social comfort to be poor.

In assessing salary, the respondents reported a sharp change. No respondents felt salary to be excellent. Only 15% of the respondents felt salary to be very satisfactory. 33% of the respondents indicated that salary was adequate. Similarly, 37% of the respondents rated salary as poor.

None of the respondents indicated that they felt opportunity for promotion was excellent, additionally, only 7% of the respondents felt promotional opportunity very satisfactory, although 33% of the respondents did express adequacy in promotional opportunity. On the other hand 44% of the respondents indicated that opportunity for promotion was poor.

Similar to the response for promotional opportunity, none of the respondents felt that the circumstances affecting conflicts with personal values were excellent. However, 11% were very satisfied with the level of conflicts with personal values on their job, while another 30% of the respondents felt the level of conflict with personal
values was adequate. Contrary to these favorable responses 18.5% of the respondents felt that the level of conflicts with personal values was poor, while a very large 44% of the respondents gave no response or felt the question not applicable. From review of the question it is likely that the wording created confusion, and consequently, such a high number (37%) of respondents felt the question not applicable.

In fulfilling long term career goals, 15% of the respondents felt their job was excellent in this respect. 18.5% of the respondents felt very satisfied with their job's fulfillment of long term career goals. An additional 22% felt their job adequate in this aspect while 18.5% of the respondents felt that the level of long term career goal fulfillment by their present job was poor.

15% of the respondents felt their job was excellent in meeting their original expectation. An additional 26% of the respondents were very satisfied when comparing their job to original expectations. 22% of the respondents felt their job adequate in meeting original expectations.

None of the respondents felt their job to be excellent in regard to pursuit of social interest. 11% of the respondents felt very satisfied with their ability to pursue social interest on the job. 44% of the respondents felt their job adequate in affording pursuit of social interest. 30% of the respondents indicated that they felt their ability to pursue social interest was poor.

11% of the respondents felt that the attitude of their family
toward their job was excellent, an additional 30% of the respondents were very satisfied with family attitudes towards their job. 26% of the respondents felt family attitude towards their job was adequate. Only 3.7% of the respondents reported family attitudes toward their job as being poor.

It is clear from the data here that most of the Black administrators interviewed were satisfied with their job. However, this could be misleading because only half the potential respondents identified participated by filling out a questionnaire. It is quite possible that a relatively high percentage of dissatisfied responses existed in this unpolled pool. Salary, opportunity for promotion, opportunity to do research and opportunity to pursue social interest were the most significantly dissatisfied areas for the respondents. However, family attitude towards job, respect from supervisor and the social comfort at work appear to be the areas which generate the least amount of dissatisfaction.

Part IV: Social Living Environment

In this section descriptive analysis is made of the data concerning selected social factors related to the living environment.

Factors such as racial attitude in the community, peer relationships, job market, housing and additional social living environment factors are examined. It is perhaps in the area of social living environment that the respondents indicated the highest level of dissatisfaction.

In assessing the general response to Blacks in the Amherst area only 7.4% indicated an excellent response. 14.8% of the respondents were very satisfied with the general response to Blacks in the Amherst
### TABLE # 3

**TABLE OF WORK SATISFACTION INDEX CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK SATISFACTION FACTORS:</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>11.1 11.1 33.3 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work you do</td>
<td>7.4 18.5 37 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of responsibilities and lines of authority in institution</td>
<td>7.4 18.5 40.7 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of responsibilities and lines of authority in your job</td>
<td>7.4 33.3 29.6 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over responsibilities</td>
<td>7.4 33.3 29.6 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptiveness to your leadership</td>
<td>7.4 25.9 37 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect from supervisors</td>
<td>7.4 37 14.8 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social comfort</td>
<td>14.8 0 29.6 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>14.8 0 14.8 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for promotion</td>
<td>14.8 0 7.4 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with personal values</td>
<td>44.4 0 11.1 25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment of long term career goals</td>
<td>25.9 14.8 25.9 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original expectations</td>
<td>25.9 14.8 25.9 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of work to personal interests</td>
<td>11.1 14.8 37 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to research and publish</td>
<td>22.2 18.5 7.4 25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>18.5 14.8 25.9 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuance of social interests</td>
<td>14.8 0 11.1 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of family towards job</td>
<td>29.6 11.1 29.6 25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
1. No Answer
2. Excellent
3. Very Satisfactory
4. Adequate
5. Poor
area as adequate. However, 22.2% of the respondents felt the response to Blacks in the immediate area was poor.

Peer relationships outside of the office with co-workers was reported by 11.1% of the respondents as excellent. Another 11.1% of the respondents indicated that peer relationships outside of the office was very satisfactory. 40.7% of the respondents rated peer relationships outside the office as adequate. 18.5% of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with peer relationships outside of the office rating this factor as poor. An additional 18.5% of the respondents reported no answer or a non applicable response.

The attitude of the general White community in the area towards Blacks was not rated as excellent by any respondent. 11.1% of the respondents rated the general attitude of the White community towards Blacks as very satisfactory. 33% of the respondents felt the attitude of the general White community was towards Blacks was adequate. However, the largest percentage on the respondents, 40.7% reported the attitude of the general White community as poor. 7.4% of the respondents gave no response while 7.4% thought the question not applicable.

None of the respondents reported excellent or very satisfied responses to the local police's treatment of Blacks. 44.4% of the respondents felt the local police treatment of Blacks was adequate. However, 37% of the respondents indicated that the local treatment of Blacks was poor. 18.4% of the respondents indicated no response or non applicable category to this question.
The local newspapers' concern for Blacks was not reported to be excellent or very satisfactory by any of the respondents. 29.6% of the respondents felt the local newspapers' concern for Blacks was adequate. 51.9% of the respondents indicated that the local newspapers' concern for Blacks was poor. 18.5% of the respondents felt this factor not applicable or gave no response.

None of the respondents indicated an excellent rating of local shops and merchants toward Blacks. 11.1% of the respondents reported being very satisfied with the attitude of local shops and merchants towards Blacks. 51.9% of the respondents felt the local shops and merchants' attitude towards Blacks was adequate. 22.2% of the respondents reported the attitude of local shops and merchants as poor towards Blacks felt this factor not applicable or gave no answer.

The local job market for Blacks was not rated as excellent or very satisfactory by any respondent. 11.1% of the respondents felt the local job market for Blacks was adequate. However, 66.7% of the respondents rated the local job market for Blacks as poor. 3.7% of the respondents felt the local job market for Blacks was a combination of both adequate and poor. 18.5% of the respondents gave no response or felt this factor non-applicable.

Recreation and social outlets for Blacks was not rated excellent by any of the respondents. 11.1% of the respondents felt recreation and social outlets for Blacks was very satisfactory. 22.2% of the respondents rated the recreation and social outlets for Blacks as adequate.
59.3% of the respondents felt the recreation and social outlets for Blacks was poor. 7.4% of the respondents gave no answer or felt this factor not applicable.

Black cultural and artistic affairs was not rated excellent by any respondent. 11.1% of the respondents reported being very satisfied with Black cultural and artistic affairs. 33.3% of the respondents reported Black cultural and artistic affairs as adequate. 48.1% of the respondents rated Black cultural and artistic affairs in the area as poor. 7.4% of the respondents felt this factor not applicable or gave no response.

Available housing for Blacks in the area was rated excellent by 3.7% of the respondents. 7.4% of the respondents rated available housing as very satisfactory. 55.6% of the respondents reported the available housing for Blacks as adequate, 22.2% of the respondents felt available housing for Blacks was poor. 11.1% of the respondents indicated no answers or not applicable for this factor.

None of the respondents rated the atmosphere for living on campus as excellent or very satisfactory. 40.7% of the respondents indicated that the atmosphere for living on campus was adequate. 29.6% of the respondents indicated that they felt the atmosphere for living on campus was poor. 11.1% of the respondents gave no answer or felt the item not applicable.

Black representation in public jobs was rated by none of the respondents as excellent. 3.7% of the respondents felt Black representation in public jobs was very satisfactory. 11.1% of the
respondents gave no answer or felt the item not applicable.

Black representation in public jobs was rated by none of the respondents as excellent. 3.7% of the respondents felt Black representation in public jobs was very satisfactory. 11.1% of the respondents reported Black representation in public jobs as adequate. A very high 74.1% of the respondents indicated that representation in public jobs was poor. 11.1% of the respondents felt this item not applicable or gave no response.

The quality of public schools in the area was rated excellent by 7.4% of the respondents. 25.9% of the respondents indicated that the quality of public schools was very satisfactory. 37% of the respondents reported the quality of the public schools as adequate. Only 3.7% of the respondents felt the quality of public schools in the area was poor. 22.2% of the respondents gave no response or indicated this factor as not applicable. Another 3.7% felt the quality of public schools in the area was a combination of both adequate and poor.

The social environment for children under twelve years of age was rated by 3.7% of the respondents as being excellent. 11.1% of the respondents felt very satisfied with the social living environment for children under twelve years old. 33.3% of the respondents reported the social living environment as adequate for Black children under twelve years of age. 25.9% of the respondents indicated that the social environment for Black children under 12 years of age was poor. Another 25.9% of the respondents felt this item not applicable or gave no response.
The social environment for Black teenagers was not rated excellent by any respondent. 7.4% of the respondents felt the social environment for Black teenagers was very satisfactory. 14.8% of the respondents rated the social environment for Black teenagers as adequate. 59.3% of the respondents reported the social environment for Black teenagers as poor. 18.5% of the respondents gave no answer or indicated not applicable for this item.

The social environment for Black families was not rated excellent by any respondent. 11.1% of the respondents felt the social environment for Black families was very satisfactory. Another 29.6% of the respondents rated the social environment for Black families as adequate. However, 44.4% of the respondents reported the social environment for Black families as being poor. 14.4% of the respondents gave no response or indicated this item was not applicable.

The social environment for single Black people also was not rated excellent by any respondent. Only 7.4% of the respondents reported the social environment for single people as very satisfactory. An additional small margin, 11.1% of the respondents felt the social environment for single Black people was adequate. 51.9% of the respondents assessed the social environment for single Black people as poor. 29.6% of the respondents gave no response or indicated not applicable.

The control over the social environment by Blacks was not rated excellent by any respondent. Control of social environment by Blacks was adequate. However, 55.6% of the respondents reported
that control of the social environment by Blacks was poor. 18.5% of the respondents gave no response or a not applicable response to this item.

None of the respondents rated the interaction of local Blacks with each other as excellent. 11.1% of the respondents reported being very satisfied with the level of interaction of local Blacks with each other. 29.6% of the respondents rated the level of interaction of local Blacks with each other as adequate. 37% of the respondents rated the interaction of local Blacks with each other as poor. 22.2% of the respondents reported no answer or not applicable to this item.

It is clear from the reported data that the social living environment contained the highest level of dissatisfaction amongst the respondents.
<table>
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<tr>
<th>TABLE OF SOCIAL LIVING ENVIRONMENT CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL LIVING ENVIRONMENT FACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**TABLE OF SOCIAL LIVING ENVIRONMENT FACTORS**
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CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Impact on Minorities: Aspects of Motivation and Organization and Personality Development

Oppression

Within the corporate bureaucratic structure of education, minorities find themselves oppressed by the new individualism which corporate values impose. Spring describes it as individualism which stresses cooperation and sacrifice to society, the rooting out of selfish individualism.

"The development of the corporate man according to this definition was brought about by education training the individual for that specialized place in society. Only the popular educational phrases of individualizing instruction and meeting individual needs meant nothing more than educating a child for the role it was determined he would play or fill in society."

For minorities these roles are traditionally sad. Yet, insulated at first by segregation, Black administrators in higher education found surprising safety. Often the segregated environment removed the faculty, administrator and student from the direct daily tension racism creates in a totally alien racist environment such as the White university. Unlike today, segregated minority organizations were not totally subjugated to daily living encounters with hostile racial attitudes, prejudices and censorship. This generally was reserved for the control level. Whites had little reason to enter the daily organizational life of Black institutions. The integration of minorities on to White campuses, however, quickly
ended the conditions for such antebellum existence.

One of the major reasons minorities were introduced to previously exclusive White higher education was, in fact, the so-called Black Revolution of the 1960's. But one need not wonder in light of the clear absence of change what the motive for this sudden integration. Indeed, the bureaucratic bourgeois corporate structure realized that while they could not impose structural assurance for limiting minority social mobility, it could not insure attitude formation. As with the European immigrant it was feared that without some form of immigrant like Americanization Blacks would cause a rapid decay of American institutions.²

The question of attitude formation played a large part in higher education's motive in recent integration. However, it is a question with as usual pedagogical consequence. While integration in higher education represented a movement by minorities into the mainstream of American life it also meant a flow into bureaucratic White corporate structure and at the same time away from the industry of American culture. No longer structurally segregated from White colleges and universities, Blacks were emersed into the daily tension control and censorship of the racist culture.

The Black Revolution in this country opened the eyes of much of America. Corporate bureaucracy, when faced with the harsh defeat of its military and economic empire in Asia, suddenly discovered that as was feared in the nineteenth century, without some control or Americanization process, i.e., attitude control,
a rapid decay occurred in American institutions. Racial minorities, perhaps the largest ethnic group in America, stood at the doors of corporate bureaucracy with torches. While no one had actually planned to burn it down, the threat became omnipresent. To the elite who controlled capitalist interest in American society, the minority youth and civil rights struggle of the 50's and 60's made it plain that segregated higher education was not creating the dependent submissive results for which it was structured. As Upton Sinclair points out, "Public secondary schools were organized to fit the child of the working class into the industrial machine making him both dependent and submissive to its structure." Minority youth suddenly had exploded this bond of dependency. Psychologically, the 60's proved minorities in segregated structures were no longer controllable. This may have been alright in itself but this played a peculiar role in influencing American White middle and working class of youth. The contradiction of racist societal values played havoc on the thinking of many complacent White youth. A whole spectrum of slogans of "Apple Pie" and fair play was in sharp focus. And this combination of protest and war and the contradictions of racial oppression were simply too great for even corporate education to cover up. What is becoming clear to Americans is as Katz describes:

"...A great gap between the pronouncement that education serves the people and the reality of what schools do to and for the children of the poor... Despite the existence of free compensatory education most poor children become poor adults. Schools are not the great demographic engines for identifying
talent and matching it with opportunity... That fact cannot be explained either by genetics or by theories of cultural privation: it is the historic result of the combination of purposes and structure that has characterized American education for the past hundred years."

However, a new resurgence of federal action seeming to respond to social unrest occurred. The overall strategy of social control could no longer tolerate segregation. Higher education began a mad rush for minority admissions.

Today minorities are becoming less and less a priority in higher education. The era of Bakkism, or dejura backlash has created an environment in which the institution of higher education, already saturated with racial inferiority complexes, faces a greater challenge then ever before in American history. It is hoped that this study on the felt effect of race can shed light on the problem society faces. As the Carnegie Commission points out, higher education is the primary vehicle through which society has chosen to cope with racial unrest. However, how can an institution saturated with the same root evils of racism be expected to provide leadership in solving this complex problem. But it must, society is caught in a paradox in solving this one problem because higher education represents that institution with critical social positioning and resource capacity for addressing the problem of racism. Therefore, it is imperative that higher education rid itself of inferiority complexes. Institutions of higher education must examine themselves, study the phenomena of racism in minute detail. Not only racism in abstract academic
theory, but committed research on its own peculiar organizational behavior and complicity with the problem and how to change. It is imperative that institutions of higher education in American society provide an aggressive vanguard for progressive change.

In order to fulfill this mission it must resist the temptation and understand the forces which compel these institutions to the familiar sanctuary of a fallacious and an insecure past. Black administrators, because of the peculiar working of racial dependency, are a critical link in maintaining vigilant assault on the forces of institutional oppression, not because of race, but rather the strange role race plays in the overall behavior of organizations of higher education. The retreat from social responsibility and progressive change in society must be countered with an intelligent understanding of how potentially lethal institutional racism has been in the past and can be in the future for free and creative cultural growth and development. The Black administrators, because of the alien status they hold, are in a unique position to see and provide critical insight into the true state of American higher education. While present class interest to neo racist economic systems control the college campus, there is no balance of power by which to maintain continual social change.

Higher education, as we know it today, must be understood as playing a sinister role in human exploitation and oppression, if the human oppression of racism is not eliminated. Higher education must fulfill its role as the vanguard of truth and upholder of the American idea by irradiating from its campus the
conditions where racism is tolerated and especially even fostered.

In order to do this, higher education must examine itself and the effect of racism on organizational structures, the people in them, and the society. This study proposes to foster such research by concentrating on a study of the minority administrator. By examining the felt effect of race on Black administrators, a clearer understanding of the organization and human dimension of institutionalized racial oppression can be better perceived and understood.

Aspects of Motivation

Perhaps the greatest psychological consequence that bureaucratic corporate racist organization environments hold for minorities is in the area of motivation. Somehow this critical variable which supposedly reflects one's will is to tenaciously carry no consequence of circumstance presented by institutional racism.

It is important that we understand the philosophic connection between the notion of motivation and a will to live. Because it is here in this frontier that we find attempts to define man's nature. An area with considerable implication in rationalizing human oppression. As Argyris points out:

"There are good reasons for the widespread belief in man's innate laziness. The main reason lies in the fact that alienated work is unsatisfactory and boring; that a great deal of tension and hostility is gendered, which leads to an adversion against the work one is doing and everything connected with it."
The paradox for Blacks is that their survival in the corporate world is distinctly tied to educational success. Yet, the excruciating circumstance of being alienated within the process could have serious impact on individual human development.

The space between the individual and an organization is bridged by motivation. In other words, people interact with organizations almost totally in accord with some motive for satisfying some need or desire. One of the greatest Japanese industrialist, Kobayashi, goes one philosophic step further and asserts that motivation is in fact a direct expression of one's will to live. "It is the primary link between man and his environment." The crises for the Black administrator is reflected in the fact that this has come to mean the relationship between himself and a racist organizational environment. Critical issues of self determination, culture, and control are integrally linked to this aspect of his personality.

Entwined with the personality process are aspects of dependency relationships. With all sorts of hostile experiences in the mazes of education by the time minorities reach higher education, they have already been at least constrained in personality development by education's organization process. Precisely how and where these various constraints serve to control, thwart or effect the personality and consequent cultural aesthetic of minorities is unclear. While the specifics are not easily demonstrated, however, the overall principle can be understood in simplistic
terms by turning for a moment again to Kobayashi. According to
Kobayashi; and many early philosophers, man by nature must contradict
his environment. This has become the force through which most
of man's culture has come to exist. Yet, the productive acts
involved in culture today are as complex as the many machines
making for industrialized society. At the heart of man's nature
is the drive to act upon his environment. Only the action of
man can easily be seen as destructive or creative. The question
is not, however, the good and bad of it. It is a matter of
creativity, productivity, satisfaction, alienation, structure
and ambiguity all manifested into control. For the most part,
Kobayashi asserts that creativity is a function of freedom to
control. Freedom as defined as the absence of structure and
external limitations.

This poses a major problem for the Black administrator for
while his organizational status may often seem ambiguous, he is
faced with a harsh process of alienated structure and control.
In fact, Kobayashi asserts that the extent a man can control
his productivity, to that extent he can bring creativity into
his work. Satisfaction, he says, diminishes in proportion to
the loss of control and, subsequently; diminishes creative motives.
to the extent control is taken away, to that extent the individual
feels alienation towards his work. As the degree of alienation
accumulates, the need for harsher means to insure controlled
production arises. Thus, the spiral of pedagogical bureaucratic
oppression is put in motion. For Black administrators, the
problems of control are racially dependent which also subsequently effects productivity and satisfaction from work.

The effect of the peculiar organizational position of Black administrators in higher education effects the development of values and aesthetic for the entire community. It is important that some understanding be gotten in regards to the relationship between Black administrators and the White institution of higher education. For as Kobayashi says,

"I do not trust the behavior of human beings, but at the same time I know that human beings cannot be happy while doing wrong. Human beings want to behave correctly. It is because of their own fraility and the treatment they receive from others that they grow rebellious and, unfortunately, lose their sense of moral values. To say this another way, I do not trust the behavior of human beings, yet, I know I can trust beings as such."

To leave to chance the impact of the situation mentioned in descriptive detail within the content of this paper is tantamount to negligence. It is important that we, as Black people and educators, in general, especially in higher education, investigate and understand to the fullest extent possible the ramifications of institutional racism.

Another peculiar organizational dilemma found in the institutional response to racism by higher education is found in the nature of the newly emerging racism centers on the college and university campus. However, in the following analysis, argument is made that strange organizational circumstances constrain any impact that these centers might have on the problems of institutional racism as they are now designed.
It is important to understand the systems, organizational and human response to racism within institutions of higher education. It must be kept in mind that just as Michael Weitheimer, states in his article on the psychological problems of confrontation. 
"...Moral motives by no means guarantee moral outcomes." "Moral content and moral process are distinguishable although related concepts."9

The Issue of Racism in Higher Education

It is important that the particularity of racism be understood. Especially, must this particularity be understood in addressing the question of oppression of racial minorities in White institutions. Unfortunately, however, racism because of its dire socio-economic and political consequence, is most often identified as a principle of oppression rather than a particular. True, when compared to other particulars of oppression. Historically there are a few examples of horror and gruesome dehumanization parallel to the legacy of racism. Yet, in large part, it is the pedagogical relationship between all aspects of particular human oppression which maintain, foster and provide operant conditions for the principles of human oppression to thrive.

In order to view this point more clearly, let us take a dialectic view of the system's position racism holds in institutions of higher education. What we see first is the structure, design and tradition of an oppressive organizational structure. Through principle organization values, assumptions, motives and vested interest,
principal human oppression is legitimized and systematized. From the principal organization design human oppression takes on many particular forms. Sexism, chauvinism, elitism, racism and others all are reflected and manifested in the attitudes and behavior not only of the individuals within the organization but also by the various components, departments and parts of the organization as they interact both internally within the institution and externally with the environment.

Essentially what is fundamentally at issue are corrupt bourgeois assumptions of man's innate laziness and corruption. Once it is assumed that organization design must oppress these tendencies in man by imposing arbitrary structure and rules of order, the pendulum of oppression is put in motion. Then the factors of corrupt vested ethnic and class interest necessitates both the legitimization as well as institutionalization of oppression. Institutions must be designed to insure unfair advantage for an elite class, excluding and limiting both entry and mobility for oppressed classes.

Having inherited organizations which initially emerged during times of slavery, overt oppression of women, ethnic minorities and economically disadvantaged classes, the movement to eradicate oppression cannot be waged from the mere attack on a particular symptomatic aspect of oppression. Let us render that the institutions and the design of higher education organizations were already established
In American society even before the Bill of Rights. Directly out of the feudal monarchical traditions of European institutions, higher education was incorporated into American society. Designed not to serve the needs of a newly emerging society but the explicit interest and tradition of an already established and fast growing European bourgeois elite.

The hierarchical bureaucracy of higher education finds itself entrapped in the traditions and conditions of a pedagogical dependence. Emerging as they did, not out of the system's planning or organization growth, but arbitrary and decrees of a ruling class.

The paradox of the newly emerging racism movement is fourfold. First, it is merely a bureaucratic response to symptomatic conditions of racism. Spending its energy not on changing the organization design which propagates not only racism, but more universal human oppression. Responding to problems after they have been created, fostered and maintain.

Second, is the fact that most newly emerged racism centers and programs are totally subserviant to bureaucratic control. Furthermore, they function on a purely voluntary basis and tend to involve only those few individuals who for the most part are already concerned with the issue.

Third, while it is true that they attempt to affect positively the values, attitudes and behavior of individuals, the problem exists in system and institutional proportions. Although it is
good to address the personal responsibility of individuals and the roles each person plays in racism, in no way can this strategy counteract the massive impact of racist institutional design and environments. The problem of racism, if clearly understood, in small part is a factor of individual values, attitudes and behavior, but more fully, it is a question of institutional or organizational values, attitudes and behavior. As Chester Pierce, Chairman of the American Psychiatric Association Committee on Academic Education described by Aaron Ford in the latter's book, *Black Studies: Threat or Challenge*, stated:

"...racism, besides affecting masses of population, also defies therapy on a one to one basis, produces chronic, sustained disability, and will cost large sums of money to eradicate."10

While some argue that this is a temporary condition and, in fact, given time, racism centers will emerge beyond bureaucratic control and institutional limitation, it is unlikely to think, given current budget and other institutional cutbacks, that this is a realistic assertion.

Fourth, the problem of addressing racism as a principal rather than a particular aspect of human oppression creates a greater pedagogy. What results from the weighting of this particularity of contradiction over those other particulars leads to both heightened ethnic rivalry and the polarization and division of other particular aspects of oppression. Thus, the old divide and conquer phenomenon is put in motion. While women centers compete with racism centers and White males decry reverse discrimination, the problem of
institutionalized human oppression goes unaddressed.

Yet, in all its vitality, the recent emergence of racism centers has not changed the circumstances or level of racism. In fact, the principal assumptions and designs for human oppression through organization behavior and structure go fundamentally undaunted.

Addressing racism as a principal, rather than a particular, only serves to perpetuate the conditions in which the true principal of human oppression can outmaneuver growing, consciousness. Finally, in addressing the racism movement, one further observation is relevant. What we see in various institutions are, in fact, racist movements. There is little to to Black and other Third World presence. It addresses the issue of racism as though it were merely a phenomenon of Black and White and tends to attribute its existence to individual taste, value, and attitudes. On the whole, the racism movement of recent years has confused the issue of racism. It has ill-defined the problem and consequently circumvented any real solution.

In understanding the perplexities of Black existence in White institutions, it is important to understand clearly distinctions between principal and particular contradiction. It is as Mao states:

"...the university of contradiction, the particularity of contradiction, the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of contradiction, the identity and struggle of the aspects of a contradiction and the place of antagonism in contradiction. These things must be understood and in a clear and proper perspective to address a problem of any sort."
In closing, the minority experience in higher education, while it must be addressed in principal proportions, should not be mistaken as principal contradiction. For the principal contradiction which the particular oppression of minorities demonstrates in higher education is not merely racial but organizational.

So long as the circumstance exists for the exploitation of one single secretary, or person by organization design and operant values, so does the potential and conditions for racial oppression reach heightened proportions. Not only is there a value question of helping versus exploitative attitudes, but structural role definition as well. Until some system-wide organization development response is made to human need, oppression, higher education's organizational design will remain incompatible with its mission and self-perpetuating pedagogical oppression remains inherent.
ENDNOTES
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A Note on Black Administrators in White Institutions

Within institutions of higher education, questions of organization development and dialectic systems thinking usually preside in the social science and often management or political science departments. To some extent, issues concerning minorities in these situations are addressed there. However, in White institutions the clear failure of affirmative action makes it almost inconceivable for issues concerning minorities to be studied in adequate degree or organizational depth. Consequently, the responsibility of insuring organizational study and dialectic systems analysis concerning minorities and human oppression may often befall Black's working in the environment. In fact, the absence of such activity by Black administrators is a sheer violation of the mandate expressed during their emergence in the late 60's and early 70's. Minority administrators, then as now, did not need adaptations and duplication of the same old process in new rhetoric and cultural aesthetics. The mandate for the 60's was for one of continued institutional change and redefinition. Unfortunately, without the careful analysis afforded by scientific research, analysis and organization studies, the behavior of institutional oppression is left to chance. Only for the minority, the deck is too unevenly divided to provide such a generous gamble. In fact, it is becoming clearer and clearer that the dye may have been already cast.

Black administrators in general must not merely wage to maintain Black and minority representation in the curriculum and
culture aspects of college life; they should be encourages to study the circumstance, design, institution and organization of human oppression and therefore, racism in American higher education. Institutions of higher education should mandate long term task forces for irradicating racism on the campus and in American society.

It must be considered an important part of both the rationale and motive of Black administrators in White institutions of higher education to end not merely the historic interpretation and cultural expression of racism; but also study and expose organizational process in which both the structure and values effecting minorities entraps Whites as well. The study of racial dependency and various conceptual theories of human organization must be kept in careful scrutiny. Without systematic and scientific search on a continual basis, the pendulum of pedagogy merely becomes inherited and transmitted through circumstance.

The tyranny of both place and time must be address beyond the rhetorical. Minority organizational impact and consequent responses necessitate careful analysis. Although, the irony of responsibility befalling the alein, or victim in this case, is bitter, without proper address, both academically and organizationally. Racism's bitter irony will become an even "stranger fruit" to bar.

Let us conclude this point with Nathan Hare's statement in a 1975 Black Collegiate:
"As quiet as it is kept these days, there is something crucial that Black people can lose in the march to freedom if we begin to get the notion—as some are doing—that Black administrators are no longer relevant. Black remains relevant indeed, although it is true that we are slowly letting discipline slip from our political grip. Thus, it is being increasingly shaped and defined for us rather than by us, and we appear increasingly all too willing to allow that to occur.

Nevertheless, Black administrators in one form or another are here to stay. The only question is what form they will take and whether they will fulfill the original vision of Black people or fade into faint and spurious facade. The answer to this is going to depend, I think, on whether Black people (particularly Black students and professors) can rally to the challenge to be relevant to Blacks."12 (amended here specifically to discuss Black administrators rather than educators.)

It imperative that both Black educators, faculty and administrators, together with White institutions of higher education make a unilateral commitment and reasserted thrust to dissolve the remant shackles of racial and other forms of human oppression inherent in the traditions, organizations and elitist design of higher education. Fast and corrective action is needed. It is hoped that this study helps clarify the need. Perhaps by understanding how and in what specific ways race is felt in the environment more in depth, institutional studies can pinpoint sources, conditions and principals, covertly conspiring through the pedagogy of history, to limit and constrain the full human potential and institutional purpose within higher education.
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VI APPENDIX
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
EDUCATION POLICY STUDIES CLUSTER

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

for

An Exploratory Case Study on the Felt Effect of Race on Job Satisfaction
by Black Administrators in White Institutions of Higher Education

conducted by

Richard M. O'Daniel

PART I: ACADEMIC, CAREER, AND PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Name of Institution where you currently work ______________________________

2. Please state your job title and academic standing ____________________________

3. Please state title of your immediate supervisor ______________________________

4. Please check one or more of the following items which best describe(s) the
highest degree you hold:
   a. ___ Bachelor's, b. ___ Master's, c. ___ Ed.D., d. ___ Ph.D.,
   e. ___ Other, please specify ________________________________

5. Please check the response offered below which best describes the field in
which you hold your highest degree:
   a. ___ Humanities, b. ___ Social Science, c. ___ Education, d. ___ Science,
      Mathematics, or Engineering. e. ___ Other, please specify ______________________

6. Please check below the following item which best describes the number of years
you have been at your present position.
   a. ___ Two years or less, b. ___ Three to five years, c. ___ Six to ten years,
   d. ___ More than ten years, e. ___ Other, please specify ______________________

7. Please select the following statement which best describes your present
career aspiration.
   a. ___ I intend to stay in the field of college administration in my present
      position, seeking vertical or horizontal advancement; b. ___ I intend to
      stay in college administration only if I can teach college-level or graduate
      courses; c. ___ I would like to move out of administration and into a tenure
      faculty slot; d. ___ I would prefer to be in another line of work and am
      seeking appropriate opportunity; e. ___ Other, please specify ___________________
Interview Questionnaire (contd.)

Please check appropriate responses:

8. Sex: a. ____ Male, b. ____ Female


10. Marital status: a. ____ Single, b. ____ Married, living with spouse and children; c. ____ Married, living with spouse and no children; d. ____ Married, living apart from spouse and children; e. ____ Separated or divorced with no children living with you; f. ____ Separated or divorced with children living with you; g. ____ Other

11. How many children do you have living with you in the area? ____________

12. Do you own a house or are you currently planning on buying a house in the area? ____ Yes ____ No

13. Does your spouse work in the area? ____ Yes ____ No

14. Does your spouse attend school in the area? ____ Yes ____ No

15. Did you attend undergraduate or graduate school in the area? ____ Yes ____ No

16. If you were no longer employed at your current institution, would you seek work in the area or leave? ____________

17. Do you have any other relatives outside of spouse and children living in the area? ____ Yes ____ No

18. Please select the item below which best reflects your income bracket.
   a. ____ $10-20,000; b. ____ $20-25,000; c. ____ $25-30,000; d. ____ $35-40,000; e. ____ over $40,000

PART II: MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIPS

19. Please select from the following general headings the area under which most of your responsibilities fall. Please indicate any combinations with an approximate percentile estimate (%).
   a. ____ Trustees, Alumni, or Board of Directors; b. ____ President's or Chancellor's Office; c. ____ Fiscal Treasurer or Comptroller's Office; d. ____ Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor's Office; e. ____ Special Administrative appointment or Special Program Administrator; f. ____ Student Personnel (Dean's Office, Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Affairs); g. ____ Other
Rate the effect you feel race has on the areas listed below using the following scale: 1=usually negative, 2=sometimes negative, 3=neutral, 4=sometimes positive, 5=usually positive

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Rapport with workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Control over areas of responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Attitudes of colleagues towards your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Level of reward and recognition you have received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Conflict in carrying out your job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Level of ambiguity towards your job by your coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Level of ambiguity towards your job by you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Level of openness and trust among coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Communication of important information to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Atmosphere for free and honest expression of your point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Response to your authority outside your department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Level of support given in your job by your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Recognition and communication of evaluation of your work by your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Level of encouragement and goal emphasis by your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Supervisor's approachability in solving your work-related problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Supervisor's approachability in solving your personal problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Supervisor's confidence in you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Level of authority in your areas of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Your authority with subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Level of honesty and frankness in communications between you and your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Your level of dependence on your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Please describe how you feel about the supervisory relationships affecting your job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
**Interview Questionnaire (contd.)**

**PART III: WORK SATISFACTION INDEX**

Rate your level of satisfaction with the factors listed below using the following scale: 1=excellent, 2=very satisfactory, 3=adequate, 4=poor, 5=not applicable.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Overall level of satisfaction towards working environment
43. Overall level of satisfaction towards your work
44. Overall level of satisfaction towards clarity of responsibility and lines of authority in institution
45. Clarity of responsibility and lines of authority pertaining to your job.
46. Control over your areas of responsibility
47. Receptiveness to your leadership
48. Respect from supervisors
49. Social comfort
50. Salary
51. Opportunity for promotion
52. Conflicts with personal values
53. Chance for fulfilling long-term career goals (which are ___________________________)
54. Comparison to original expectations (which were ___________________________)
55. Work relevant to personal interests
56. Opportunity to do research and publish
57. Geographic location
58. Ability to pursue social interests
59. Attitude of family toward your job
60. How can your job be made more satisfying? ___________________________
61. What are the three most satisfying things about your job? ___________________________
62. What are the three least satisfying things about your job? ___________________________