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Abstract

The conceptual model and theory posited in this paper, offers a more comprehensive examination and holistic explanation of developmental factors that drive the cognitive processes of individuals—children, adolescents, and adults. The Cognitive Lens offers a critical perspective that has the capacity to not only support the on-going development of faculty and educators individually—but scaffolds them in their ability to facilitate students’ sense of belonging, perceptions of emotional security, positive adjustment (i.e. social, behavioral, and academic), and life-long success within learning contexts. Furthermore, the Cognitive Lens addresses reflective practice which is essential to the process, for whether acknowledged or not, each of us comes to the task with different perceptual filters, personal ideologies, lived experiences, and inherited biases. These dynamics, and the impact of ecological and socio-ecological systems biases on our respective Cognitive Lens guide our interactions and shape our capacity to effectively work with students and families, particularly diverse populations and communities. On this premise, the Cognitive Lens proffers the perspective that higher education faculty and K-12 educators should be proactive in addressing these factors in their respective institutions through adapted curriculum and continual professional development.

Introduction

The demographics within American schools, and in the nation as a whole are rapidly changing and becoming more diverse (NEA, 2018; Utley, Obiakor, & Bakken, 2011; Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010). The Latino population is predicted to multiply more precipitously than nearly all other ethnic groups. In contrast, the rate of growth for Caucasians is predicted to be slower than that of other racial groups reducing their portion of the entire populace (Utley et al., 2011). Despite the changing demographics across the United States, the education system has a teaching force that continues to be exceptionally middle class, white, and speakers of English (Department of Education, 2016; Utley et al., 2011; Assaf, Garza, & Battle, 2010; Sanders, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Noguera, 1996). Data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2016;
2010), emphasizes that while student demographics in the United States are becoming progressively racially diverse, its’ teacher pool comprises primarily of white women (NCES, 2016; 2010; Assaf, Garza, & Battle, 2010; Sanders, 2006; Noguera, 1996).

Considering these current statistics, that many students have cultural, ethnic, linguistic, gender preference, racial, and social class backgrounds that differ from their teachers (NAEYC, 1995), and the high percentage of diverse students who fail to experience academic success (Betts, 1992; Reardon, 2011; NCES, 2016; 2012; 2011) an examination of school as a functional system along with contextual factors should be embarked upon from a different perspective. Thus, the purpose of this conceptual framework is to examine contextual elements, ecological factors, and different systems—including school, family, etc.—in which individuals are entrenched and operate with respect to the Cognitive Lens theoretical model (see appendix).

The educational implications of The Cognitive Lens model and theory are expansive; however, cultural competence is one of its core components. Moreover, this model and related theory supports the position that culturally competent faculty (B-20) are able to reflect on their own cultural identity (NEA, 2018; Morrow, 2016). Culturally competent educators comprehend the differences among individuals in the same group that makes each individual distinctive, even as they observe and appreciate differences between groups (NEA, 2018). Attempting to address cultural competence, many “mainstream” educational institutions have implemented mandatory multicultural/diverse /intersectional content in the core curriculum for students, pre-service teacher preparation programs for both novice and veteran teacher professional development, that emphasizes the integrated concepts of cultural, family and community dynamics, yet it sometimes lacks an explicit conveyance of pluralism but infuses tolerance and other deficit ideologies that uphold exclusivity. (Yuan, 2018; Causey & Haubert, 2016; Premier & Miller 2010; Morrier, Irving, Dandy, Dmitriyev, & Ukeje, 2007). In theory, teachers should be prepared to teach the heterogeneous amalgam of students within learning contexts, however, lacking a true progressive trajectory of one’s Cognitive Lens (supported by inadequate preparation and professional development), presents the tragic, poignant reality that many teachers may lack the knowledge to educate the whole student effectively (Yuan, 2018; Premier & Miller, 2010).

In response, the Cognitive Lens proffers the ideology of pluralistic multiculturalism that analyzes and examines multiple cultures, identities, groups, ways of knowing and perspectives, instead of particularistic multicultural content of the perceived dominant group or one minority group to the exclusion of other groups (Ratvich, 1990). This conceptual model examines and promotes the holistic development of the individual through an understanding of the multifarious components (ecological systems—school, community, family—experiences within different contexts, biological factors, etc.). Additionally, it explores how the various elements work in concert to influence the development of the whole individual from birth through adulthood, the cognitive processes utilized to operate within diverse systems and networks, and students’ adjustment even as they and their families/caregivers navigate the educational system. The Cognitive Lens theory provides a fresh perspective emphasizing the importance of evaluating the model’s various components both separately and as a whole, as the different elements interact in ways that influence the intellect and reasoning that students, educators, family members, and other individuals bring to bear as they function and interact with each other on a daily basis within diverse systems especially within the context of school.
In relation, the Cognitive Lens theory, stresses that teachers and faculty members develop cultural competence to the extent that they are able to reflect on and understand their own cultural identity. From an ethical perspective, they should learn about and utilize students’ cultural ways of knowing and learning styles, have a sense of diverse students’ family structures, teach curriculum that is both inclusive and reflective of students, and accepting of diverse cultures. These ideals shift paradigms such that individuals develop a sense of respect and acceptance of diverse peoples and their cultural norms and traditions. This sensitivity and insight contrasts with teaching tolerance and equal opportunity in response to negative stereotyping and indiscreet manifestations of prejudice (George & Aronson, 2003). Adopting these standards promote student success, specifically positive adjustment (i.e. social, behavioral, and academic) within the context of school (Atherton & Hines, 2013).

Another distinctive quality of the Cognitive Lens is its endorsement of an assets-based education as opposed to a deficit-based ideology (as supported by Eloff & Ebersohn, 2001). Rather than perceiving students with different learning needs or those from culturally/ethnically diverse backgrounds as students at risk, the model and theory offer the concept of students with promise and learners with potential. Thus, this assets-based perspective facilitates educators’ ability to assess and evaluate student performance, ascertain their capacity to achieve, and aid in determining their prospects by unlocking or locking doors (supported by George & Aronson, 2003; Eloff & Ebersohn, 2001). The Cognitive Lens theory posits that diverse students bring with them experiences, gifts, talents, abilities, cultural knowledge, and an absent narrative which should be utilized to support students’ positive adjustment (supported by MacKinnon Morrow, 2016). The theory and model—the Cognitive Lens—aids teachers, students, and parents in establishing and holding students to higher standards and expectations (supported by George & Aronson, 2003).

In review, the theoretical perspective considered here illustrates that there is a need to examine the Cognitive Lens which individuals (including students, educators, parents, caregivers, administrators, and others impacting children) apply specifically within the context of school in relation to the nature of its role in student adjustment as well as factors which impact its naissance, maturation, and transformation.
Interconnectedness of Family, Community, Systems, and Contextual Levels.

When considering today’s multifaceted systemic and ordered structure through Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory, community involvement plays a progressively distinct role in supporting the success of students in educational organizations, together with positive and effective exchanges that families, guardians and caregivers experience in educational systems. Consistent with the ecological perspective, the Cognitive Lens theory proposes that individuals’ holistic development—including the initial development and subsequent progression of the Cognitive Lens—are influenced by the myriad contextual levels in which individuals operate (e.g., school, home, family) or in which others in their world function (e.g., parents/caregivers’ workplace, legal and human services systems). The contextual levels include the immediate stratum, the interconnected level, the exoteric layer, the remote affect tier, and the generative phase (Paquette & Ryan, 2001). The quality and degree of support and caring the child receives within the immediate environment, by parents, caregivers and teachers, impacts the developmental progression, overall development, and the state of the Cognitive Lens with which the child functions as he or she interacts with others within the immediate environment (this perspective aligns with Oswalt’s (2008) analysis of Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory). Every child has distinctive inborn and organically controlled attributes that influence how the child responds to others in the immediate stratum with whom he/she comes into direct contact and to the way in which the contexts are structured (Slavin, 2018; Oswalt, 2008; Paquette & Ryan, 2001). In the immediate stratum, the developing child will experience interpersonal exchanges with others within their proximate environment. The impact of the exchanges is two-way (Ungar, 2002). The child is not a passive participant (Darling, 2007). Environmental factors influence the development and progression of the child’s Cognitive Lens. However, the child also affects the
environmental elements with which he/she has direct exchanges in this ecological level (Oswalt, 2008; Paquette & Ryan, 2001). The manner in which the child responds to others with whom he comes into direct contact in the immediate stratum drives the way in which those individuals will regard and behave toward the child (Oswalt, 2008). There is a discernible degree of reciprocity. Also, the way in which different individuals behave toward the child within his/her proximate environ may influence the type of response given by the child to different people in different structures with whom he/she has direct contact. According to Ungar (2002), human beings persistently reorganize and adjust to their environs in the same way that their surroundings impact or elicit responses from aforesaid individuals. In accordance with Erickson’s theory, in the early phases of development the child’s needs must be met—as they are solely dependent on others. Contingent upon whether those needs are met by caregivers/parents a sense of trust or mistrust will be cultivated in the child (Slavin, 2018; 2010). Explicitly, if the needs of the child are not satisfied the Cognitive Lens through which the child views caregivers, teachers, and others within diverse contexts/systems in which the child operates may lead to wariness in the child’s dealings with them. In circumstances in which the needs of the child are satisfied by caregivers/parents, the child is more likely to develop into a responsible individual who has confidence in others (Slavin, 2018; 2010). Specifically, the Cognitive Lens that informs the child’s responses will tend toward more positive rational and reasoned responses. Thus, from the Cognitive Lens perspective, the child is not only influenced by these exchanges but also impacts the thinking and actions of others by being honorable and responsible or guarded and untrustworthy in his or her dealings with other individuals (Slavin, 2018; Faris & McCarroll, 2010; Ungar, 2002).

Concerning the interconnected layer embedded within the Cognitive Lens model, like Bronfenbrenner’s mesosystem, this tier (i.e., the interconnected) deals with the interrelatedness between the different networks in which the child functions (Berk, 2000). At this phase, the reciprocal effect is operating at a different level. For instance, in terms of legal and human services, in custody battles when the child meets with the legal service workers such as judges these direct interactions impact what occurs in their lives, thus, children may play a direct role. The developing child as an active participant in the diverse structures is not only impacted by experiences within these contexts but acts on those environments in such a way that agents embedded within the different structures interrelate. From the Cognitive Lens perspective, who operate in the different structures should become mutually supporting so as to act in ways that benefit the growth of the child (Berk, 2000; Oswalt, 2008) and support positive adjustment especially within educational contexts. And so, it is fundamental for the diverse representatives within different networks to attune and accommodate in concert with each other to better support the child’s development and overall well-being. It is critical that the interactional processes occur so that individuals secure from the environment the means vital for their progress and existence and the positive developmental progression of the Cognitive Lens communicate—supported by Turner (1996). Drawing on a systems approach (Lunenberg, 2010), the Cognitive Lens asserts that when systems become fragmented can only be detrimental to the positive developmental progression of an individuals’ Cognitive Lens as well as, their complete positive adjustment particularly when applicable within the context of school. In anticipation, the focus of administration, faculty, and staff should shift from policies that are repressive in nature, to procedures that support stress reduction amongst systems—family, communities, services such as health, welfare, legal, etc.—to facilitate flexibility and resourcefulness at varied levels with regard to how things operate within the professional domain.
This change would support the positive progression of one’s Cognitive Lens which in turn could facilitate positive adjustment.

In terms of the external environment, the Cognitive Lens theory aligns itself with Bronfenbrenner’s perspective—Exosystem—in that the child’s world is impacted by systems in which they do not actively operate (Paquette & Ryan, 2001). For instance, healthcare insurance might be nonexistent for a parent without a job; this in turn negatively impacts the developing child as he/she would not have access to affordable medical attention outside a free clinic. Should the child develop a serious health risk, the chances for proper care (e.g., costly surgery, medications, etc.) would be limited, given the policies that may be in place especially in private versus community hospitals. Children whose parents become unemployed due to economic declines may also experience decreases in satisfaction of their basic and secondary needs due to a lower or declining socio-economic status (America’s Poor Kids, 2013). In contexts in which healthcare reform is actualized/reified so that medical attention becomes affordable to disenfranchised and underrepresented individuals or free for all individuals, the restructuring of healthcare then directly impacts the developing child in a more positive way (Rasberry, et al. 2017; Ridic, Gleason, & Ridic, 2012). These are examples of social catalysts—due to the conflict or action between two or more forces or between individuals and systems; the child is impacted even as the exerting force (i.e., system or structure) remains unchanged.

An implication from the Cognitive Lens perspective is the fundamental need for agents within the diverse systems to be more cognizant of the far-reaching consequences that policies, decisions, and organizational procedures have on individuals even those who do not function within the respective organizations. For example, children are impacted by decisions that judges, social workers, and others who function within these systems make regarding their welfare, though they do not operate within the legal services system themselves. Another example involves government representatives who lack expertise in child development, education, social work, or cultural competence. Discounting the advice of specialists, and deficient of the necessary expertise themselves, they construct educational policies that considerably impact young people even though they are not directly involved in the system. To facilitate a more functional system’s approach, it is hypothesized that the developing child’s participation or influence in policies, procedures, and decision making should become more pervasive at crucial times, even though he/she does not function within or whose influence is marginal in the exoteric stratum. Agents’ dynamic efforts to garner information from the developing child would allow them greater insight into the child’s world and thinking, rendering more equitable policies and procedures (e.g., a judge’s minimal interaction with a child in chambers). Specifically, policies that drive education and welfare services, legal provisions, and healthcare should be proffered in keeping with needs and not in terms of policies, procedures, or notions of equality. In addition, agents operating within systems must understand that societies are ever-changing and so the needs of the general public and individuals embedded within, undergo transformation commensurate with societal changes—albeit the changes are cultural, political, religious, or other (Changes in Society; 2018). In theory, this should initiate a response that more effectively serves the needs of individuals—especially in the case of the developing child who does not actively operate within the system, but at times may influence to some extent decisions made by agents. The Cognitive Lens that representatives utilize to make decisions within the confines of their systems, has far reaching consequences as individuals are impacted by policies and procedures imposed on them by various systems at work.
Also connected, is the remote affect stratum recognized as the macrosystem in Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory. At this level the developing child learns, becomes knowledgeable, and gains understanding of the cultural tenets, ideals, norms, and traditions as well as, of laws and principles (Paquette & Ryan, 2001). The influence of different codes and ethics delineated at the remote affect stratum strongly fuels exchanges in all other tiers. For instance, if social norms dictate that unmarried parents who cohabitate are not entitled to death benefits upon the passing of one parent, that society is unlikely to proffer support for the remaining parent and children when the breadwinner dies. Thus, the family system or framework in which the parents operate and in which the children are embedded, is impacted (Berk, 2000). The surviving parent’s capacity or incapacity to provide for the children at the remote affect tier is influenced correspondingly. At this level the cultural contexts encompass ethnic/racial background, position within the hierarchical social structure (i.e. dependent upon occupation, education, income, wealth, and place of residence), and country of residence (e.g. living in a third world nation/developing, or politically stable/unstable, or developed nation).

Drawing on Bronfenbrenner’s chronosystem, the generative phase incorporates the aspect of time in relation to the environment in which the developing child is embedded. Specifically factors both at the core like biological changes and outside influences like birth, death, or divorce impact the ways in which children act on their environment and react to contextual changes at different points in time (Paquette & Ryan, 2001). In contexts in which change becomes inevitable due to a birth or death, children will act in accordance with their phase of cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioral development in concordance with the wealth of developmental theories (Slavin, 2018).
Family functioning and family relationships. In terms of the social order, the principal function of families is to take care of, support, and cultivate the quality of family life and healthy relationships (Family Impact Information Sheet No. 4, 2009). Plausibly, family systems theory can be utilized by researchers and educators to describe how families function within any given context (Christian 2006; Fingerman & Berman, 2000). Christian (2006) emphasized that in order to more efficiently support children’s positive adjustment, it is important to employ accounts and explanations of how families operate. He further reasoned that it is more productive in facilitating positive adjustment (i.e. social, behavioral, and academic success), over attempting to repair or attribute culpability on the family for students’ failure.

As discussed earlier in examples, the position families occupy or the manner in which they function can be profoundly impacted by systems, policies, and programs operated by government and
service agencies. Also, how the family functions are crucial to the progress and development of each member of the family, the developmental progression of each member’s Cognitive Lens, in addition to the overall wellbeing experienced by members of the family unit. A broad range of issues, including the family’s ability to cope with and navigate the multifarious systems, is impacted by the Cognitive Lens individuals utilize as they maneuver the different systems. Research (Adair, 2005; Bromfield, Sutherland, & Parker, 2012; Dolan, Pinkerton, & Canavan, 2006) has demonstrated that the manner in which the family functions in terms of quality is impacted directly by both positive (protective) and negative (risk) factors to include quality of housing, appropriate access to services and support systems, financial support, and the need for a safe environment.

The effects of policies on family functioning and family relationships and the connectedness to families and communities? The components of the mesosystem and exosystem, comprising but not limited to social welfare and legal services, health services, legislative and educational policies, all have an indirect influence on the child’s socialization as well as the development of the Cognitive Lens though the child may not directly function in them (Berk, 2000). Directly impacting the progression of the Cognitive Lens are the roles individuals in these various contexts play in the child’s life (Berk, 2000). Cultural factors such as social values taught by family and community elders, faith-based values, changes in periods in one’s lifecycle, and direct interactions with others are all relevant in the naissance and progression of the Cognitive Lens.

### School

**Effective Teacher:**
- Culturally Proactive,
- Culturally Congruent,
- Culturally Responsive,
- Culturally Competent,
- Cogent Flexibility, Novice
- Expert & Veteran Expert

**Student:** Self-Regulated, Critical Thinking Skills,
- Problem Solving,
- Learners with Potential

### School as a System

Betts (1992) reasoned that school as a system, functions under a progression of periodically contradictory official directives. Moreover, schools are disposed to being automatous in nature made manifest by its inflexible structure. Every component is dealt with in the same way rather than each component receiving support based on individual needs (Atherton & Hines, 2013; Betts, 1992). Thus, the structure of the system tends to operate from an equality angle whereby everybody gets the same thing rather than an equity perspective where needs are fulfilled based on necessity. The more limitations a school faces (e.g., judicial directives, environmental factors—impoverishment, racial inequities, and the like), the more automatous they become facilitating perceptions of emotional risk and disenfranchisement (Atherton & Hines, 2013; Atherton, 2010;
Hamm & Faircloth 2005; Betts, 1992). Positing a different perspective, the Cognitive Lens hypothesizes that the quality of school as a system can be enhanced by taking a more pluralistic approach in its structural development (Betts, 1992; Banathy, 1991).

According to Banathy (1991), to promote a better-quality education system, it is imperative to create a structure that augments the connection amongst the components of educational systems and environs. Expressly, this involves cultivating a system that is more open, wholesome and natural, pluralistic, and multifaceted. An educational implication associated with this perspective involves a movement away from perceiving education as a system in which the teacher is the major source of information and knowledge to many students. Rather, there needs to be a change in direction to a system in which there are myriad information resources accessible by each student one of which is the teacher. This shift may be genuinely typified as progressing from centering on instruction to a focus on learning. Along with this, we assert that the school as a system must be structured in such a way that it supports the development of positive student-teacher relationships which is a critical component of academic achievement and student motivation (Cornelius-White, 2007; Roorda, Koomen, Spiltt, & Oort, 2011). Another important implication from a Cognitive Lens standpoint is the need to develop and maintain gracious and productive associations and interactions with the caregivers and parents of students to support students’ positive adjustment within the context of school (Reynolds & Clements, 2005; Jeynes, 2003; Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

Communities and Schools

School
Effective Teacher: Culturally Proactive, Culturally Congruent, Culturally Responsive, Culturally Competent, Cogent Flexibility, Novice Expert & Veteran Expert, Student: Self-Regulated, Critical Thinking Skills, Problem Solving, Learners with Potential

Community
Homes, Family, School, Peers, Faith Based Institutions, Friends Neighborhood, Neighbors

Social Catalyses
Sense of Self, Cultural Identity, Socio-Emotional, Psychosocial & Moral Development, Media
Bringing schools and communities together is not easy and often reflects school environments in which faculty, administrators, and staff, have found it difficult to positively interact with students’ families (Belfield, & Levin, 2007; Sanders, 2006). Sanders (2006) argued that educational institutions have become progressively disconnected from the families they serve. Consequently, faculty, staff, and administrators within these schools lose the ability to effectively connect with and convey valuable information to students and their caregivers (Sanders, 2006). Moreover, while the students in these educational institutions may become progressively more diverse in ethnic group, social class, and culture, quite a lot of faculty, supervisors, and other administrators are White, belong to the middle-class, and often have limited cultural knowledge of students and their families (Sanders, 2006; Noguera, 1996). These situations often result in low parental participation in school business and events, or inequitable power relationships between parents and school administrators, staff, and faculty causing families to experience perceptions of emotional risk in terms of feeling snubbed and not welcomed to actively contribute or involve themselves in their child’s education (Atherton, 2010; Sanders, 2006; Lareau, 1989).

The implication here is that educators (faculty, teachers, staff, and administrators) need to understand the family and community structure on a more profound level to facilitate more productive interactions. Furthermore, Mark Warren’s (2005) and Sanders’ (2006) research respectively, established that community organizations can facilitate the building and maintaining of connections between schools and students’ families, and even in certain circumstances alter the nature of parental and caregiver involvement and commitment within educational institutions. Another educational inference from a Cognitive Lens perspective is that those embedded within the context of educational institutions must gain an understanding that although students have a similar social background or share a corresponding racial and ethnic heritage, there are structural differences within each family unit. In essence, within individual families there is a microculture that is unique to that family unit. Explicitly in line with the Cognitive Lens perspective, much more than cultural values, customs, beliefs, and ideals constructed around race and ethnicity and the larger collective culture of the particular society, the family has its own distinctive code that is mediated by the moral beliefs, prior experiences, critical thinking capacity, and the personal Cognitive Lens of each of the individuals within the family system (supported by Harmon, 2012; Sanders, 2006; Willis, 2003).
Though the child may be unaware of the influences, novel laws, government reform, social unrest, financial turmoil, the rising cost of healthcare, and disparities in the judicial system are all examples of contexts that can dramatically affect a child’s life, experiences, and the manner in which the Cognitive Lens develops. Likewise, the disproportionality in high school graduation, dropout and suspension rates for students of color, social class and the opportunities commensurate with class (specifically in terms of knowledge children bring with them; Anyon, 2001) also significantly impact the progression of the Cognitive Lens.

Data is available on the impact that these systems have; however, the issue surrounds the advantage and value of a collaborative effect of wedding schools and communities for the efficacious empowerment of families, guardians, and caregivers to navigate these intricate systems (Kania & Kramer, 2011; Sanders, 2006).

Based on the collective impact model (Kania & Kramer, 2011), there is a need to build a collaborative, comprising all involved in the success of children, that influences the progress and development of the Cognitive Lens which, provides resources for families that allow them to efficiently navigate the interconnected layer—mesosystem—that crosses the boundaries of the immediate stratum—microsystem and exoteric layer—exosystem—respectively. Commensurate with the shared measurement system of the collective impact (Kania & Kramer, 2011), the Cognitive Lens puts forward that it is crucial for pre-service and in-service teachers to obtain intentional professional development to facilitate an understanding of culturally diverse populations and learning from diverse individuals as supported by results of research completed by Atherton and Hines (2017). Further, with the shifting demographics of children who are being served in pre-school and after-school programs, it is essential that educators augment their level of experience or gain knowledge as participants in these programs. It is vital that both pre-service and in-service teachers and college and university faculty expand their understanding of learning
strategies and the multiplicity of learning styles to facilitate the development of self-regulated students and their positive adjustment in the currently operating educational systems.

Considering this, from a Cognitive Lens perspective, the emphasis on academics does not frequently center on psychosocial and identity development specifically for students of color. This is due to 1) limited curricula or the hidden curricula 2) the stereotypical prejudice of these curricula and 3) the prescriptive ethics of the media in how they continue to perpetuate stereotypes that do not address micro aggressions, micro invalidations, micro assaults, and the marginalization of people of color from a historical lens in the educational achievement of all students (Aynon, 1980; Ortiz & Jani, 2010; Solorzano, 1998). From the Cognitive Lens perspective, if educators across the board have the fortitude to develop more inclusive curricula, the achievement of students of color as well as that of white students will increase (Hines, 2012). The developmental progression of the Cognitive Lens of all students along with faculty in public and post-secondary institutions will be impacted by a reflective, inclusive, and more rigorous curricula—encompassing viewing, analyzing, and thinking critically about documentaries including Eyes on the Prize (Writers: Bernard, DeVinney, Davis Lacy, & Pollard; Producers: Hampton, Vecchione, & Else; 1987-1990), Slavery by Another Name (Director: Pollard; Producers: Pollard, McWilliams, & Vaughn; Writers: Pollard, Blackmon, & Bernard; 2012), and Taking AIM: The story of the American Indian Movement (Director: Langworthy; 2010) to list a few and documentaries related to migrant laborers—in such a way as to comprehend the historical perspective of the shoulders upon which we all stand. The educational implication is that those in the educational field must be cognizant of a collaborative effect that extends a process of reform which facilitates a coalition and fusion of a drive for leadership development (Muhammed & Hollie, 2012) and a buildup of expertise entailing on-going development of instructional methodology and pedagogy (Muhammad & Hollie, 2012). Explicitly, educators through their Cognitive Lens must consider the notion that all children can learn and experience positive adjustment. They are learners with potential. Thus, there is a need for educators to develop a culturally healthy environment across the institution even as they align this belief with creating a collaborative culture and effectively responding to frustration (Atherton, 2010; Muhammad & Hollie, 2012). Additionally, consideration must be given to utilizing responsive pedagogy that warrants that all students have opportunities to experience high levels of learning. From a Cognitive Lens perspective all students should be given the tools, skills, and knowledge that would allow them to be successful in the halls of higher education. All students should be afforded an opportunity to choose whether or not they enter the “hallowed” halls of academia or elect to take an alternative path.

Conclusion

“It takes a whole village to raise a child” is recognized as an Igbo and Yoruba (Nigeria); Rhaiti, 2016, para.1) proverb and exists in different forms in many African languages. The basic meaning is that the nurturing of a child is not only the responsibility of the nuclear family but also the extended family and the communal family, which extends to the wider community to include neighbors, friends, and most importantly members of the school community. The Cognitive Lens offers a comprehensive approach to address and understand the importance of systems and their impact on the child and family which are at the core of how these systems directly and indirectly impact families and children positively or negatively. Education is derived from “educare” which
is defined as “to train or to mold” (Bass & Good, 2004; p. 162) and “educere” which is delineated as “to lead out” (Bass & Good, 2004: p. 162). Given the definitions, the continually shifting racial demographics in America, and the ever-increasing achievement gap between Caucasian, Native American, and other students of color, the resolve is now to reexamine how we cultivate and foster the educational preparation of pre-service teachers and the continual professional development of in-service teachers to address systems, standards, policies, laws and practices for the holistic development of students. In regard to the preparation of pre-service teachers in higher education, it is imperative for curricula to include identity development theory. Pre-service teachers’ education necessitates inclusion of racial/cultural identity concepts to begin the journey of cultural competence and cultural congruency. Everyone needs to develop a sense of their own cultural identity which should foster respect and acceptance for “otherness”. Exposing pre-service teachers, novice and veteran teachers, to models and theoretical foundations of identity provides the educational practitioner, when discussing diversity and multicultural education, with a new Cognitive Lens.

The novel perspective facilitates understanding how individuals are socialized and the essence of oppression, one’s contribution to this systemic experience, as well as, one’s capacity to pursue new conduits for initiating social change and moving oneself forward to empowerment (Freire, 2013). Furthermore, there must also be the understanding that educators must join in solidarity with students helping learners develop the mindfulness that they must actively engage in the struggle for their own knowledge and schooling (Freire, 2013.) Through the positive progression of the Cognitive Lens, educators have the capacity to consider cultural and racial identity in relation to how systems impact cognition to focus mainly on cultural differences. Furthermore, the certain progression of the Cognitive Lens should also support an understanding of the significance of being aware of differences in order to see the similarities, and most importantly the effects of the systems in their stages of identity development in their own maturation. By providing an orientation of theoretical foundations for example, The Application of Racial Identity Theory in the Classroom (Tatum, 2017), Stages of Racial Identity Development (Interaction Institute for Social Change, 2011) with special attention to the different ways that white and diverse individuals move through Atkinson, Morten, and Sue’s Racial and Cultural Identity Development: Five Stages Model (1979, 1989, 1993 & 1998) will also impact self-reflection of the individual for further exploration of their own identity and the other various identities that children and families bring to educational institutions. The curriculum must not be limited in its approach to “educere” (Bass & Good, 2004, p.162). The curriculum should reflect multifarious learning modalities, roles and rules of family systems, community systems, social welfare, legal, health services, and effects of the media that directly or indirectly impact the family and the child in its identity and psychosocial developmental maturation. These aforementioned areas must not be limited to school psychologists or social workers. Rather, these concepts will assist both the pre-service and in-service (i.e., novice and veteran) educators to build deeper relationships with families to support student adjustment and teacher success. Moreover, experience in terms of reflective analysis with these concepts should facilitate potential constructive collaborations with communities for the positive adjustment (i.e., social, behavioral, and academic success) of students. This, in-turn would support the view of school systems and teachers as the communal family. The Cognitive Lens’ compendious design should inspire educational policy makers to influence and advocate for innovative curriculum redesign in P-12 and higher education institutions, developing ideal practical experiences to engage with families and students in educational settings, and most notably bringing about a pedagogical mindset of pluralism, not tolerance. Further, the theory and model (i.e., the Cognitive Lens)
proposes that it is crucial to become culturally responsive educational practitioners who utilize culturally relevant pedagogical methodology. This means that an aspect of cultural relevancy must be built into current and new curricula to support students’ positive adjustment through identity development which affect academic achievement to live in a global society.
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African-Americans were not always a highly recruited and sought-after group to attend colleges and universities; however, after the civil war, African-Americans took and accepted every opportunity to receive a formalized education that did not exist during slavery (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Midwestern reformatory colleges in addition to a few liberal arts colleges were the first collegiate institutions to allow African-Americans to attend (Gallien & Sims Peterson, 2005). This formalized education was a way for African-Americans to experience social mobility and claim their new rights as citizens (Allen & Jewell, 2002). Northern missionary societies became involved in the African-American struggle as they became teachers and pursued other occupations (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

Between 1900 – 1950 most African-American students attended only historically black colleges and universities, which today are known as HBCU’s; while a small number attended predominately white institutions, PWI’s (Wechsler, Goodchild & Eisenmann, 2007). Within ten years, the number of African-American students at HBCU’s leaped six times from 2,132 in 1917 to 13,580 in 1927 while the numbers of African-American students attending PWI’s grew very little (Wechsler et al., 2007). Of the PWI’s, Oberlin, founded by abolitionists, had the highest proportion of African-American students at 4%. Oberlin was in the minority, as most PWI’s refused to recruit and accept African-American students (Wechsler et al., 2007). In 1925, the student council at Antioch, a progressive institution in Ohio, voted that not allowing well-qualified African-American was “a matter of expediency” … summed up, it appeared just not to be a practical fit (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 469). Perhaps this vote sprung from the 1922 Harvard decision that hit the national spotlight as President Lowell refused to allow six African-American students to live in the institutional residence halls (Wechsler et al., 2007). Like Harvard, most institutions remained segregated until and after World War II (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Romano, 2009; Turner & Bound, 2003; Wechsler et al., 2007). The African-Americans that did decide to attend school had no choice but to attend HBCU’s, which the majority had substandard facilities (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Wechsler et al., 2007). “By 1940, only 1.3% of the total black population had graduated from college, compared with 5.4% of white Americans. Between the two world wars, the deck of mobility cards was stacked without question and without regret against young people from lower-class, ethnic, and black backgrounds” (Wechsler et al., 2007, p.469). In the end, the unfair educational treatment of African-Americans is one factor that prompted the Civil Rights movement.
Civil Rights, Affirmative Action, and the African-American Reality

The civil rights movement began, that is, as officially recognized in 1954, the same year as the landmark case, *Brown v. Board of Education* (Morris, 1986; Omi & Winant, 2014; Rosenstone & Hansen, 2009; Tarrow & Tollefson, 1994). This historic Supreme Court case, *Brown v. Board of Education*, is credited for sparking the civil rights movement (Brown-Nagin, 2005; Klarman, 2005; Kluger, 2011; Patterson & Freehling, 2001; Sitkoff, 2008; Tushnet, 1987). The Supreme Court ruled that public-school segregation violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment thereby overturning *Plessy v. Ferguson* and the “separate but equal” doctrine (Brown, 2005; Klarman, 2005; Kluger, 2011; Patterson & Freehling, 2001; Sitkoff, 2008; Tushnet, 1987).

According to Greene (2004), both *Plessy* and *Brown* exposed the truth behind the notion “separate but equal.” The facilities for African-American students were either nonexistent or disproportionate to the facilities of European-American students. Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court who wrote the decision for the courted stated:

Segregation of European-American and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group... Any language in contrary to this finding is rejected. We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal (*Brown v. Board of Educ.*, 1954).

Though many states did not comply with *Brown*, it was still a huge win for civil rights activists and the African-American community (Brown, 2005; Greene, 2004; Klarman, 2005; Kluger, 2011). Through other legal cases and key historical events, the momentum gained from *Brown* lead to what we call affirmative action (Bell, 2004; Garrison-Wade & Lewis, 2004, Orfield & Eaton, The Harvard Project on School Desegregation, 1996).

What we know today as Affirmative Action, started in 1941 under the President Franklin Roosevelt administration (Egerton, 1995). In early July of 1941, millions of jobs were being created to prepare the United States for war (General Records of the United States, 1941). Large numbers of African-Americans began to move to work in the defense industry but were met with discrimination and violence (General Records of the United States, 1941). President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. Phillip Randolph, met with Eleanor Roosevelt and members of the President’s cabinet to discuss their grievances (Anderson, 1973; Harris, 1991; Pfeffer, 1990). They demanded issuing an Executive Order to stop job discrimination in the industry and threatened to have a march of ten to fifty thousand African-Americans on the capital White House lawn (Anderson, 1973; Harris, 1991; Pfeffer, 1990). Hoping to avoid a march on Washington by civil rights leaders, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 (Higginbotham, 1992; Kahlenberg, 1997; Morgan, 1970). Executive Order 8802 banned discrimination in employment practices by Federal agencies, unions and companies in the defense industry (General Records of the United States, 1941). To enforce the new policy, the Fair Employment Practices Commission was created (General Records of the United States, 1941). Two years later President Roosevelt extended the Executive Order to federal contractors and
subcontractors (General Records of the United States, 1941; Higginbotham, 1992; Kahlenberg, 1997; Morgan, 1970).

Pressure continued from civil rights activist and African-American leaders on the government to end discrimination (Brunner, 2002; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Holzer & Neumark, 2006). This pressure resulted in President John F. Kennedy’s Executive Order 10925 (Brunner, 2002; Holzer & Neumark, 2006; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Mayer, 1999). Executive Order 1092, signed on March 6, 1961, created the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity that mandated projects that were financed with federal funds “take affirmative action” to ensure that hiring practices are free from racial discrimination and bias (Brunner, 2002; Holzer & Neumark, 2006; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Kennedy, 1961; Mayer, 1999). Executive Order 10925 also included penalties of contract suspension for non-compliance (Brunner, 2002; Holzer & Neumark, 2006; Jones, 1982; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Kennedy, 1961; Mayer, 1999). This was succeeded by Executive Order 11246 and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance by President Lyndon Johnson to enforce affirmative action and non-discrimination requirements in the Department of Labor (Anderson, 1996; Galloway & Ronfeldt, 1974; Jones, 1982; Kaplan-Wyckoff, 2012; Nash, 1971). In 1967 under President Richard Nixon, the Department of Labor noticed that minorities were excluded from industrial and craft unions, which were directly, correlated to the high unemployment rates of minorities in the city of Philadelphia (Marcus, 1969). This resulted in the Philadelphia Plan, which required government contractors to take affirmative action to hire minority workers on certain numerical percentages (Hood, 1993; Leiken, 1970; Pedriana & Stryker, 1997). Based on four factors, the Labor Department set minority employment goals of 4-6% of the employer’s workforce in 1970, which would increase to 20% after four years (Marcus, 1969). Even with laws and policies in the attempt to level the playing field, it did not seem they have significantly helped African-Americans or their household.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been tracking the African-American unemployment rate since 1954 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016; Desilver, 2013). According to Desilver (2013), the unemployment rate for African-Americans has been double the rate of European-Americans for the last six decades. In 1954, the average unemployment rate for European-Americans was 5% while for African-Americans it was 9.9% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016; Desilver, 2013). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016) published their annual report and in 2015, the average unemployment rate for European-Americans was 4.58% while for African-Americans it was 9.54%. Lang and Lehmann (2011) found in 2008 that African-American males between the ages of 25-54 had a labor force participation rate of “83.7% compared with 91.5% among white men. The unemployment rate was 9.1% compared with 4.5%...white men in this age group are fifteen % more likely to be employed than are black men” (p. 8).

Researchers using instruments such as the Implicit Association Tests (IAT) and the Becker Model, have found that race is one of the underlying reasons for differential unemployment between African-Americans and European-Americans (Bertrand, Chugh, & Mullainathan, 2005; Bowlus & Eckstein, 2002; Dawkins, Qing & Sanchez, 2005; DellaVigna & Paserman, 2005; Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosek & Mellott, 2002; Lang & Lehmann, 2011; Rooth, 2007; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). For example, Lang and Lehmann (2011) reported that African-Americans experience longer durations of unemployment than European-Americans. Dawkins et al., (2005) found in a sample of job losers with no controls that African-American workers are unemployed...
20% longer than European-American workers. Other researchers have disagreed with that figure and found that the percentage is higher than 20% but roughly 30% (Bowles & Eckstein, 2002; DellaVigna & Paserman, 2005; Lang & Lehmann, 2011). Despite the percentage, researchers have conducted studies to try to find a correlation between survey data and IAT results (Bertrand, Chugh, & Mullainathan, 2005; Rooth, 2007; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005).

“In the race IAT test, the test-taker must quickly categorize pictures of faces appearing at the center of a computer screen as “African-American” or “European European-American” and/or sort words as “Good” or “Bad” by hitting a computer key corresponding to the correct side of the grouping” (Lang & Lehmann, 2011, p. 12). If a biased exists against African-Americans, the test predicts that individuals will be able to categorize compatible pairings quicker versus incompatible pairings. On average, this was the case (Greenwald et al., 2002). Using IAT data, three studies have investigated the roles of implicit and explicit forms of discrimination in the labor market by paralleling survey responses addressing bias and racial hiring differences to IAT results (Bertrand, Chugh, & Mullainathan, 2005; Rooth, 2007; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). All three studies found racist attitudes show a stronger nexus with discriminatory behavior than do explicit prejudices (Bertrand, Chugh, & Mullainathan, 2005; Lang & Lehmann, 2011; Rooth, 2007; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Using race as a core component of the employment gap, Gary S. Becker created a model to explain discrimination in the labor market (Becker, 1971).

Becker (1971) in his model, The Becker Model, relies heavily on discrimination and assumes that employers and economically privileged persons are willing to pay in order to avoid contact with African-Americans. The model also assumes that European-Americans dislike working with, employing or purchasing from African-Americans and that competition forces prejudice employers to shut down (Becker, 1971). Kerwin and Guryan, (2007) disagrees with Becker’s Model and argues against his model. First, they follow Becker’s understanding that the employer is the owner who controls the firm’s capital (Kerwin & Guryan, 2007). Yet, they argue against the notion that a prejudiced employer shutting down is dependent on the racial composition of a competing firm, meaning, discrimination can survive if something prevents the competing firms from segregating appropriately by race (Kerwin & Guryan, 2007). In addition, they present evidence on racial prejudice and its relationship to African-American and European-American wage gaps across the United States. Other researchers such as Karanja and Austin (2014) have found similar results.

Karanja and Austin (2014) found that on average, African-American families earn 42% less than European-American families. In the years 2010 in 2011, the median weekly earnings for African-American males were $668-$673, but for European-American males, the earnings were $852-$891 (Karanja and Austin, 2014). In 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau conducted the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and found that the media European-American household had $111,146 in wealth holdings compared to the African-Americans at $7,113. Shin (2015) of Forbes reported that homeownership, labor markets and education are the three main factors driving the income gap between African-American and European-American households.

For the majority of families in the U.S., their house usually makes up the biggest portion of their assets (Shin, 2015). The SIPP found that there were also racial disparities in homeownership. Seventy-three percent of European-American families own a home compared to 45% of African-
Americans (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The median African-American homeowner’s house is worth $50,000 compared to $85,000 for European-Americans (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Shin (2015) found that the homeownership cost gap comes from the associated home values of African-Americans versus European-Americans given their choice or opportunity of residence. The root cause of this dates back to the National Housing Act of 1934 that redlined African-American neighborhoods labeling them as credit risks (Gotham, 2000; Pulido, 2000; Lipsitz, 1995; Shin, 2015). Though this act was outlawed in the 1960’s, the effects of it are still seen today in neighborhoods consisting mostly of people of color, higher poverty rates, declining infrastructure and lower home values (Shin, 2015). Discriminatory lending was also a problem as Wells Fargo had admitted to lending African-American households’ subprime mortgages while offering European-American households with very similar credit profiles prime mortgages (Johnson, 2008; Relman, 2008; Shin, 2015). The Justice Department reached a settlement with Wells Fargo in more than $175 million in relief for homeowners for their discriminatory lending (Savage, 2012; Shin, 2015; Stuart, 2014).

Labor markets were another factor driving the income gap between African-American and European-American households (Shin, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Shin (2015) argues that inequality in the labor markets is responsible for 20% of the growing racial wealth gap in the last 25 years and an additional 9% of employment. On average, a European-American family earns $50,400 while the typically African-American family earns $32,038 (Shin, 2015). According to the SIPP, African-American families see a lower return on their incomes (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Shin, 2015). European-American families see a return on $19.51 for every dollar they earn, compared to African-American families who will see only $4.80 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Shin, 2015). Some of the roots or causes of these gaps are due to African-Americans being less likely to have jobs that offer employee health care, retirement plans or paid time off, which results in the depletion of savings dealing with life emergencies (Shin, 2011).

Lastly, education is the third factor driving the income gap between African-American and European-American households (Shin, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). In 2011, 34% of European-Americans completed a 4-year degree compared to 20% of African-Americans (Shin, 2015). Shin (2015) argues that degree completion is not enough for African-Americans since the return on investment is so low compared to their European-American counterparts. According to the SIPP, a European-American family will see a return of $55,869 on a bachelor degree compared to an African-American family who will see $4,846 (Shin, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Shin (2015) that some of the causes are the higher costs of education, debt and discrimination. “Even if you graduate from college, as a black college graduate, you’re faced with discrimination. So, you might have done everything right, achieved the skills you need to succeed, but you won’t see a higher return” (Shin, 2015).

**Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU’s) and African-American Education**

The Higher Education Act of 1965 defines HBCU as any historically black college or university that was established, accredited, or in making progress towards accreditation prior to 1964 and whose mission was and is to educate black Americans (P.L. 105-244). Since the beginning, HBCU’s was met with criticism and opposition but was of chief importance to African-Americans (Wechsler et al., 2007). African-Americans viewed education and HBCU’s as a way of social
mobility while defending and extending their new rights (Anderson, 1988; Wechsler et al., 2007). To achieve this, African-American built education into a social movement through building institutions and legislation (Anderson, 1988; Franklin, 1992; Webber, 1978; Wechsler et al., 2007). African-American began working on a “…system of universal public education, which included poor Whites as well Blacks in region where education had largely been the privilege of the White upper class, African-Americans were in essence attempting to transform the Southern social order” (Wechsler et al., 2007, p.663).

Between 1870 and 1890, there were nine federal African-American land-grant institutions in the south, which increased to sixteen in 1915 (Wechsler et al., 2007). In 1915, seven of the schools were state controlled (Wechsler et al., 2007). The problem was that not all of these schools were teaching at the collegiate level. According to the Survey of Back Higher Education in 1917 by Thomas Jesse Jones, only one of the sixteen schools taught at the collegiate level (Wechsler et al., 2007). The Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, which had twelve enrolled African-Americans college students (Anderson, 1988; Wechsler et al., 2007). The seven HBCU’s had no students in the collegiate grades (Anderson, 1988; Wechsler et al., 2007). Of the 7,513 students enrolled in the twenty-three HBCU’s, 4,061 were identified as elementary level students, 3,400 were classified as secondary level students, and 12 were enrolled in collegiate level courses, as mentioned above (Anderson, 1988; Wechsler et al., 2007).

The continued struggle and fight for equality and advancement produced some of the most highly educated African-American leaders that represented African-American (b) interests within a European-American (w) power structure. "Ex-slave communities… believed that the masses could not achieve political and economic independence or self-determination without first becoming organized, and the organization was impossible without well-trained intellectuals-teachers, ministers, politicians, managers, administrators, and businessmen” (Anderson, 1998, p. 20).

Even with the rise of new leaders, African-Americans, and their European-American allies continued to face opposition from Southern conservatives that saw African-American education as a threat to European-American supremacy (Allen, Hunt, & Gilbert, 1997, Morris, 1986; Wechsler et al., 2007). Yet, there was much headway made; 25 years after the Civil War there were approximately 100 colleges and university for African-Americans located primarily in the south (Wechsler et al., 2007). The majority of these institutions were operated by European-American philanthropic agencies and missionaries (American Missionary Association, the Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and American Baptist Home Mission Society) while just a few were operated by African-Americans (the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church) (Wechsler et al., 2007). “As such, African-Americans found their collective voice in the education of their leader’s limited by the paternalism of their White allies (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 664).

HBCU’s despite having differing origins had three primary goals, the education of African-American youth, training teachers and the missionary tradition (Ogden, Miller, Frost, Bruce, Frissell, Du Bois, & Merrill, 1905). European-American missionaries having staff, controlled and built institutions like Shaw University, Spelman College, Morehouse College, Clark College, Bennett College, Straight College (later Dillard), Hampton Institution, Atlanta University, Fisk University and Howard University, also dictated the curriculum and means that these primary
goals would be met (Wechsler et al., 2007). The majority of the missionary institutions implemented the same curriculum that was used by elite European-American colleges, which many African-Americans accepted as necessary for advancement, leadership and training (Anderson, 1988; Wechsler et al., 2007). The curriculum often reflected the biases of the dominant European-American culture (Wechsler et al., 2007). Scholar Carter G. Woodson (1933) noted in his book, *The Mis-education of the Negro*, that even the best missionary schools focused heavily on the contributions from Europe and the West while viewing and teaching non-European-American areas, mainly Africa, as being benighted and desperate need Christianizing and civilizing. Schools like Hampton Normal and the Agricultural Institute broke away from this belief and focused on manual training (Wechsler et al., 2007). These institutions were the model as the school’s European-American missionary founder believed African-Americans to be inferior morally and incapable of utilizing a liberal arts education (Wechsler et al., 2007). The curriculum was basic academic competence, manual labor skills and encouraged political accommodation through the obedience of the South established racial codes (Bullock, 1967; Spivey, 1978; Wechsler et al., 2007).

European-American philanthropy, funding, and curriculum of HBCU’s affected the educational destiny and perspectives of many African-Americans (Wechsler et al., 2007). This could not be clearer that the controversy between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois (Wechsler et al., 2007). Booker T. Washington, a graduate of the Hampton Institute, established his own school on the Hampton model in Tuskegee, Alabama (Harlan, 1972). He became famous for his self-help ideology, perspectives on industrial education and his views on race (Harlan, 1972; Wechsler et al., 2007). “Largely through his efforts, the Hampton/Tuskegee model of education was accepted and avidly encouraged by White Northern philanthropists and Southern politicians as an effective compromise between maintaining White supremacy and satisfying Black educational aspirations in the south” (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 664). Due to a modification in the 1862 Land Grant Colleges Act, and popularity for the Hampton/Tuskegee model, there was tremendous support for state-supported industrial and technical colleges for Blacks (Anderson, 1988, McPherson, 1975; Wechsler et al., 2007).

This support from the Hampton/Tuskegee model and Washington becoming a spokesperson for African-Americans generated some controversy and concerns within the African-American community (Buchanan & Hutcheson, 1999; Dunn, 1993; Johnson & Watson, 2004; Wechsler et al., 2007). W.E.B. DuBois was a liberal arts graduate from Fisk University and Harvard University (Alridge, 2008; Broderick, 1958; Du Bois, 1976). He argued against Washington’s industrial model for educating African-Americans according to ability and continued political advancement against segregationists and Southern laws and customs (Alridge, 2008; Broderick, 1958; Du Bois, 1976). This debate and opposing viewpoints split the African-American intellectual community and HBCU’s into two camps (Alridge, 2008; Broderick, 1958; Wechsler et al.). Due to Washington’s influence, many liberal arts HBCU’s had to adopt the Hampton/Tuskegee philosophy to maintain financial support from Northern philanthropists and Southern state governments (Bullock, 1976; Du Bois, 1976; Wechsler et al., 2007). The decisions to fund industrial education opposed to liberal arts education was not the decision of African-Americans, but by European-American-controlled state governments, European-American individual and corporate philanthropists, and European-American-dominated organizations (Bullock, 1976; Wechsler et al., 2007).
Leading all the way up to the 1920’s, European-American philanthropy and missionary’s control of HBCU’s remained a huge issue (Wechsler et al., 2007). Students, faculty and staff began to become more vocal and protest for greater African-American representation among the administration, changes in the curriculum and the rules that governed student life (Wechsler et al., 2007). These protests overall were successful and resulted in them achieving their attended goals (Wechsler et al., 2007). Du Bois (1989) referred to HBCU’s as “social settlements” where the “best traditions of New England” were known and taught to the children of slaves by European-American missionaries (p. 100). Their goal of educating African-Americans was to divest them of their unfortunate past while teaching them the ways of the European-American middle-class (Wechsler et al., 2007). “However, the modernist/evangelical fervor produced a system of draconian rules that rigidly defined “appropriate” behavior, dress, speech, and extracurricular activity for the future “leaders” of the Black race” (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 665). These rules and forms of education continued well on into the twentieth century after they had been modified or relaxed at PWI’s (Flemming, 1983; Jewell, 1998; Little, 1981).

HBCU’s also played a part in the social stratification within the African-American community; there was a door to social mobility (Wechsler et al., 2007). Before Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, the African-American professional class was trained almost at all HBCU’s (Wechsler et al., 2007). Even today, HBCU’s only account for 3% of postsecondary schools but have produced a very high percentage of the African-American workforce (Allen & Jewel, 1995; Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; Nettles & Perna, 1997). They make up 70% of African-American dentists and physicians, 50% of African-American engineers, 50% of African-American school teachers, and 35% of African-American attorneys (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014).

HBCU’s produced highly educated African-Americans that assimilated into a middle-class Anglo-Protestant culture, which was the goal of their missionary founders, (Wechsler et al., 2007). Since African-Americans started to assimilate into the Anglo-Protestant culture, some African-Americans felt it was their duty to hand this knowledge and information to uneducated and uncultured African-Americans (Miller, 1905). Gaines (2012) described how in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century that racial uplift that was taught at HBCU’s contained undertones of cultural paternalism and class privilege. Although these leaders were committed to the struggle for racial equality and civil rights, some of these leaders were as paternalistic toward the African-American masses as their European-American missionary teachers had been towards them (Gaines, 2012). This placed the educated African-American elites at odds with the people they pledged to uplift, a tension that has lasted well into the civil rights and beyond (Gaines, 2012; Wechsler et al., 2007).

Why in large HBCU’s operated and were categorized as successful, their effectiveness was limited by the harsh realities of segregation (Wechsler et al., 2007). Despite the separate but equal claim that was made by the Supreme Court in Plessy v. Ferguson, African-American public education was extremely underfunded on not only on the local level but the state as well (Harper, Patton & Wooden, 2009). “Although missionary societies and philanthropic agencies had intended to help lay the groundwork for a system of public higher education for blacks, they often found themselves solely responsible instead of providing for the only quality education available for blacks (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 666). To compensate for the lack of funding, African-American
communities, with the help of the missionaries and philanthropists, had to not only maintain the quality of the school but provide teachers and fund the construction of buildings (Gaines, 2012; Wechsler et al., 2007).

HBCU’s were forced to function as multilevel institutions, high schools, college preparatory schools and colleges, essentially one institution serving the entire community (Wechsler et al., 2007). This prevented the advancement of HBCU’s as they were unable to function fully as colleges. European-American power structures in the South continuously and carefully examined the curriculum keeping HBCU’s a college in name only (Morris, Allen, Maurrasse & Gilbert, 1995). Due to the large high school departments, the majority of HBCU’s were not recognized as college-grade institutions by state and federal agencies and were consistently denied accreditation (Wechsler et al., 2007). Eventually, the high school and secondary departments at HBCU’s were phased out. Even after Plessy and Brown v. Board of Education, African-Americans still had to fight to be viewed as equal and eventually began access to previously segregated colleges and universities (Jewell, 1998).

In reality, Brown did not end the struggle for equal educational opportunity, but in many respects was the beginning as many schools across the South denied the mandate for integrated education with lawsuits and defiance (Wechsler et al., 2007). Nationwide, European-American parents fled to the suburbs and enrolled their children in private schools with the intention of thwarting the Supreme Court ruling (Wechsler et al., 2007). As a result, present day schools remain largely segregated by race (Orfield et al., 1996). In fact, “After some delay and further resistance previously segregated universities grudgingly opened their doors to African-Americans in the decade following Brown. Predictably this process moved faster in institutions of higher education outside of the South” (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 666). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (1979), the national enrollment rate of African-Americans grew from 83,000 in 1950 to 666,000 in 1975. In 1950, the vast majority of African-Americans attended HBCU’s, but 25 years later 75% of all African-Americans in college attended PWI’s (Wechsler et al., 2007). Allen, Epps, and Haniff (1991) refer to this at the second “Great Migration” as the vast majority of African-Americans moved from HBCU’s to PWI’s.

Even during this time, students and faculty from HBCU’s were still contributors and catalysts for change as they were leaders and foot soldiers in the civil rights and African-American power movements (Wechsler et al., 2007). The leaders at the student sit-ins of Greensboro, participants in the mass civil disobedience in Birmingham and contributors to the voter registration drives across Mississippi were often students from HBCU’s (Morris, 1986; Payne, 1994; Robnett, 1997; Ture and Hamilton, 1992). Even alumni from HBCU’s were always represented among the leadership of civil rights organizations and attorneys seeking legal challenges for the equal educational opportunity (Wechsler et al., 2007). According to Nettles and Perna (1997), HBCU graduates were disproportionately represented among the African-Americans who were pioneers in fields and occupations that had been traditionally closed.

During this period, African-Americans made great strides for degree attainment. In 1976 – 1977, 58,636 African-Americans earned bachelor degrees, but by 1994, the number increased by 43% to 83,576 (Wechsler et al., 2007). For doctorate degrees, there was a total national increase of 30% from 1977 (33,232) to 1994 (43,185), but for African-Americans, there was an increase by 43%
from 1,253 in 1977 to 3,344 in 1994 (Wechsler et al., 2007). The number of doctorate degrees awarded by HBCU’s saw an increase of 218% from 66 in 1977 to 210 in 1994 (Blackwell, 1987; Nettles & Perna, 1997).

The 1970’s and 1980’s brought on never before seen challenges for HBCU’s in regard to resource availability, enrollment, and academics (Wechsler et al., 2007). Since the civil rights gains of the 1960’s and 1970’s had a created an African-American middle-class, HBCU’s had to compete with PWI’s for African-American students (Wechsler et al., 2007). HBCU’s practiced a modified form of open enrollment, recruiting the majority of their students from lower socioeconomic class, both urban and rural, who were most often underprepared for college (Jewell, 2002; Jewell & Allen, 2002; Wechsler et al., 2007). Unfortunately, in the 1970’s and the 1980’s, there was a sharp decline in the already small number of high-achieving and affluent students that were attending HBCU’s (Webster, Stockard, & Henson, 1981). “This enrollment trend, coupled with the steady decline of American public schools which, according to census data, educate roughly 80% of African-American school-age children, has led to a corresponding change in the academic environments of HBCU’s” (Wechsler et al., 2007, pp. 669-670). HBCU’s have continued to take the responsibility of repairing deficiencies in the education received by African-American students (Wechsler et al., 2007). Many of these institutions are committing greater resources to remedial instruction, which takes away from college-level instruction and affects their recognition as high-quality academically rigorous institutions (Jencks & Reisman, 1968).

This was not the case for all HBCU’s, for example, Florida A&M, Howard University, Hampton University, Xavier University, Fisk University, Morehouse College and Spelman College, had a completely different narrative in the 1980’s and 1990’s (Jewell & Allen, 2002). These institutions were not only able to compete with PWI’s for the brightest African-American children of the middle-class, but able to maintain academically rigorous programs and build strong endowments (Wechsler et al., 2007). Some of the schools not only competed but surpassed PWI’s. For example, Spelman College, Morehouse College, and Fisk University were all listed as the best liberal arts colleges in the U.S. News and World Report (1999) educational rankings. In the U.S. News and World Report (2014) rankings Spelman College, Morehouse College and Howard University were added to the list. The Xavier University, of Louisiana, has been credited as the leading institution for their preparation of African-American undergraduates that enter medical school (Jewell & Allen, 2002). Florida A&M has been acknowledged for consecutive years for having the largest number of National Merit Scholars enrolled (Jewell & Allen, 2002).

HBCU’s have also been places of inclusion challenging the status quo and redefining access to higher education (Jewell & Allen, 2002). Not only have HBCU’s opened their doors to African-Americans, but they were also the first institutions to open their doors to people regardless of color, race, gender, national origin, despite the already existence of segregation customs that limited this practice and idea (Wechsler et al., 2007).

Native American, African, Asian, Latin American, and Caribbean students have all benefitted from the educational and social commitment of HBCU’s, as have European-American women and Jews who enrolled in professional schools at these institutions when gender, religion, and race-based quotas kept many of them out of traditionally White institutions (TWI’s) in significant numbers (Jewell & Allen, 2002, p.670).
This open-door policy was not only limited to students (Edgcomb, 1993). During World War II, HBCU’s employed refugee scholars from Europe and letting them work as faculty at Fisk University, Howard University, Xavier University and other institutions after arriving in the United States (Edgcomb, 1993). In the years following, HBCU’s continued to employ international scholars for faculty positions, mainly from Africa and Asia (Edgcomb, 1993; Logan, 1969).

In the present day, many scholars, leaders, and critics are questioning HBCU’s future as “historically black” given their growing diversity (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014). Gasman (2013) reports that currently 13% of HBCU students are European-American, 3% are Latino, and 1% are Asian American. Within the changing demographics of the United States, with large growth among Latinos and Asian Americans, it is more likely that HBCU’s, like other institutions, will change over the next coming decades (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014). Several HBCU’s, such as Bluefield State University in West Virginia and Lincoln University in Missouri, have “converted” into, or will soon have, examining current trends, a majority European-American student body (Wechsler et al., 2007). This growing diversity is unsettling to some, mainly HBCU alumni and constituents, and welcomed by others-administrators that are concerned with the declining enrollments of African-American students (Gasman, 2013). HBCU’s have had to become more accepting of a more diverse student body with some institutions experiencing unstable financial solvency and extreme fiscal crisis, continually threatens the viability and existence of some HBCU’s (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; June, 2003; Wechsler et al., 2007).

Regardless of all the challenges, HBCU’s have faced and will continue to face; their accomplishments are very impressive. Though HBCU’s represent only 3% of all colleges and universities, in the 1990’s they enrolled around 25% of all African-American students in the United States (Wechsler et al., 2007). During this same period, they granted 25% of baccalaureate degrees, 15% of master’s and professional degrees and 10% of Ph.D.’s to African-Americans (Carter & Wilson, 1997; Nettles & Perna, 1997). Arroyo and Gasman (2014) reports that 50% of African-American engineers, 70% of African-American dentist and physicians, 50% of African-American public-school teachers and 35% of African-American attorneys graduated from an HBCU. In addition, the top eight baccalaureate-granting institutions for African-Americans that go on to earn a terminal degree in engineering or science are HBCU’s (Burrelli and Rapoport, 2008).

Marketing in Higher Education

With the continuously changing demographics and landscape of higher education, marketing has become a major priority for institutions. For example, the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2016) reported that from 1976 to 2012 the percentage of African-American college students in the United States rose from 10% to 15%. While calculating the same data for European-American students, they found that the age fell from 84% to 60%. The Census Bureau (2014) reported that in 2013, 58.2% of college students were European-American, and 14.7% were African-American. They went on to highlight that there is a national decrease of high school students entering college, especially European-Americans. European-American children comprised 52.7% of elementary schools (grades first – eighth) in 2013; however, the percentage was 59.1 in 2003 (Census Bureau, 2014). Furthermore in 2014, the Census Bureau released a report stating that in 2013 European-American students made up 47% of all kindergarten students, yet a
mere decade ago, 60% was the waterline. With these changes, institutions have had to change continuously and adapt like businesses.

Higher education is a business, administrators in higher education are in fact businessmen, and the business is selling and producing education (Silber, 2012). It is a business with different procedures and standards than other business, the product, education, is intangible and difficult to identify, but marketing is a major institutional operation (Silber, 2012). In 1972, Krachenberg wrote *Bringing the concept of marketing to higher education*, which was one of the first comprehensive articles on marketing in higher education. While discussing marketing, Krachenberg stated, that it “…deals with the concept of uncovering specific needs, satisfying those needs by the development of appropriate goods and services, letting people know of their availability, and offering them at appropriate prices, at the right time and place” (1972, p. 380). He argued that marketing is not only important from an advertising perspective but serves a basic service to society (Krachenberg, 1972). Marketing helps companies identify the needs of society, create and develop products and services that address those needs, and gets the products and services to the people in need (Krachenberg, 1972).

For colleges and universities to create an effective institutional identity, a strategic marketing plan is a critical component and should be a part of the mission (Hesel, 2004; Keller, 1983). The college must know the audience they are trying to market to (Anctil, 2008). A successful marketing plan views products objectively and makes business decisions on a truthful evaluation (Anctil, 2008). A good marketing plan knows its product, understands the price structure and how to make the product appealing to consumers (Kotler, 1999; Kotler & Fox, 1995). In addition, a good marketing plan is very well researched, professionally delivered and highly coordinated (McCarthy, 1960).

Within the past forty years, the marketing efforts of higher education institutions have become tightly controlled and organized units that have been created to maintain, create and promote an institution’s image (Anctil, 2008). There have been a number of factors that have created the culture of colleges and universities running more like a business opposed to educational and social institutions (Bok, 2003; Kirp, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). For example, in the 1950’s and 1960’s, there was a flow of state and federal financial support for teaching and research (Anctil, 2008). Congress also funded campaigns on university campuses and poured research dollars to advance technologies and scientific discoveries for private business and the state government (Anctil, 2008). This level of support started to decline around the 1970’s due to an energy crisis and to finance an expensive war (Anctil, 2008; Bok, 2003; Zemsky, Wegner & Massy, 2005). In addition to this lack of federal support, there was a decline in state funding in the 1980’s and 1990’s due to state budgets for things like greater support for state-financed health care, increasing costs for the creation of prisons, prison maintenance, and the increasing cost of welfare (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Because of higher education lacking the above-described resources, institutions were faced with several threats to their viability (Anctil, 2008). Higher education saw a declining student body after institutions had doubled in size and built new campuses with public investment dollars that were no longer available (Bok, 2003; Zemsky et al., 2005). In addition, the economy experienced turmoil due to rapid inflation with motionless outputs that raised unemployment and applied additional pressure to the United States, a country with already slim resources (Bok, 2003; Zemsky
et al., 2005). With these pressures and threats, higher education had to make some major transitions to stay afloat (Anctil, 2008).

Due to the decline in monies, colleges and universities had received from the past thirty years; they had to change the way they did business, which gave way to a new type of high education to emerge (Anctil, 2008). Bok (2003) thought of this period as the commercialization of higher education and the modern university. He also believed that this period of commercialization was due to the financial cutbacks, which caused colleges and universities to seek out profit-seeking ventures (Bok, 2003). These ventures were aided when in 1980, Congress passed the Bayh-Dole Act which made the process easier for colleges and universities to own and license patents on findings made through research paid for with public monies (Mowery, Nelson, Sampat & Ziedonis, 2001; Mowery, Nelson, Sampat & Ziedonis, 2015; Mowery & Sampat, 2005; Sampat, Mowery, & Ziedonis, 2003). “Passage of this bill legitimized partnerships between the commercial interests of business and the research interests of the university… discoveries and patents opened new revenue streams to college and university administrators eager to plug budget gaps (Anctil, 2008, p. 21). The combination of the Bayh-Dole Act and the eagerness for entrepreneurial enterprise not only encouraged but legitimized for-profit research in higher education (Anctil, 2008). The increased competition for students and resources drove college and universities to adapt and implement business practices as they recalibrated their priorities to portray the revenue centers they were (Anctil, 2008).

During 1980 – 1990 when colleges and universities began to shift their mission regarding their entrepreneurial activities, a more sophisticated, technologically advanced knowledge-based economy began to emerge to support institutional business partnerships and research discoveries (Bok, 2003; Kinser, 2006, Zemsky et al., 2005). The right place, right-time philosophy greatly benefitted traditional colleges and universities but gave way to the increased competition from the for-profit education sector (Anctil, 2008). Organizations like the University of Phoenix, DeVry University, American InterContinental University to become serious competitors in the higher education marketplace (Anctil, 2008). The roughly 908 for-profit institutions could deliver online courses to students wherever they are and whenever they want it (Foster & Carnevale, 2007).

For-profit institutions are able to compete with public colleges and universities by meeting needs those schools have failed to meet (Anctil, 2008). In most cases, for-profit institutions offer specialized programs that meet conveniently on evenings, weekends or have classes that are just online (Anctil, 2008). This method of educational delivery is especially convenient and attractive for nontraditional students, students with families and working professionals; not only is this approach more convenient, but it is also often cheaper than state and private schools with their delivery models geared towards customer service and satisfaction (Anctil, 2008). Kinser (2006) found that for-profit institutions typically enroll higher rates of low socioeconomic students, people of color and more women, which greatly affects the diversity makeup of these institutions and how they market. For example, according to Edmiston-Strasser (2009) the Apollo Group, the parent company of the University of Phoenix, spent more than $142 million dollars in internet advertising in 12 months, September 2005 to September 2006. This amount places them amongst the big spenders of internet advertisers including companies like Ford and General Motors (Blumenstyk, 2006). “This heaving spending reflects an industry where institutions spend around 20% of their annual budgets on marketing and marketing-related activities” (Anctil, 2008, p. 23).
As a comparison, nonprofit higher education spends less than 5% of their annual budgets (Strout, 2006).

With the declining enrollments in the 1990’s, decreased state and federal funding and increasing competition from for-profit institutions, colleges and universities had to create a niche in the marketplace along with repositioning themselves (Parameswaran & Glowacka, 1995). When faced with increased competition and reductions in funding, most businesses of any kind respond to competition and marketplace needs while assessing their position (Anctil, 2008). Competition brings awareness of the need to “create, disseminate, and maintain a rather distinctive image” is key in maintaining a competitive advantage (Parameswaran & Glowacka, 1995, p. 42). This competition has forced colleges and universities to evaluate and identify their image, determine their strengths and weakness, develop a clear mission and vision that reflects the organizational identity and goals as these institutions continue to position and reposition themselves (Bok, 2003; Kirp, 2003; Zemsky et al., 2005). This reposition has pushed colleges and universities to create and maintain clear strategic marketing plans.

According to Clagett (2012), from an enrollment management perspective, the goal of a marketing plan is to achieve the target enrollment goals, understand tuition and fee revenue assumptions, and obtain retention and graduation rates. Depending on the institution, the marketing plan could also include the entire mission of the college, including continuing education and lifelong learning, or could be narrower to student recruitment, retention, and graduation (Clagett, 2012). In order to obtain a university’s goals, especially recruitment, strategic marketing plans typically encompass three types of marketing (Helgesen, 2008; Lewison & Haws, 2007). These marketing practices are primarily found in business, which include mass marketing (Agins, 2010; Newman, 1999; Nueno & Quelch, 1998; Tedlow, 1996), target marketing (Aaker, Brumbaugh & Grier, 2006; Goodhue, Wixom & Watson, 2002; Rossi, McCulloch & Allenby, 1996) and relationship marketing (Grönroos, 1996. Gummesson, 2004; Gummesson, 2011; Sin, Tse, Yau, Lee & Chow, 2002). An institution has the option to either overlook the differences among potential students or confront them (Lewison & Haws, 2007). If a college or university chooses to ignore the differences, it is practicing mass marketing or even non-marketing (Lewison & Haws, 2007). Recognizing and acknowledging the differences between prospective students takes a target marketing approach (Lewison & Haws, 2007). Relationship marketing is used when institutions identify, establish and maintain relationships at a profit so that the goals of all parties are met (Grönroos, 1994; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995).

Mass marketing from an enrollment management perspective seeks to attract anyone and everyone with a single broad-based marketing strategy (Lewison & Haws, 2007; Scott, 1995). This used to be a common approach for university administrators, and college admissions offices because they did not believe that there were enough consumer differences to rationalize different campaigns for market segments (Lewison & Haws, 2007). These administrators opposed identifying different subsets of the market; they would rather utilize a mass marketing approach and address the entire market as a [target] by concentrating on the similarities among student need (Lewison & Haws, 2007). “This marketing effort is characterized by mass production and distribution… the final university offerings represent a compromise, even though only a few are ideally served by this “one-size-hopefully-kind-of-fits-all” strategy” (Lewison & Haws, 2007, p. 16). Yet, there are two different ways to approach mass marketing.
There are two types of mass marketing, undifferentiated and product differentiation (Baker, 1991; Lewison & Haws, 2007; Mazzeo, 2002; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995). An undifferentiated marketing method will disregard the market differences and develop a single product for the entire market (Ostrow & Smith, 1988; Wright & Esslemont, 1994). Lewison and Haws (2007) believe that a college or university taking this approach would develop generalized degree programs, like a classic liberal arts college degree created with the intent to serve any student within the market.

Product differentiation seeks to distinguish its market offerings from the competition based on the differences in product characteristics (Lewison & Haws, 2007). “An example of product differentiation strategy would be a university that promotes usage of a tri-semester plus summer system rather than a quarter system in a market dominated by the latter” (Lewison & Haws, 2007, p. 16).

Target marketing focuses on one or more designated market sectors and develops marketing strategies for each sector (Cavanagh, 2002: Rindfleish, 2003; Selingo, 1999; Thomas, 2004; Wright & Esslemont, 1994). Depending on the number of students in each market segment, colleges and universities could use three different types of target marketing, differentiated marketing, concentrated marketing, or orchestrated marketing (Lewison & Haws, 2007). For a differentiated approach, institutions could select a limited, clustered or scattered target market, known as selectively differentiated marketing by specifically targeting each market segment, commonly known as complete differentiated marketing (Lewison & Haws, 2007). Concentrated marketing also has two types, exclusive and integrative concentrated marketing (Walker, Hanson, Nelson & Fisher, 1998; Workman, Homburg & Gruner, 1998). When a university concentrates all its attention and resources on a single segment of the market with the intent of domination, it is called “exclusive concentrated marketing” (Lewison & Haws, 2007). Integrative concentrated marketing, an extension of exclusive, occurs when an institution plans to expand a single market sector to dominate the other related segments (Lewison & Haws, 2007). Lastly, the orchestrated approach to target marketing is designed to meet the common needs of range, typically horizontal and vertical (Howard, 1993; Kranzow & Hyland, 2011; Lewison & Haws, 2007).

Relationship marketing is a strategic process of that is used to “… attract, motivate, and enhance existing and potential students’ relationships as well as students’ parents, relatives, friends, reference groups for the benefit of all sides concerned, emphasizing on retaining existing students until their graduation and attract further students” (Al-Alak, 2006, p. 4). The basic idea and core component of relationship marketing is the establishment of customer values should be a continuous process over the lifetime of that relationship (Egan, 2008; Grönroos, 1994; Gummesson, 1997; Helgesen, 2008). According to Egan (2008), relationship marketing (RM) in higher education has six different dimensions, which are different from the original definition proposed by Grönroos (1994).

1. RM seeks to create new value for customers and then share it with the customers.
2. RM recognizes the key role that customers have both as purchasers and in defining the value, they wish to achieve.
3. RM businesses are seen to design and align processes, communication, technology, and people in support of customer value.
4. RM represents continuous cooperative effort between buyers and sellers.
5. RM recognizes the value of customers’ purchasing lifetimes (i.e., lifetime value).
6. RM seeks to build a chain of relationships within the organization, to create the value customers want, and between the organization and its main stakeholders, including suppliers, distribution channels, intermediaries, and shareholders. (Egan, 2008, p. 25).

The principle goal of an institution using relationship marketing is to attract students who are committed despite situations that may arise, which will translate into student loyalty, patronage and retention (Helgesen, 2008). However, in order to obtain the full benefits and goals of marketing, companies have been known to fall short of the ethical line (Angell, 2009; Crow & Hoek, 2003; Harris, 2004; Harris, 2009; Landefeld & Steinman, 2009; Rubin, 2009).

There is research that shows improper, illegal and deceptive marketing practices in almost every field (Alderman & Daynard, 2006; Angell, 2009; Courtney, 2006; Crow & Hoek, 2003; Harris, 2004; Harris, 2009; Landefeld & Steinman, 2009; Rubin, 2009). Some of these incidents have even resulted in lawsuits (Alderman & Daynard, 2006; Courtney, 2006; Harris, 2004; Harris, 2009; Rubin, 2009; Zwier & Gutman, 2016). A great example of this would be the tobacco lawsuits, specifically, *Price v Philip Morris Inc.* (Alderman & Daynard, 2006). In this case, a certified class of persons and two individuals claimed they were hurt by Phillip Morris, Inc’s violations of the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act by their use of “false and fraudulent” marketing practices for its light cigarette products. Phillip Morris, Inc denied the accusations but was found to guilty by Illinois’s Circuit Court of Madison County and awarded the plaintiffs punitive damages and compensation for $10.1 billion dollars. Another example of this is Pfizer. In 1993, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved a drug called Neurontin only for anti-seizure by use by epilepsy (Zwier & Gutman, 2016). Warner-Lamber, a Pfizer subsidiary company, marketed the drug for a number of other treatments like including bipolar disorder, which had not been approved by the FDA (Zwier & Gutman, 2016). Pfizer settled and agreed to pay $420 million dollars in 2004 (Harris, 2004; Zwier & Gutman, 2016). Then again in 2009, Pfizer agreed to pay 2.3 billion dollars to settle criminal and civil allegations of illegally marketing Bextra, a painkiller, as the FDA specifically declined to approve the drug for safety reasons (Harris, 2009; Rubin, 2009; Zwier & Gutman, 2016). This case was the biggest health care fraud settlement and criminal fine ever (Harris, 2009). In 2011, 2012 and 2013, Pfizer went on to pay a total of 560.4 million dollars in settlements for off-label and deceptive marketing practices (Zwier & Gutman, 2016).

The deceptive and unethical marketing practices is not just inclusive to the tobacco and drug industries, but food, financial, banking, media and health care industries (Alderman & Daynard, 2006; Angell, 2009; Brescia, 2009; Bussom & Darling, 1978; Courtney, 2006; Crow & Hoek, 2003; Drewnowski & Darmon, 2005; Fisher, 2009; Harris, 2004; Harris, 2009; Landefeld & Steinman, 2009; Mello, Rimm & Studdert, 2003; Pettinga, 2012; Powell, 2009; Rubin, 2009). Knowing these deceptive marketing practices happen in every field, the American Marketing Association (AMA) has created ethical norms and values that should be used in marketing practices.
AMA is one of the leading organizations that allows marketers and academics to connect with people and resources in order to be successful. AMA also conducts research and publishes content for their members in the *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of International Marketing*, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* and the Journal or Marketing. In addition, AMA has student organizations at over 350 colleges and universities with over 10,500 student members. As they are one of the umbrella organizations to businesses and institutions it was fitting, they created their own ethical norms and values. The ethical norms follow:

**ETHICAL NORMS**

As Marketers, we must:

1. **Do no harm.** This means consciously avoiding harmful actions or omissions by embodying high ethical standards and adhering to all applicable laws and regulations in the choices we make.

2. **Foster trust in the marketing system.** This means striving for good faith and fair dealing so as to contribute toward the efficacy of the exchange process as well as avoiding deception in product design, pricing, communication, and delivery of distribution.

3. **Embrace ethical values.** This means building relationships and enhancing consumer confidence in the integrity of marketing by affirming these core values: honesty, responsibility, fairness, respect, transparency, and citizenship. (AMA Publishing, n.d.)

In short, the AMA’s ethical values include honesty, responsibility, fairness, respect, transparency, and citizenship. While discussing implementation in their ethical norms and values, they state, “We recognize that every industry sector and marketing sub-discipline (e.g., marketing research, e-commerce, Internet selling, direct marketing, and advertising) has its own specific ethical issues that require policies and commentary” (AMA Publishing, n.d.). Knowing from the above statement that higher education has its own ethical issues, what does the research say about higher education? Anctil (2008) and Thacker (2005) both criticize marketing and college admission processes for placing more values on institutions skimming the best students from their applicant pool, opposed to placing a value on delivering a quality education from acceptance to graduation, and ensuring a good fit. After a thorough review of twenty-five years of research, the author was able to find only one article that discussed documented unethical and deceptive marketing practices in higher education; however, researchers, in theory, have offered suggestion on ethical marketing should look what like in higher education (e.g., Anctil, 2008; Gibbs & Murphy, 2009; Gibbs & Murphy, 2009; Krachenberg, 1972; Silber, 2012). The question becomes, is this an omission or oversight of researchers in higher education or is this an area yet to be researched?

In Thacker’s (2007) research article titled, *Confronting the Commercialization of College Admissions Leadership Opportunities*, the researcher discussed some of the unethical practices college and universities use to recruit students and increase their institutional rank. Thacker (2007) argues that the college admissions process has become so commercialized, and it has created a
crisis that now undermines educational values. The researcher continued and stated, “Policies and practices once formulated to serve broad educational goals are being supplanted by private sector mechanisms. These mechanisms are increasingly being used to manage institutional strategic goals, which are often determined by agencies external to education (such as the rankings)” (Thacker, 2007, p. 71). The researcher gives a few examples of current trends that show the growing disconnection between institutional educational values and the commercially drives admissions processes. Thacker stated the focus on marketing popularity, status, comfort, prestige, and brand as a critical educational criterion. Another example Thacker gives the confusion of what is good for the business versus what is good for education. Quoting a dean from a highly ranked institution, Thacker documented a confession, “We are all lying in order to improve our college’s rank” (2007, p. 71). Thacker uncovers some of the ethical issues in higher education that administrators face to improve college rank and to recruit students. It is logical to assume this research article targets all colleges and universities (PWI’s, HBCU’s, Public, Private, etc.) and their commercialized admissions process. As such, the research, as the stated above, is reason enough for further examination of how institutions recruit students and the performance measures for African-Americans after they become students. This next section will discuss some of the existing literature on African-American success at PWI’s vs. HBCU’s.

African-American Academic Success, PWI’s v. HBCU’s

Researchers for a number of years not have investigated or documented major differences for African-American student performance at PWI’s and HBCU’s (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004; Crawford, 2009; Fischer, 2007; Gose, 2014; Harper, 2009; Harper, Patton & Wooden, 2009; Jackson, 2012; Karanja & Austin, 2014; Kim & Conrad, 2006; Melguizo, 2008; Ostrom, 2009; Palmer, Davis, & Hilton, 2009; Palmer & Maramba, 2010; Shaun, 2012; Shoretette II & Palmer, 2015; Sibulkin & Butler, 2005; Small & Winship, 2007; Winkle-Wagner, 2015, Wood & Palmer, 2013). However, it is noted in the research that African-American students attending HBCU’s tend to have lower GPA’s and standardized test scores (i.e., ACT and SAT) than African-Americans attending PWI’s (Allen, 1992; Gurin & Epps, 1975; Kim, 2002; Nettles & Thoeny, 1988). African-American students from HBCU’s tend to come from families with lower socioeconomic statuses than their peers at PWI’s (Allen, 1992; Kim, 2002). PWI’s have greater resources, higher academically ranked faculty, available academic programs and opportunities for advanced study than at HBCU’s (Kim & Conrad, 2006). Melguizo (2008) argued that investigating the financial and academic advantages of the PWI is of interest to the African-American student because overall, individuals who complete their degree can receive the full economic advantage of a college education, and students at a PWI graduate may have an advantage given the resources available. Yet, Allen (1992), Ross (1998) and Well-Lawson (1994) found that African-American students tend to have more frequent and meaningful interactions with African-American and European-American faculty at HBCU’s than PWI’s; while Weglinsky (1996) found no significant difference in student-faculty interactions at HBCU’s and PWI’s. After reviewing some of the differences in PWI’s v. HBCU’s, this section will review the literature of African-American student success at HBCU’s and PWI’s.

Fischer (2007) found that African-Americans are successful at HBCU’s because they take a hands-on approach to student success. For example, at Fisk University, academic advisors encourage
students to set aside no call times when they turn their cell phones off and just study. Fisher continued and discussed how other students must bring their notebooks to weekly meetings to assess or ensure students are taking good notes during class time. The researcher stressed that by taking a more systematic approach, low-income and first-generation students can also receive special support services financed through the Department of Education’s TRIO program for disadvantaged students. The author sums up that this special support includes advisers in the Leadership and an Academic Enrichment program (LEAD) not only to monitor academic progress for 200 out of the total 901 undergraduates, but they also identify scholarship and internship opportunities and have a lending library for students who cannot afford textbooks. In addition, Fischer reports towards the end of each semester; the office holds what they call an “exam jam” where offices are decorated with pictures of program graduates while eating snacks, receiving study tips and getting additional tutor help. For males who make up around 30% of the student body, a “Fellows” program designed to help males succeed, as Fischer (2007) believes that males have a harder time adjusting to college than women do.

Fisk University and other HBCU’s have found this and similar approaches necessary as they tend to enroll lower-income and first-generation college students (Fischer, 2007; Jewell, 2002; Jewell & Allen, 2002; Wechsler et al., 2007). For Fisk, over 50% of their graduates receive federal Pell Grants and 85% of the students qualify for need-based financial aid (Fischer, 2007). HBCU’s have a tradition of admitting students with lower academic credentials to provide these students with educational opportunities to those who would not be able to pursue post-secondary education (Jones, 2013; Williams, Ashley & Rhea, 2004). Most of the admitted students attended Pre-K-12 schools with limited resources (Walker, 2015). “This is evident in the fact that no HBCU received a Barron’s selectivity rating of most competitive, or highly competitive and only two HBCUs rated as very competitive institutions” (Jones, 2013, p. 136). Reid (2011) adds that HBCU’s are three times more than likely to admit and educate students with annual incomes under $25,000. HBCU’s also accept students with scores that are 20% lower than non-HBCU competitors at the 75th SAT percentile (Reid, 2011).

Fischer (2007) reported that due to the lower academically credentialed, low-income and first-generation student profile, HBCU’s have implemented, “early academic interventions, other strategies, like “freshmen-orientation” courses, small classes, and generous financial-aid packages” (p. 2). The author reported that these hands-on practices seem to have paid off for Fisk University. Fischer discussed how the retention rate for the LEAD program was around 82%, compared to around 86% for all their students. The author continued and recounted that its 6-year graduation rate is 63.8%, which is 10% higher than the national average for 4-year colleges and universities. However, the graduation rate was 39% for schools classified as “low-income serving” by the Department of Education. These approaches utilized by Fisk not only work but have been used to create a close-knit community. Quoting a sophomore from Los Angeles talking about, he states, “We’re all like neighbors on the street you grew up with… We’re close-knit” (Fischer, 2007, p. 4).

Although HBCU’s do graduate lower academic students, they are known to cultivate and instill a set of values, principles and norms with the objective of developing citizens of character and competence (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; Douglas, 2012; Lott, 2005; Ricard & Brown, 2008; Sydnor, Hawkins & Edwards, 2010). These values include a dichotomy of progressive and conservative
components (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014). Ricard and Brown (2008) has shown research that progressivism is most obvious at HBCU’s with a focus on “social peace” which tends to be absent from PWI’s. While PWI’s tend to place a larger emphasis on scholarship and research, HBCU’s typically sets its sight on societal change (Snydor et al., 2010). Institutional HBCU stakeholders from students (Douglas, 2012; Lott, 2005) to presidents (Ricard & Brown, 2008), seem to adhere to this principle because it correlates with rectifying the racial and social injustices. Conservatism is also a part of the HBCU values system (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014). Three themes of conservatism emerge which are, “… restrictions on sexuality and sexual orientation, restrictions on self-presentation and expression (e.g., clothing choices), and spoken and unspoken demands for positional subordination (i.e., lack of democracy in classrooms and clubs)” (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014, p. 11). Although the situation seems to be improving, researchers have found antigay treatment, policies and practice at HBCU’s all over the country (Cramer, Arroyo & Ford, 2013; Ford, 2007; Patton, 2011; Patton & Simmons, 2008).

HBCU’s have shown to prepare and equip African-Americans to combat negative stereotypes while focusing on student identify and leadership formation (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; Walker, 2015). This is done by stressing the importance of political activism, academic excellence and communalism (Walker, 2015). “HBCUs generally seem to place a distinctive emphasis on the formation of student identity, or self-concept, on at least three levels: racial/ethnic, intellectual, and leadership (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014, p. 9). One way they do this by providing same-race role models (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014). African-American faculty/administrators (Jett, 2013; Rucker and Gendrin, 2003), external role models (Palmer & Gasman, 2008; Thompson, 2008) like African-American speakers are said to make students feel more comfortable in their skin while improving as intellectuals. Outcalt and Skewes-Cox (2002) found that 69.1% of African-American HBCU students were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the opportunities for leadership on campus compared to 57.3% of those who attend PWI’s. Jean-Marie (2008) reported that African-American female leaders viewed students as children of their community that need to be groomed, nurtured and prayed upon as next generation leaders. In addition, HBCU’s create a foundation for students and instills a mission of racial uplift (Bennett, Hirt, Strayhorn & Amelink, 2006; Gasman & Bowman, 2001), provides social capital to persons traditionally marginalized (Gasman & Jennings, 2006), and provides a student experience that is uncommon yet meaningful to African-American students (Jett, 2003; Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002; Thompson, 2008).

Shorette II & Palmer (2015) found that HBCU’s are phenomenal at developing what he refers to as non-cognitive factors, such as self-confidence, which is done through an inclusive environment and system of support. These findings came from 45-70-minute in-depth interviews from six different African-American HBCU students with majors that included agricultural economics, electrical engineering, cell and molecular biology, kinesiology and secondary education (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015). Of the six students, two reported family income as low-income, three reported middle-class, and one reported as upper middle-class. Many of the students discussed the influence HBCU’s had on their sense of self and self-worth (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015). For example, Willis, a student from North Carolina and Ph.D. candidate in electrical engineering, elaborated on how he never felt alienated and the people he viewed as mentors believed he would be successful (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015). Other participants agreed with Willis and added that the people who worked at the HBCU’s were genuinely invested in their academic success as African-American men and women (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015). Jerome, a Ph.D. candidate in cell and molecular
biology, explained how attending an HBCU allowed him to view himself in a more positive light, helped him increase his internal motivation and provided him with a skill set that would allow him to be a successful future scientist (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015). Marlon, a Ph.D. candidate in agricultural economics, talked about how he found support at every turn and stated:

I mean, she would pull me to the side, you know, take my paper, “Do it again,” you know, you can do more than this, I need more than this, -these were the things I felt pushed me to be able to make it [in my graduate program]. But she gave opportunities for students because she knew, -she probably wanted more for me than I wanted for myself at that time. She knew the potential that I had. (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015, p. 24).

By providing this inclusive environment and system of support, HBCU’s have accomplished two tasks: first, they gave African-American students the necessary support to persist to graduation; second, “… the institutions instilled within these students the wherewithal to understand their personal and academic needs, as well as the support they needed to be successful in their future aspirations” (Shorette II & Palmer, 2015, p. 25). Walker (2015) argues that due to a system of support, mentorship, instilling self-confidence, HBCUs are successful at developing a new cadre of African-American scholars in various fields such as science, technology, and philosophy.

Shorette II and Palmer (2015) found that HBCU’s are praised for producing African-American graduates in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, as well as producing many of the nation’s judges, attorneys, and doctors. *HBCU’s have been a major force with training African-Americans in the health care, science, law and education fields* (Arroyo & Gasman, 2014; Noonan & Jaitley, 2013). For example, a review of African-Americans that received doctorate degrees in science 2006 revealed that 25% received their bachelor degrees from HBCU’s (Noonan & Jaitley, 2013). In the same year, HBCU’s graduated more African-Americans doctorate degrees that year than any other school (Noonan & Jaitley, 2013). Though HBCU’s account for only 3% of American postsecondary institutions, Arroyo and Gasman (2014) reports that 50% of African-American engineers, 70% of African-American dentist and physicians, 50% of African-American public-school teachers and 35% of African-American attorneys graduated from an HBCU. After discussing African-Americans at HBCU’s, a transition is warranted to discuss some of the findings of African-American students PWI’s.

When examining the research of African-Americans at PWI’s, studies have been very consistent that African-American students tend to feel socially isolated, discriminated against, aggression and a sense of “belonging-within-alienation” (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). Researchers have found that African-American students at PWI’s feel connected to other students with similar racial and ethnic backgrounds while the entire group feels alienated from the entire campus (Bristow, 2002; Gloria, Kurpius, Hamilton & Wilson, 1999; Loo & Rolison, 1986). For example, Loo and Rolison (1986) conducted a research study to investigate if students of color felt alienated at PWI’s. Their survey was conducted through interviews with 163 undergraduate students, which 109 were students of color and 54 were European-American (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Using a 4-point Likert scale (1-“a lot”, 4-“not at all”), approximately 40% of the students of color felt the university either “a little” or “not at all” reflected their values (Loo & Rolison, 1986). African-American students reported “often” feeling less socially integrated into their institution as well as feeling socially
isolated (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Students of color also reported that they felt the cultural dominance of European-American, middle-class values on campus, forcing them to assimilate to those values while rejecting their own (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Loo and Rolison (1986) also found that reasons for students of color wanting to leave were due to a lack of support and socioemotional dissatisfaction. Yet, these same students feel that positive student-faculty relationships and satisfaction with academic equality balanced these feelings of leaving (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Overall, the alienation felt by students of color was not due to not being able to make friends nor to hostile campus environment (Loo & Rolison, 1986). There appear to be more inherent cultural factors. Brower and Ketterhagen (2004) also investigated African-American at PWI’s but also included HBCU’s in his article titled, Is there an inherent mismatch between how Black and White students expect to succeed in college and what their colleges expect from them?

Brower and Ketterhagen (2004) conducted a study surveying 2,400 students, 1,500 responded of which 1,079 were included in the study and were comprised of African-American students attending an HBCU, African-American students attending a PWI and European-American students attending a PWI. Of the 1,079… 296 were African-American students attending an HBCU, 60 were African-American students attending a PWI, and 723 were European-American students attending a PWI. Their study found that African-American students attending HBCU’s and African-American students PWI’s both were expected to receive a 3.1 GPA their first semester at college. They then investigated some of the factors of why African-Americans persist through HBCU’s and PWI’s. Brower and Ketterhagen’s (2004) found four factors that contribute to African-Americans staying enrolled at HBCU’s: first, they set realistic expectations on their semester goals and GPA’s; second, they find a balance between being on their own, being with other students and negotiating and family time and visits; third, they maintained consistent exercise and mental health; fourth, wishing they attended a different institution was positively correlated to retaining.

Brower and Ketterhagen’s (2004) also found four factors that contributed to African-Americans staying enrolled at PWI’s. First, while investigating the number of hours spent activities during the week, African-Americans at PWI’s spent more time with themselves focusing on academic work and with a small group of friends (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). They also found while investigating the number of hours spent on various activities that African-Americans at PWI’s did not have large social groups (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). Third, African-American students who set a semester GPA was an important factor, yet, they did not feel satisfied if they achieved the desired GPA (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). Finally, like African-American at HBCU’s, African-American students at PWI’s who wished they attended another institution was positively related to remaining enrolled (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). Overall, it would seem that African-American students have different experiences at PWI’s v. HBCU’s. It appears that African-American students at PWI’s seemed to be managing “… college like task domains in stride; they instead seemed to have had to work harder to negotiate between academic demands and social demands and have had to work harder to determine how much time to spend alone or with others” (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004, p. 109). Brower and Ketterhagen (2004) argue that African-American students must work harder to stay in school than European-American students at PWI’s than African-Americans at HBCU’s. Interestingly and objectively, Brower and Ketterhagen point out that African-American students did, in fact, remain enrolled at the same rate. European-American students did at PWI’s, around 90%, which is higher than the rate African-American
students remained at HBCU’s, around 80% (2004). PWI’s have created centers and initiatives to retain and increase African-American student satisfaction and success.

Gose (2014) research outlined and detailed some of the programs implemented at PWI’s that have been successful for African-Americans. For example, the researcher refers to Ohio State University’s Todd Anthony Bell National Resource Center on the African-American male. The center was opened in 2004 and provides a 4-day program for about 50-60 African-American males, approximately a third of the African-American male students entering the class. The program does not focus on academic instruction but emphasizes motivation and study habits. Gose (2014) continued and explained that in addition to the program, each [Fall-semester] the center holds an event called the Gathering of Men, a networking event for African-American male students, professors, and community professionals. The author detailed how during Black History Month, the Bell center organizes a two-day campus retreat for African-Americans from Ohio State and other institutions. The two-day event has a schedule that includes research paper presentations, yoga, financial literacy sessions and how to deal with encounters with law enforcement. Gose (2014) summed up that the programs seem to be working as Ohio State’s 6-year graduation rate for African-American males, now is at 67%, an increase of 30% since 2002.

Gose (2014) also details programs at the University of Maryland College Park and Georgia’s University System. At the University of Maryland College Park, African-American undergraduates helped start the Black Male Initiative in 2005. The researcher explained how the group initially met on Saturday mornings so African-American students could meet and interact with African-American professors and administrators on campus. Now, the group hosts month community forums that focus on topics such as racial profiling, the criminal-justice system, and organizes community service opportunities in local schools for African-American male undergraduate students. Gose also reviewed how the Georgia University System has created an African-American Male Initiative and had programs on the 27 of the 31 campuses; and reported the system encourages participation for campuses by providing matching grants for up to $30,000 per year. Gose concluded that this program has really been paying off as the number of African-American males receiving bachelor degrees have increased by 82% from 2002-2013. After reviewing some of the literature on HBCU’s and PWI’s one may ask, Is there research showing a difference in impact on an African-American student attending an HBCU v. a PWI? Research regarding this question has produced mixed results (Kim & Conrad, 2006). Some studies have found that there is no significant difference in academic and cognitive abilities when examining the two types of institutions (Bohr, Pascarella, Nora & Terenzini, 1995; Centra, Linn & Perry, 1970, Kim, 2002). Flemming (1982, 1984) reported that African-American students will have greater cognitive growth at HBCU’s, especially for female students. Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn and Terenzini (1996) found that students attending HBCU’s do as well or better their peers at PWI’s on science reasoning and standardized measures of writing. Some researchers found that African-American students receive higher grades at HBCU’s (Allen & Wallace, 1988; Fleming, 1984; Wenglinsky, 1996) while Kim and Conrad (2006) found that GPA’s do not differ based on institutional type. Heath’s (1992) research revealed that African-American studies have higher degree aspirations at HBCU’s.

When discussing retention and graduation, research is limited, and producing mixed results. Pascarella, Smart, Ethington and Nettles (1987) and Cross and Astin (1981) found that African-American students attending HBCU’s are positively correlated with students retaining and
graduating with a bachelor degree. Ehrenberg and Rothstein (1993) used the data from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1971 and found that African-American students who attended HBCU’s were more than likely to receive a bachelor degree than African-American students who attended a PWI. Kim and Conrad (2006) used 9-year longitudinal data and hierarchical non-linear modeling analyses and found that African-American students attending HBCU’s and PWI’s will result in a similar probability of obtaining a bachelor degree. Kim and Conrad (2006) compared their research to other studies and found the exact opposite, that HBCU’s are positively correlated degree attainment (i.e., Cross & Astin, 1981; Pascarella, Smart, Ethington & Nettles, 1987).

Regardless of institutional type, graduation is of great importance as researchers have found that the low graduation and non-completion rates are a contributor to the lower average income and unemployment for African-Americans (Karanja & Austin, 2014; Sibulkin & Butler, 2005). Melguizo (2008) reported that a person obtaining a college degree will have a higher median income and Return on Investment (ROI) compared with those who does not attend or only complete a few years of college. Despite the connection between graduation rates and employment outcomes, no found studies have specifically examined the Return on Investment (ROI) data for African-American students given the institutional type and cost of attendance.

After a review of the key differences with HBCU’s and PWI’s, this study will detail the theoretical framework, behavioral economics theory, and affirmative action.

**Behavioral Economics Theory**

As a foundation for this study, the behavioral economic theory was used to serve as the framework for this research. Hursh (1984), defined behavioral economics as a science of behavior, albeit highly organized behavior of humans. Behavioral economics began in the mid-20th century and at first mirrored economics, concentrating on very analytic concepts, statics and probability theory (Edwards, 1954, 1961). Simon (1955, 1956) pushed the field more towards models of problem-solving and information processing based on bounded rationality, an economic decision-making process that acknowledges that the human mind is bounded by “cognitive limits.” Expanding on his research, Tversky and Kahenman (1974), Tversky (1972) and Kahneman, Slovic, and Tversky (1982) began to demonstrate in their research how individuals boundedly rational employ heuristics such as representativeness, anchoring, and availability to make judgments and simple strategies like “elimination of aspects” to make decisions. Other researchers focused on the analytic strategies of choice and judgment through models of comparative advantages (Shafir, Oscherson, & Smith, 1989), dominance structuring (Montgomery, 1983), and constructed preferences (Payne, Bettman, & Johnson, 1993).

According to Camerer and Loewenstein (2004), behavioral economics classifies research into two categories, choice, and judgment. Judgment investigates the process individuals will use to estimate probabilities (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004). Choice deals with the processes individuals use to pick among actions, factoring in any relevant judgments those individuals have made (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004). Individuals will judge the probabilities of future events and base it on how easy they can imagine or retrieve from memory (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004).
This can lead to what Camerer and Loewenstein (2004) call “hindsight bias.” “Because events which occurred are easier to imagine than counterfactual events that did not, people often overestimate the probability they previously attached to events which later happened (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004, p. 10).

In researching choice, studies have been done in “framing effects” showing the ways people choose based on how the information is presented to them (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004; Tversky & Kahneman, 1985). This was not more prevalent in the “Asian disease” scenario, where a disease threatens 600 citizens, and people are told to choose between two detrimental outcomes (Tversky & Kahneman, 1985). Camerer and Loewenstein summarize the results:

In the “positive frame” people are given a choice between (A) saving 200 lives for sure, or (B) a 1/3 chance of saving all 600 with a 2/3 chance of saving no one. In the “negative frame” people are offered a choice between (C) 400 people dying for sure, or (D) a 2/3 chance of 600 dying and a 1/3 chance of no one dying. Despite the fact that A and C, and B and D, are equivalent in terms of lives lost or at risk, most people choose A over B but D over C (2004, p. 13).

Another phenomenon that Tversky and Kahneman (1975) found when investigating choice was the “anchoring effect.” In this experiment, Tversky and Kahneman (1975) showed their subjects a wheel of fortune with a range between 0 and 100. These subjects were asked to guesstimate whether the number of African nations in the United Nations is less that or greater than that number (Tversky & Kahneman, 1975). Though the numbers on the wheel of fortune were evidently random, the subjects’ guesses were influenced by the spin of the wheel (Tversky & Kahneman, 1975). They described that the subjects seem to “anchor” on to the numbers that were spun on the wheel, and adjusted their numbers incorrectly based on what they thought or knew (Tversky & Kahneman, 1975). Ariely, Loewenstein, and Prelec (2003) also tested the “anchoring effect” when selling high-end consumer products (bottles of wine, a luxurious box of chocolate, fancy computer mouse and a wireless keyboard) to recent MBA college graduates. Ariely et al., (2003) presented a product to the recent MBA graduates and asked if they would purchase the product for a price equal to the last two numbers of their social security number converted to a dollar figure. For example, if the last two digits was 48, then the researchers would ask for a yes or no response to the question, “Would you pay $48?” (Ariely et al., 2003). Immediately following, students were asked, what is the most they would pay? Which question allowed the students to answer truthfully (Ariely et al., 2003). Ariely et al., (2003) found that students with higher ending social security numbers were still willing to pay more. For example, students with numbers in the lower half was willing to pay $11.62 for a 1998 Cotes du Rhone Jaboulet Parallel ‘45’bottle of wine, while those on the top half priced it at $19.95. Simon (1955) knew early on that choice was a major component of behavior economics.

As mentioned above, Simon (1955) focused his research on rational choice. Discussing some of the features of rational choice, he states:

Among the common constraints – which are not themselves the objects of rational calculation – are (1) the set of alternatives open to choice, (2) the relationships that determine the payoffs (“satisfactions,” “goal attainment”) as a function of the
alternative that is chosen, and (3) the preferences – orderings among pay-offs. The selection of particular constraints and the rejection of others for incorporation in the model of rational behavior involves implicit assumptions as to what variables the ration organism “controls” – and hence can “optimize” as a means to rational adaption – and what variables it must take as fixed (Simon, 1955, p. 100-101).

Simon (1955) went on to compute what he called “classical” concepts of rationality in conjunction with probabilistic and game-theoretical models. In summary, he argued that these computations are difficult, complex, cognitively difficult, and humans simply cannot accurately calculate all of the exact possible outcomes from their choices. Simon (1955) also believed that people would choose the first option that they feel or deem as satisfactory. He gives an example, if a chess player finds a move that leads to a forced mate against the opposing player, they will likely adopt this alternative without worry or thinking if another alternative would lead to a forced mate (Simon, 1955). When in the decision-making process, a person’s “aspiration level” can determine their motivation for a cognitive choice generation (Simon, 1955).

In researching, rational choice, Simon (1955) defines aspiration level as satisfactory alternatives. If a person discovers what they deem as satisfactory alternatives, their aspiration level increases (Simon, 1955). However, if they find that the generation of satisfactory alternatives is difficult, their aspiration level will decrease (Simon, 1955). With a decreased aspiration level, a person may just choose an option to avoid the cognitive difficulty of generating satisfactory alternatives (Simon, 1955). His research essentially supports his idea that humans are cognitively bounded by the choices and options that can generate.

Researchers have also focused on the role of emotions in rational decision making. For example, Wegner and Wheatley (1999) found that what seemed to be deliberative decision-making, may be emotional drives that are later rationalized as a thoughtful decision. Antonio Damasio (1994), a neurologist, researched the role of emotion and affect in decision making. Essentially, Damasio (1993) wanted to know what in the brain made humans act more rationally. He found that thought is made primarily of images that are constructed to contain symbolic and perceptual representations (Damasio, 1994). Through lifelong learning and experience, these images are “marked” with positive and negative feelings (Damasio, 1994; Slovic et al., 2002). When a negative marker is connected to an image of a future outcome, alarm sounds (Damasio, 1994; Slovic et al., 2002). However, when a positive marker is linked to an outcome image, it becomes an incentive (Damasio, 1994; Slovic et al., 2002). While processing this information, it is two different modes of thinking to be used.

There are fundamentally two modes of thinking in behavioral economics, experimental and analytic (Epstein, 1994; Slovic et al., 2002). “The experiential mode is intuitive, automatic, natural, and based upon images to which positive and negative affective feelings have been attached through learning and experience” (Slovic et al., 2002, p. 329). The analytic mode of thinking is reason based and deliberative (Slovic et al., 2002). Slovic et al. (2002), presented a table the differences between the two and argued that the experimental system is holistic, translates reality into images, pain and pleasure oriented and the behavior is mediated by past events and experiences. The analytic system is analytic, logical, reason-oriented, slower processing and necessitates justification for logic and evidence (Slovic et al., 2002). Finucane et al., (2003) believe
these two modes of thinking are continuously active and interacting in what they have called “the dance of affect and reason.” Emotional affect is critical in the process of analytical thinking and the use of rational actions (Slovic et al., 2002).

Affect is defined as, “the specific quality of “goodness” or “badness” (i) experienced as a feeling state (with or without consciousness) and (ii) demarcating a positive or negative quality of a stimulus (Slovic et al., 2002, p. 329). These affect responses happen instantaneously and automatically (Slovic et al., 2002). Even though analysis is vital in some circumstances to make decisions, relying on affect and emotion is faster, simpler and more efficient in a complex and uncertain world (Epstein, 1994; Slovic et al., 2002). The affective features that become most important in a decision-making process or judgment, relies heavily on the characteristics of the person, the task, and the interaction between the two (Slovic et al., 2002). “Tasks differ regarding the evaluability (relative affective salience) of information. These differences result in the affective qualities of a stimulus image being “mapped” or interpreted in diverse ways” (Slovic et al., 2002, p. 332). This mapping of information regulates the input of stimulus images to an individual’s “affect pool” (Slovic et al., 2002). In addition, according to Slovic et al., (2002) not only are people’s minds marked with different amounts of affect, but the affect pool also encompasses all of the negative and positive markers associated with the images, rather conscious or unconscious.

This affect pool is utilized in the process people use to make judgments (Slovic et al., 2002), and using “… the readily available affective impression can be easier and more efficient than weighing the pros and cons of various reasons or retrieving relevant examples from memory, especially when the required judgment or decision is complex or mental resources are limited. Finucane et al., (2000) has labeled this mental short-cut and use of affect a “heuristic.” While using the analytic mode of thinking, individuals tend to make choices based on risk and benefit, which are correlated positively in the world, but negatively in the minds of people (Slovic et al., 2002).

Numerous experiments have conducted tests on risk and benefit. For example, Alhakami and Slovic (1994) conducted a study and found that not only does perceived risk and perceived benefit have an inverse relationship, but the two are linked to the strength of (positive or negative) affect that is associated with that activity. Meaning, people make judgments based on what they think and how they feel about it (Slovic et al., 2002). “If they like an activity, they are moved toward judging the risks as low and the benefits as high; if they dislike it, they tend to judge the opposite— high risk and low benefit” (Slovic et al., 1994, p. 333). Finucane, Alhakami, Slovic and Johnson (2000) also conducted an experiment and found that the inverse relationship between perceived benefit and risk increased greatly under pressure when the chances for analytic deliberation was reduced. “These two experiments are important because they demonstrate that affect influences judgment directly and is not simply a response to a prior analytic evaluation” (Slovic et al., 2002, p. 334). Individual’s analysis of judgment, risk, and benefit come from three traits, bounded rationality, bounded willpower and bounded selfishness (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000).

Mullainathan and Thaler (2000) researched bounded willpower, bounded selfishness, and bounded rationality in relationship to behavioral economics. Judgments, beliefs, and choices can cause a departure from rationality (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000). Even when humans know what the best option is, they fail to do so for self-control reasons, or lack of willpower (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000). For example, humans have saved, exercised or worked to little, drank, eaten, procrastinated
and/or spent too much money (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000). This happens because people are inherently altruistic while focusing on self-interests (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000). Though people will at times do community service, people are selfish and care more about themselves (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000). As mentioned above, Simon (1955) was an early critical of economic models and theories believing that humans had the unlimited cognitive capability to process information. Conlisk (1996) agreed and argued that the failure to include bounded rationality in any theory of economics is rather foolish. “Since we have only so much brainpower, and only so much time, we cannot be expected to solve difficult problems optimally. It is eminently “rational” for people to adopt rules of thumb to economize on cognitive faculties” (Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000, p. 5). Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) argue that because of bounded rationality and cognitive limits, the financial aid system is too complex, and it is difficult for students and family to understand.

Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) published an article titled, The cost of complexity in federal student aid: Lessons from optimal tax theory and behavioral economics. They argue that the financial aid costs and complexities fall on non-white, low-income and non-English speaking students whose lagging education is the continuous justification and citation for financial aid (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006). Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) offered four insights that behavior economics can offer about college attendance and student aid. Specifically, barriers from an economic perspective that could prevent students from attending college.

Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) investigated college attendance and student aid and discussed them from four insights: time inconsistency, loss aversion, default behavior, and identity salience. In researching time and behavioral economics, O’Donoghue and Rabin (1999) found that people are not good when committing to behavior that requires a present sacrifice in the hopes of future returns and payoffs. This view aligns with Mullainathan and Thaler (2000) viewpoint of bounded willpower. People are aware of the right thing to do, but commitment falters when it comes time to complete the task (O’Donoghue & Rabin, 1999; Mullainathan & Thaler, 2000; Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006). From this viewpoint, college is no different. “By its nature, college is an investment: upfront sacrifices are required (tuition, forgone earnings, studying) in order to obtain back-loaded benefits (better job, higher earnings, higher social status)” (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 16). These are an example of what economics and behavioral economics refer to as time-inconsistent preferences (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006).

Kahneman and Tversky (2000) argue that people are loss averse, meaning, they will avoid risky bets, and losses are detrimental than gains. To summarize, a lost dollar will decrease utility more than a gained dollar (Kahneman & Tversky, 2000; Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006). “When it is the gains that are probable and the losses that are certain, this will lead to risk aversion and avoidance of even “good bets.” … Students must apply for aid, give up earnings, pay tuition, and study.” (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 16-17). Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) argue that students do not and cannot know with certainty rather their investment in college will pay off. Though college is a pretty good bet, there is a huge variance in the earning of college graduates, and for some, the college will not pay off (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006). The possibility that college may not pay off may be a deciding factor as to rather a person chooses to go to school due to loss aversion (Dynarski & Scott-Clayton, 2006).
Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988) in their research found that peoples’ decisions are influenced by their “default” course of action. For example, Madrian and Shea (2001) conducted a study where they examined retirement saving at a big financial firm. At this firm, new employees had to check a box to opt-in the 401(k), not checking the box would lead to non-401(k) participation (Madrian & Shea, 2001). Participation was low even though there were low enrollment costs, tax benefits and financial incentives (Madrian & Shea, 2001). The company made a change, opposed to non-participation being the default; participation was the default and employees had to check a box not to participate (Madrian & Shea, 2001). The minor change had a huge effect on behavior and participation increased by 50%. Avery and Kane (2004) tested this with low-income Boston high schoolers and found that very few of them decide against the college. However, there are minor obstacles that prevent college, such as incorrectly filling out a form, missing deadline, etc. (Avery & Kane, 2004). These high schools went through all the deadlines of financial aid and college admission (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006). “By contrast, due to their comparatively weak institutional and social supports, the default option for low-income students is to not go to college. Navigating the maze of college and aid application requires both formal and informal support” (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 18). Most of these students do not have family members that attended college, receive fewer visits from colleges and have fewer counselors per student, so the default behavior is not to attend college (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 18).

Bertrand, Mullainathan, and Shafir (2004) found that programs may discourage participation through self-identification it triggers in people. For example, the food stamp application can induce guilt, alienation, and have negative identifying cues, therefore discouraging participation (Bertrand et al., 2004). Dynarksi and Scott-Clayton (2006) argue that the FASFA is full of these negative identifying cues. As an example, the FASFA asks the applicant if they have ever been convicted of possessing or selling illegal drugs, and if the applicant answers yes, they receiving a message saying “…complete and submit this application, and we will send you a worksheet in the mail for you to determine if your conviction affects your eligibility for aid” (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 18). The last step in submitting the FASFA asks the applicant to sign with a concluding statement, “If you purposely give false or misleading information, you may be fined $20,000, sent to prison, or both” (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006, p. 19). Dynarksi and Scott-Clayton (2006) note that this penalty is almost five times longer than on the IRS 1040 Form. In addition, multiple questions consistently remind low-income students about their poverty and welfare payments (Dynarksi & Scott-Clayton, 2006). Dynarksi and Scott-Clayton (2006) conclude by arguing the financial aid process can be stressful and create anxiety even amongst middle-class applicants.

Affirmative Action and Higher Education

To reiterate, “Affirmative Action” defined by Merriam-Webster (2015), is the practice of improving the educational and job opportunities for members of groups, treated unfairly in the past, because of their race, sex, and such. Cornell Law (2015) broadened the definition and details that affirmative action is a set of procedures designed to eliminate unlawful discrimination between applicants, remedy the results of such prior discrimination, and prevent such discrimination in the future. These applicants could be seeking admission to an educational program or looking for employment. Black’s Law Dictionary (2015) offers a very brief and simple definition of affirmative action as when an employer must consider employing any race or minority that applies
for a job. As a synopsis, all definitions include the concept of improving or at least not restricting the opportunity to an individual or group for employment or educational opportunity.

However, although the affirmative action definition and rationale are easy to understand, it comes with both positive and negative societal responses as evidenced by issues making its way to court. For example, in education, the Supreme Court has upheld affirmative action in the college admissions process to obtain a critical mass (Small & Winship, 2007; Nagourney, 2003; Park, 2015). Now depending on your philosophical position, affirmation action, as well as the court decisions previously presented, could be good or bad.

According to Park (2015), there are two rationales arguing for affirmative action that culminates in structural change. The first is the need to rectify and correct the historical disadvantages and discrimination of people of color. The second is the “need for universities to provide learning environments that facilitate the educational benefits of engaging with a racially diverse student body” (p. 15). Tierney and Chung (2000) contribute to the conversation and add that the policy has been successful, have the ability to erase past discrimination, and without it, higher education becomes less concerned with equity. However, some researchers point out that increasing only structural diversity can produce negative effects on students (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Milem, Chang & Antonio; 2005, Moses & Chang, 2006; Pike & Kuh, 2006). The researchers conclude that negative effects can include increased reporting of discrimination, low perception and decreasing institutional climate and even non-completion regarding graduation rates (Denson & Chang, 2015). Research has shown that the percentage of students of color (African-American and Latina/os, specifically) at 4-year institutions negatively influences the graduation rates (Heck et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2006; Ryan, 2004). Webber and Ehrenberg (2010) also found a negative relationship between enrolled African-American students and graduation rates.

Denson and Chang (2015) conducted a study that examined the relationship between undergraduate student development and cross-racial interaction (CRI). According to Denson and Chang, CRI is the most widely studied in the literature because it well documented in reducing prejudice. It has also been used as it has shown to have a positive impact on student outcomes, has been used as an aggregate measure “(i.e. the institution’s effort to engage students with diversity both formally and informally (p. 3). For example, Bowman (2010) found that a campus environment, if it has higher frequencies of CRI, along with other experiences related to diversity, was associated with gains in cognitive tendencies, cognitive skills, and other cognitive outcomes. Denson and Chang (2015) also found when diversity is reduced to just a number, and there is not focus on CRI or interactional diversity, it can have a negative effect on students. Researching African-American students, Rothman, Lipset and Nevitte (2003) found that structural diversity (measured by the proportion of African-American students) has a negative relationship to several student educational experiences. Specifically, they found that African-American students had a negative relationship to satisfaction with the university experience and perception on educational quality (Rothman et al., 2003). Denson and Chang (2015) adds that “… these negative findings are most likely a result of poor institutional contexts for diversity that affect the quality of interactions (behavioral dimension) and students’ perception of the climate (psychological dimension) and not structural per se” (p. 25). Others have found problems with affirmation action for other reasons.
Some individuals or groups view the issues related to affirmative action as one-sided. Tierney and Chung (2000) suggest that critics of affirmative action will argue, “that the demise of the policy will enable colleges and universities to return to a standard of excellence based on meritocratic norms rather than ones based on social engineering” (p. 247). Other opponents argue that affirmative action can be a form of discrimination against European-Americans and have made it to the popular press. For example, NBC News (2009) reported that several states ended up in court because of European-Americans claim of unfair treatment for protecting and promoting African-Americans and Hispanics. NBC went on to discuss how in South Carolina, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission sued a historically black college on behalf of three European-American faculty members who were allegedly forced from or denied jobs because of their race. Cases have even made it the Supreme Court (Regents of the University of California v. Bakke and the University of Michigan cases). These Supreme Court cases challenge the inherent assumptions of affirmative action and race-conscious admissions practices by arguing reverse discrimination (Park, 2015; Small & Winship, 2007).

In Bakke, a European-American applicant was rejected from a medical school and sued the school and claimed that the special admissions program for racial minorities violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Knowlton, 1978; Seeger, 2016). The special admission program set aside 16% of the seats for disadvantaged students of color. Justice Powell claimed that racial classifications are suspect and insisted that the University of California show that race preferences served a compelling state interest and were necessary for the aid of that interest (Seeger, 2016). The University of California gave the following four justifications:

(i) reducing the historic deficit of traditionally disfavored minorities in medical schools and in the profession; (ii) countering the effects of societal discrimination; (iii) increasing the number of physicians who will practice in communities currently underserved; and (iv) obtaining the educational benefits that flow from an ethnically diverse student body (Regents of the University of California v. Bakke).

Seeger (2016) reported that the court only accepted the fourth as a potential compelling interest, although the University of California’s admissions process was not specifically tailored to that goal. The author continued and explained how rejecting the other justifications, Justice Powell rejected a legal definition of diversity that hinged on structural diversity, arguing that desiring percentage for a racial balance is “discrimination in its own sake” thus constitutionally forbidden. However, Seeger discussed how Justice Powell believed that interactional diversity was necessary to train leaders through the exposure of new ideas and people. Thus, Seeger concluded that Justice Powell distinguished between wanting a certain number of racial minorities, which is not the constitution intent and wanting to use those numbers to create a diverse learning environment for students, is constitutional and compelling.

In 2003, the Supreme Court saw another case this time involving the University of Michigan over affirmative action in college admissions. In Grutter v. Bollinger and its companion case, Gratz v. Bollinger, the European-American applicants challenged the admissions policies at the University of Michigan’s law school and undergraduate program. Barbara Grutter was rejected from University of Michigan’s law school and claimed that the admission policy was unconstitutional. She alleged the institution used race as a [predominate] factor which discriminated against
European-Americans, therefore violating the Fourteenth Amendment. In *Grutter*, Justice O’Connor upheld the law school’s use of race in the admissions processes and stated that in Bakke, “Justice Powell approved the university’s use of race to further only one interest: ‘the attainment or a diverse student body’” (*Grutter v. Bollinger*). *Gratz* involved a challenge to the University of Michigan’s undergraduate program. The University of Michigan ranked each applicant on a 150-point scale with 100 points essentially granting an individual admission. If an applicant either attended a predominately minority disadvantaged high school or belonged to a racial group that had been discriminated against, that resulted in a 20-point bonus. Jennifer Gratz and Patrick Hammacher sued the school as they were denied admission. Justice Rehnquist ruled that the University of Michigan admission point system program was unconstitutional as it is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. Nevertheless, Bowen and Bok (1998) add another level of complexity by arguing against the notion that African-Americans who receive preferential treatment along with academic unpreparedness contributed to the lower success rates in college and could be a different type of discrimination.

Bowen and Bok (1998) published, *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*, which is based on a quantitative analysis of the College and Beyond (C&B) database with approximately 45,000 students at approximately twenty-eight selective institutions. Arguing for affirmative action, they analyzed a subsample and found that without affirmative action, African-American enrollments would decline from 7.1% to 2.1%, and 1.6% at the most rigorous institutions. Bowen and Bok also pointed out that among European-American applicants who scored an average 1331 on the SAT had a 25% admissions rate, compared to 42% for African-American applicants who had an average 1157 SAT score. They found that graduation rates were 86% for European-Americans and 75% of African-Americans. The authors supported these separate standards by arguing that an institution containing a number of different backgrounds, talents and experiences will be a richer learning environment. They also argued against the common criticism of affirmative action that African-American students that are academically underprepared do not graduate because they cannot handle the rigorous education or competition at institutions and should attend second-tier schools. Bowen and Bok (1998) pointed out and found data that proved otherwise and established that African-American students with similar SAT scores not only graduate at a higher rate but report a greater confidence at elite schools that less prestigious schools. They state, “Even those black students in the lowest SAT band graduated at higher rates the more selective the school they attended” (p. 61). Agreeing, Small and Winship (2006) conducted a study and found that as the institutions’ selectivity increases, so will the admitted African-American graduation rate. The authors also discuss some of the implications of a class-based admission policy and point out that the pool of European-American students from low socioeconomic backgrounds is six times more than that of African-American students. Bowen and Bok (1998) discussed substituting affirmative action for a class-based system but commented this “would drastically reduce the quality of the eligible pool of African-American and Hispanic applicants” (p. 51) and conclude with presenting Harvard University and Princeton University as examples of a solid scholarly argument that affirmative action does work.
University Size in Relationship to Graduation

The relationship of institutional size and degree attainment has produced mixed research results. For example, Nelson (1966) found that smaller colleges and universities have higher graduation rates. However, Kamens (1971) found that larger institutions have higher graduation rates. Rock, Centra and Linn (1970) researched suggests that smaller institutions have students more likely to achieve due to the higher levels of institutional income per student. Yet, Tinto (1975) found that both smaller and larger institutions can be successful in student persistence but for different reasons. Smaller colleges may be successful due to the smaller class sizes and increased student–faculty interactions, therefore directly affecting the student’s grades, persistence and intellectual development (Tinto, 1975). “The larger institution, normally more heterogeneous in student composition, may enhance persistence through its ability to provide for a wider variety of student subcultures and, therefore, through its effect upon social integration into the institution” (Tinto, 1975, p. 116).

Cuseo (2007) adding to the previous research and examine class size in relationship to retention. The author asserts that there are eight conceptual arguments against large class sizes according to the empirical evidence:

(1) increased faculty reliance on the lecture method of instruction
(2) less active student involvement in the learning process
(3) reduced frequency of instructor interaction with and feedback to students
(4) reduced depth of student thinking inside the classroom
(5) reduced breadth and depth of course objectives, course assignments, and course-related learning strategies used by students outside the classroom
(6) lower levels of academic achievement (learning) and academic performance (grades)
(7) reduced overall course satisfaction with the learning experience
(8) lower student ratings (evaluations) of course instruction (Cuseo, 2007, p. 2).

One may raise the question; what number is small? Cuseo found that most studies have compared higher-class sizes to (example, 50 and higher) and compared them to lower class sizes (example, 25 and lower). As a result, these studies have not concluded a linear relationship between class size and positive educational outcomes. The author admits that additional research is necessary to see if there is an exact threshold number where educators can magnify the documented benefits of small class size. In the end, Cuseo, after reviewing the literature agreed with other researchers who found that the ideal class size would be 15 (see Barefoot, 1993; Centra & Creech, 1976; Fischer & Grant, 1983; Light, 2001; Marsh, 1987, NCTE Guideline, 2004; NEA, 2003).

Light (2001) conducted in-depth interviews with over 1600 undergraduate students and found that the students who had at least one smalls class size was more engaged in the college experience. The researcher asked the students what they believed “small” and the most common response was “fifteen or fewer people” (p. 45). Fischer and Grant (1983) found that in smaller class sizes, small defined as 15 or fewer people, student thinking in relation to faculty-posed questions was higher than in larger class sizes. Research has also shown that student course evaluations are higher in class of 15 or less (Barefoot, 1993; Centra & Creech, 1976; Marsh, 1987). The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) has an official statement that the optimal class size is 15 or fewer
students in college writing, and in developmental writing or remedial courses, maximum is 15 (NCTE Guideline, 2004). Lastly, the National Education Association officially recommends a class size of 15 for pre-college level students (NEA, 2003).

**Tuition Cost and Education Outcomes**

There has been interesting research investigating tuition costs to educational outcomes, specifically, graduation and institutional expenditures (Blose, Porter & Kokkelengerg, 2006; Porter, 2000; Ryan, 2004). Ryan (2004) found that instructional expenditures, academic support expenses, the cost of living on campus have a positive effect on graduation. Importantly, instructional and academic support expenditures are critical as they may provide addition support for student involvement and engagement that increases student retention. Yet, Smart, Ethington, Riggs and Thompson (2002) found that instructional expenditures had a negative effect on student leadership abilities. However, they did find that expenditures for student services and activities had a positive effect on the student.

Zhang (2008) taking the research in a slightly different direct, investigated the relationship between state funding and graduation rates. Zhang did find results similar to the previous research (see Blose et al., 2006; Porter, 2000; Ryan, 2004) but argues for the importance of State appropriations. In short, the author strongly suggests that the amount of State appropriations will determine graduation rates. Zhang (2008) makes the parallel between State appropriations and resource dependency. The researcher highlights that when institutional organizational activities are dependent upon external resources, a decline in State appropriations will likely lead to a reduction in institutional expenditures. However, Zhang clarified that it is unlikely that public colleges and universities can fully compensate for the reduction in State appropriations without internal fund allocation.

Garibaldi, Giavazzi, Ichino and Rettore (2012) examined college cost and degree completion. To summarize, their research suggests that if colleges and universities were to raise their tuition costs past normal degree completion that the probability of prolonged gradation would decrease (Garibaldi et al., 2012). The researchers argue that:

if an institution was to raise their tuition cost to $1000 Euro (approximately $1113.10 Dollars) in the last regular year of the program, it will “…have a negative causal effect on the probability of late graduation as large as 5.2 percentage points, in a context in which the average probability of late graduation is 80%” (Garibaldi et al., 2012, p. 710).

However, Garibaldi et al., (2012) suggest this is a positive outcome since students will complete their degree faster without affecting the quality of education received.

**Summary and Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is important to review some of the pertinent points made in the above discussion. Starting between 1900 – 1950 most African-American students attended only historically black colleges and universities, known as HBCU’s; while a small number attended PWI’s (Wechsler et
Within ten years, the number of African-American students at black colleges and universities leaped six times from 2,132 in 1917 to 13,580 in 1927 while the numbers of African-American students attending PWI’s grew very little (Wechsler et al., 2007). After years of mistreatment and a lack of mobility for blacks, this prompted the start of the Civil Rights Movement in 1954, the same year as the landmark case, Brown v. Board of Education (Morris, 1986; Omi & Winant, 2014; Rosenstone & Hansen, 2009; Tarrow & Tollefson, 1994). Through the Civil Rights movement came Affirmative Action, which was implemented under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and focused on the employment of blacks (Egerton, 1995).

This review also elaborated on HBCU’s, white paternalism, the Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois approach to education as well as the role HBCU’s had in the social stratification of blacks and the door to social mobility (Wechsler et al., 2007). White philanthropy, funding, and curriculum of HBCU’s affected the educational destiny and perspectives of many African-Americans (Wechsler et al., 2007). This could not be clearer that the controversy between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois (Wechsler et al., 2007). Booker T. Washington, a graduate of the Hampton Institute, established his own school on the Hampton model in Tuskegee, Alabama, which was encouraged and supported by White Northern philanthropists and Southern politicians (Wechsler et al., 2007). W.E.B. Dubois was a liberal arts graduate from Fisk University and Harvard University (Alridge, 2008; Broderick, 1958; Du Bois, 1976). He argued against Washington’s industrial model for educating African-Americans according to ability and continued political advancement against segregationists and Southern laws and customs (Alridge, 2008; Broderick, 1958; Du Bois, 1976). HBCU’s produced a highly educated African-Americans that had assimilated into a middle-class Anglo-Protestant culture, which was the goal of their missionary founders, (Wechsler et al., 2007). Since African-Americans assimilated into the Anglo-Protestant culture, many African-Americans felt it was their duty to hand this knowledge and information to uneducated and uncultured African-Americans (Miller, 1905). This placed the educated African-American elites at odds with the people they pledged to uplift, a tension that has lasted well into the civil rights and beyond (Gaines, 2012; Wechsler et al., 2007). After discussing HBCU’s, this review discussed marketing in higher education.

For colleges and universities to create and effective institutional identify, a strategic marketing plan is a critical component and should be a part the mission (Hesel, 2004; Keller, 1983). The college must know the audience they are trying to market to (Barefoot, 2008). Thacker (2007) believes that colleges and universities use unethical practices to recruit students and increase their institutional rank. He also argues that the college admissions process has become commercialized and created a crisis that now undermines educational values (Thacker, 2007). The review then discussed African-American student success at PWI’s v. HBCU’s.

African-American students attending HBCU’s tend to have lower GPA’s and standardized test scores (i.e. ACT and SAT) than African-Americans attending PWI’s (Gurin & Epps, 1975; Kim, 2002; Nettles & Thoeny, 1988). African-American students from HBCU’s tend to come from families with lower socioeconomic statuses than their peers at PWI’s (Allen, 1992; Kim, 2002). PWI’s have greater resources, higher academically ranked faculty, available academic programs and opportunities for advanced study than at HBCU’s (Kim & Conrad, 2006). Yet, Allen (1992), Ross (1998) and Wells-Lawson (1994) found that African-American students tend to have more frequent and meaningful interactions with African-American and European-American faculty at...
HBCU’s than PWI’s; while Wenglinsky (1996) found no significant difference in student-faculty interactions at HBCU’s and PWI’s. Fischer (2007) found that African-Americans are successful at HBCU’s because they take a hands-on approach to student success. Fischer (2007) reported that due to the lower academically credentialed, low-income and first-generation student profile, HBCU’s have implemented, “early academic interventions, other strategies, like “freshmen-orientation” courses, small classes, and generous financial-aid packages” (p. 2). When examining the research of African-Americans at PWI’s, studies have been very consistent that African-American students tend to feel socially isolated, discriminated against, aggression and a sense of “belonging-within-alienation” (Brower & Ketterhagen, 2004). Researchers have found that African-American students at PWI’s feel connected to other students with similar racial and ethnic backgrounds while the entire group feels alienated from the entire campus (Bristow, 2002; Gloria, Kurpius, Hamilton & Wilson, 1999; Loo & Rolison, 1986). This review then detailed the two theories used for the theoretical framework, Behavioral Economics Theory and Affirmative Action.

As a foundation for this discussion, behavioral economic theory was used to serve as the framework. Hursh (1984), defined behavioral economics as a science of behavior, albeit highly organized behavior of humans. According to Camerer and Loewenstein (2004), behavioral economics classifies research into two categories, choice, and judgment. Judgment investigates the process individuals will use to estimate probabilities (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004). Choice deals with the processes individuals use to pick among actions, factoring in any relevant judgments those individuals have made (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2004).

This review elaborated on the role of emotions in rational decision making and the two modes of thinking in behavioral economics. In investigating emotion and rational decision making, Wegner and Wheatley (1999) found that what seemed to be deliberative decision-making, may be emotional drives that are later rationalized as a thoughtful decision. Epstein (1994) and Slovic et al., (2002) found there are two modes of thinking in behavioral economics, experimental and analytic. “The experiential mode is intuitive, automatic, natural, and based upon images to which positive and negative affective feelings have been attached through learning and experience” (Slovic et al., 2002, p. 329). The analytic mode of thinking is reason based and deliberative (Slovic et al., 2002).

Before examining affirmative action, Cornell Law (2015) defined it as a set of procedures designed to eliminate unlawful discrimination between applicants, remedy the results of such prior discrimination, and prevent such discrimination in the future. According to Park (2015), there are two rationales arguing for affirmative action that culminates in structural change. The first is the need to rectify and correct the historical disadvantages and discrimination of people of color. The second is the “need for universities to provide learning environments that facilitate the educational benefits of engaging with a racially diverse student body” (p. 15). Tierney and Chung (2000) suggest that critics of affirmative action will argue, “that the demise of the policy will enable colleges and universities to return to a standard of excellence based on meritocratic norms rather than ones based on social engineering” (p. 247). This review then discussed a few Supreme Court cases (Regents of the University of California v. Bakke and the University of Michigan cases). These Supreme Court cases challenge the inherent assumptions of affirmative action and race-
conscious admissions practices by arguing reverse discrimination (Park, 2015; Small & Winship, 2007).

This review also examined the research on university size in relationship to graduation. The relationship of institutional size and degree attainment has produced mixed research results. For example, Gordon Nelson (1966) found that smaller colleges and universities have higher graduation rates. However, Kamens (1971) found that larger institutions have higher graduation rates. Rock et al., (1970) research suggests that smaller institutions have students more likely to achieve due to the higher levels of institutional income per student. Yet, Tinto (1975) found that both smaller and larger institutions can be successful in student persistence but for different reasons. Smaller colleges may be successful due to the smaller class sizes and increased student–faculty interactions, therefore directly affecting the student’s grades, persistence and intellectual development (Tinto, 1975). The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) says in an official statement that the optimal class size is 15 or fewer students in college writing, and in developmental writing or remedial courses, maximum is 15 (NCTE Guideline, 2004). In addition, the National Education Association officially recommends a class size of 15 for pre-college level students (NEA, 2003).

Lastly, this review touched upon tuition cost and education outcomes. Ryan (2004) found that instructional expenditures, academic support expenses, the cost of living on campus have a positive effect on graduation. Smart et al., (2002) found that instructional expenditures had a negative effect on student leadership abilities. However, they did find that expenditures for student services and activities had a positive effect on the student. Zhang (2008) taking the research in a slightly different direct, investigated the relationship between state funding and graduation rates. Zhang (2008) found results similar to the previous research (see Blose et al., 2006; Porter, 2000; Ryan, 2004), but argues and supports the need for State appropriations. In short, Zhang (2008) suggests that the amount of State appropriations will determine graduation rates.

In conclusion, it is clear from this review of the literature that there is a paucity of research specifically addressing the pragmatic concerns of African-American students while enrolled college in terms of graduation probability and Return On Investment (ROI). Although the literature review documents that African-American enrollment rates are increasing, the reality remains that African-American graduation rates have not increased for the general population.

This reported discrepancy in anticipated improvement in graduation rates is compounded given the cited research findings that detail African-American families earn 42% less than European-American families and have an unemployment rate of approximately 15%, almost double that of the European-American family.

Consequently, the literature reviews as presented highlights the practical gap and conceptual concerns for African-American students when selecting a college to attend, given the probability of graduation and future earning potential. Thus, the overall purpose of this study is to investigate if there is a type of institution that provides the best opportunity for African-American student success, both academically and financially given the cost of high education and the anticipated Return On Investment.
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Eleanor Roosevelt once said, “Understanding is a two-way street.” If asked to amend Roosevelt’s quote to reflect how critical partnership is to fundraising—I would say, “Fundraising is a two-way street with one car and two drivers; one person has all the gas, while the other has the steering wheel.”

According to the Council for Aid to Education 2017 Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey, “higher-education institutions raised $43.6 billion,” the largest ever counted since the inaugural survey in 1957. Each new semester brings the need for new and enhanced programs, technology upgrades and more physical space. Capital campaigns with monetary goals of $1 billion or more no longer are jaw-dropping aspirations, but the norm in higher education. A growing number of colleges and universities are complementing standard fundraising methods—in-person visits, grant writing, direct mail appeals—with the strategic use of Facebook, Twitter, and other social media platforms to cultivate donors, engage alumni and raise money. Yet, the hesitance to partners with campus development offices still exists among some program managers and faculty.

As a fundraising professional with more than 20 years of experience, I have seen great programs disappear due to a lack of external funding and lackluster fundraising. Likewise, I have seen good fundraisers leave campuses because they failed to make connections beyond a small scope of familiar programs, faculty, and staff. Students—particularly those who come to our campuses with scant resources—depend on effective partnerships of development offices, faculty and program managers to provide scholarship opportunities, sustain existing programs, and enhance facilities. And while successful fundraising does not always uncover the millionaire next door, zero effort always produce zero yield.

Before reaching out to development staffers, it is always good for program managers, principal investigators and faculty to remember a few key things:

- **Understand that the money does not roll in overnight.** Simply stating your needs does not make the money instantly appear. A commitment to fundraising is a commitment to the time it takes to build a donor’s trust and to help them realize how they can positively impact others.

- **Know how your programs work and understand the budgets behind them.** It always surprises development officers when a faculty member or program manager eagerly
pursues an in-person meeting but is unable to justify the budget behind their need. Stand ready to answer questions on project goals, outcomes, students served and long-term funding. Your development officers can only advocate for your project if they understand why it is important to the campus community.

- **Realize the work is a shared responsibility.** Development officers realize that their campus colleagues often are overwhelmed and that certain times of the academic year are impossibly busy. In turn, they realize that campus partners may only be able to devote a few hours a month to fundraising. Be realistic and clear about the amount of time you can give.

- **It’s not about you and it is not personal.** You may, indeed, be an expert in your field. Yet, you may find you are a neophyte when it comes to donor cultivation and solicitation strategies. While the onus to provide tools to build your fundraising acumen is on the development office, a willingness to be the student and a respect for the development officer’s expertise is necessary.

Once you are committed to being a fundraising partner, there are simple steps you can take to aid engagement:

- **Connect with your development officer.** Often, development officers are assigned to specific schools or colleges. Peruse the development office or foundation Web page to see who represents your area or program. Sometimes, the assigned officer may be an alumna (us) of your school. Extend an invitation to meet to learn more about the university’s fundraising priorities, upcoming events, and possible fundraising opportunities, and to showcase your area’s key research, awards and publications, and standout scholars. Investigate opportunities for development staff members to occasionally attend your department or staff meetings.

- **Once you know the calendar of events, attend a few.** Scholarship and friend-raising events are ideal ways to meet some of the university’s major donors and donor prospects. Additionally, these gatherings provide opportunities for faculty and staff to share success stories and other valuable information. But remember not to “go rogue,” as it may be detrimental to the donor relationship. If you encounter donors who are eager to learn more about your area, let them know you will work with your development officer to arrange a meeting or tour; this allows time for the development of solid cultivation and solicitation strategies.

- **Create a development plan that reflects the broader institutional fundraising priorities.** Successful fundraising emerges from the co-dependence between faculty/staff and development officer. Gain insight on campus-wide fundraising, while giving counsel to your development officer’s advocacy efforts. Additionally, department plans that reflect the institution’s priorities offer donors a unified philanthropic vision.

- **Take advantage of training programs.** Fundraising is about more than an ask for money; it involves relationship building, trust, measured strategies, and analytics. Development
offices and institutionally-related foundations often offer training for faculty, deans and program managers interested in acquiring or enhancing their skill sets. Afterwards, participants have a better understanding of the fundraising process and can better sync their individual talents with that of their development professional.

- **Herald your success.** Department and program Web pages cannot showcase every accomplishment. Routinely share student, staff and faculty success stories with development officers. Often, heralded students and stories become focal points at special events and donor publications. The more visibility you gain, the more your initiatives are at the forefront of a donor’s scope of knowledge.

- **Follow your school, department and/or program on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter.** In addition to learning the most up-to-date information about your area, you also can see who is interested in your work. Is that well-connected alumni following your school’s page? Connect with your development officer to discuss engagement opportunities.

- **Consider being available for donor visits.** Proactively share your interest in visiting with donors on and off campus or at alumni hubs out-of-state. Development officers welcome the expertise and experiences that only faculty and project leads can bring to the conversation.

The need for external funding in higher education has never been greater. Remember, partnering for fundraising success is not solely about a donor’s legacy; it is about yours, as well. So—go ahead and take the wheel.
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