Appendix A: Note on Research Method

Numerous tools are needed to assess black studies’ political and organizational development. Although the black student movement of the late 1960s is well known, it has not received the same coverage from historians and social scientists as the civil rights movement or other 1960s movements such as the Vietnam War protesters. Therefore, researchers investigating black studies’ social or administrative history must consult bureaucratic archives, student newspapers, and other sources of information. In addition to textual sources, interviews provide information not found in archival files and published sources. This is especially important, given that university departments inconsistently donate their records to archives. Often, interviews are the only method for collecting information on university decision making that took place in the distant past.

To collect information about black studies programs, I consulted published sources on well-known programs, historical treatments, first-person accounts of student activism, and higher education reference books, such as the College Board’s *Index of College Majors*. I also spoke to people who had been involved with black studies programs as proponents or critics. I consulted various reports issued by black studies programs, government offices, and nonprofit groups that were available in university libraries. These documents and discussions helped me develop a rough view of black studies’ history and an understanding of the field that suggested lines for research.

Some research questions were easily answered with existing data. For instance, a natural question concerns the number of universities that have black studies programs. Higher education reference books provide a convenient list of black studies programs. Other questions required slightly more effort. For example, chapter 6 answers a question about student protest and program creation with data culled from newspapers, government databases, and other public data sources. The most demanding data collection task in that case was calling program chairs to ask about the age of their program.

However, most of this book uses data that I collected myself or that was stored in archives. In some cases, this data was easy to collect. For example, Chapter 6 discusses attitudes among black studies professors. To collect this data, I created a roster of all black studies professors and asked every one of them to complete a questionnaire using their Web browser. There is little to distinguish the Survey of Issues in Africana Studies from any other survey, except for its use of Web-based survey technology. Similarly, when I chose to interview retired Ford Foundation officers, most of them were willing to speak at great length about their careers and their relationship to black studies.
In other cases, there was great difficulty in obtaining data. My requests for interviews were often ignored or rejected. There were instances when a person I wanted to contact could not be found or had died. In a few cases, interviewees reacted negatively to my questions.

Perhaps the most challenging issue is the use of archival sources. Some archives were easy to find and use. The Ford Foundation archives, which I used extensively in writing chapter 5, are unusual in that they are well known and well maintained. After reading the foundation’s reports on black studies, I learned that the foundation had extensive records of their support for the field. The Ford Foundation preserves huge amounts of materials, maintains excellent records, and employs a highly efficient computer system for filing and tracking documents. Furthermore, the Ford Foundation archives are extensively used by foundation staff and external researchers, which means that the archives’ staff makes retrieving and viewing documents a painless task.

In contrast, many times I visited a university only to find that the archives contained nearly nothing about the campus’s black studies program. Librarians informed me that academic departments do not regularly deposit papers; records are left at the discretion of individual faculty members. Therefore, it was through sheer luck that I was able to build the document collection I would need. I learned about the federal government’s collection of Third World Strike documents while looking for minority college enrollment reports on a federal government Web site. The Grace Holt Papers, which provide extensive information about the Department of African American Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, came to my attention only when I spoke to Darnell Hawkins, a professor emeritus and former chair of the program. Similarly, many individuals knew about document caches at various archives and were generous enough to point me in the right direction. The existence of a few collections is not public yet because the library holding the papers has not had time to file and sort the donated documents. I learned about these only because librarians and archivists were kind enough to tell me about them and grant me access.

It is worth mentioning the nature of the bureaucratic documents. Organizations in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s were very good at documenting their activities. In the post–World War II era, office procedures routinely encouraged individuals to make multiple copies of anything important and to distribute them widely. It was not unusual to find copies of the same memorandum in archives as far apart as California, Texas, and New York. I found that the quality and quantity of an organization’s documentation decreased as offices became electronic and people communicated more frequently by telephone in the 1980s and 1990s. The shift to electronic communication and computerized document storage caused some documents to disappear as organizations aged. I often found pre-1980 telephone messages that were retained as vital records of intraorganizational contacts. In the 1980s, retaining phone message slips became rare because phone messages were stored electronically or recorded on disposable slips of paper, and such records are rarely archived.

Second, there is a concern that documents might depict an unusually positive or negative aspect of an organization or person. To counter some of this bias, I tried to interview key individuals and compare different sources. For example, chapter 5 discusses conflicts among the King Center, the Institute for the Black World, and the Ford Foundation. In interviewing the leader of the institute and various foundation officers, I found that they agreed on the facts of the matter, although there was still disagree-
ment over the merit of certain policies. In general, I found that archival sources provided accounts of events that were fairly consistent with newspapers and informants’ recollections. Because I was looking at educational policy decisions and public events such as student sit-ins, there was usually agreement over facts but disagreement over whether the facts were good or bad. Only when I asked informants for very specific details, such as what happened at a particular meeting or conference thirty years ago, did I find discrepancies between interviews and published sources. For example, Nathan Hare told me that newspapers sometimes incorrectly reported the details of specific conflicts at San Francisco State College. In one case, he agreed that he had engaged in a public argument with the college’s president, but he was not accompanied by twenty supporters, as had been reported in the student newspaper. Rather, he was accompanied by four other people.

Finally, it is worth discussing how I personally affected the research process. I am Latino and am not of African or African American heritage. This may have inhibited my access to certain people. It is quite possible that some individuals were not willing to speak with me because of my Latino surname or my appearance. I was asked numerous times why a nonblack would ever find black studies worthy of attention. I explained that the field is an important aspect of higher education that deserves more attention. I also explained that the black student movement raised important issues and was undervalued in most accounts of the late 1960s. Usually, people responded well to this explanation. I was interacting with highly educated people accustomed to thinking about social change in abstract terms, so my inquiries were probably not viewed as inappropriate. It is also possible that since I am a nonwhite person, some respondents may not have viewed me as negatively as they would a white researcher interested in black activism.

Appendix B: Archives Consulted


Black Panther Party Harlem Branch Collection. Location: Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library. 515 Malcolm X Boulevard, New York, NY 10037-1801. Description: These papers were deposited by Cheryl Foster, a member of the Harlem branch of the Black Panther Party. Contains Panther documents as well as personal materials describing the daily life of a committed Black Panther.

Dean of the College Papers, University of Chicago. Location: Special Collections, University of Chicago Library. 1100 East 57th St., Chicago, IL 60637. Description: Miscellaneous documents about the College of the University of Chicago. One folder on the evolution of the Committee of African and African American Studies.

Ford Foundation Archives. Location: Ford Foundation Headquarters. 320 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017. Description: The foundation keeps records of all grants. It also keeps the papers of the Ford Foundation presidents and selected vice presi-
students as well as other documents such as consultant reports, internal evaluations, and files on various topics. The archives are accessible to academic researchers. The only restriction on this collection is that researchers are not allowed to use active files, those less than ten years old, and files on topics that are under litigation. None of the files I consulted fell into these categories. I examined the following files: the papers of President McGeorge Bundy, the papers of Vice President Howard Howe II, the grant files of thirty grant recipients (see chapter 5), numerous internal reports, four external consultant reports, the miscellaneous file on black studies applicants, the foundation’s internal oral histories, and thirty years of the foundation’s annual reports. In total, I studied thousands of pages of documents.

Ewart Guinier. Papers. Location: Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library. 515 Malcolm X Boulevard, New York, NY 10037-1801. Description: The personal papers of lawyer, labor activist, and academic Ewart Guinier. These papers relate to Guinier’s personal and professional activities. Of importance to this project are folders containing materials on Guinier’s tenure as the chair of the Harvard University Department of African and African American Studies. Researchers have access to all pertinent documents.

Grace Holt. Papers. Location: University Library, the University of Illinois at Chicago. 801 S. Morgan, M/C 234. Description: The personal papers of Dr. Grace Holt, linguist and first chair of the Department of Black Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago. All papers, except those with individual student evaluations, open to the public.

Institute of the Black World Papers. Location: Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library. 515 Malcolm X Boulevard, New York, NY 10037-1801. Description: These papers contain administrative and academic materials about the Institute of the Black World. The papers have not been sorted or cataloged as of this time.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Records and other papers from the Johnson Administration. Location: Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library at the University of Texas, Austin. Description: In 1968, President Lyndon Johnson established a federal commission to examine urban riots and college protests. The commission collected vast amounts of material on the Third World Strike so they could write the book Shut It Down! A College in Crisis (1970, Aurora Press). As government documents, the materials were deposited at Johnson's library. They are open to the public. The Johnson library also has other documents related to black power groups, the FBI’s surveillance of these groups, and citizens’ responses to black power.

National Council for Black Studies Papers. Location: Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library. 515 Malcolm X Boulevard, New York, NY 10037-1801. Description: A small collection of papers deposited by the National Council for Black Studies. The collection includes survey reports and position papers on various contentious issues in the history of black studies, such as the dispute over the promotion of Harvard professor Dr. Ephraim Isaac.

Third World Strike Collection. Location: Special Collections, Paul J. Leonard Library, San Francisco State University. 1630 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132. Description: Assorted materials on the protests of the late 1960s at San Francisco State College. Accessible by appointment with special collections librarian.
Appendix C: Newspapers Consulted

The following periodicals were consulted. They are available at university research libraries, except where noted:

- **Black Liberator**
- **Chicago Maroon** (available at the University of Chicago Main Library microfilm room)
- **Crisis**
- **Daily Gater/Gater** (available at the microfilm room of the Paul Leonard Library at San Francisco State University)
- **Illini** and **Commuter Illini** (available at the special collections room at the library of the University of Illinois at Chicago)
- **Los Angeles Times**
- **Negro Digest**
- **Newsweek**
- **New York Times**
- **San Francisco Chronicle**
- **San Francisco Examiner**

Appendix D: People Interviewed by the Author

I conducted nineteen in-depth interviews to supplement the documentary record. They included interviews with one former Ford Foundation officer and seven former black studies chairs who wished to be anonymous. I also spoke to numerous other people about black studies in informal settings. This is the list of informants who gave me permission to identify them:

Appendix E: Sample Interview Questions

Since each person I interviewed had a different role in the evolution of black studies, I opted for a “semistructured” interview format. I wrote open-ended questions that allowed respondents to provide detailed information. Then, I followed up with questions specific to their circumstances. Here are sample interview questions for program officers who worked for the Ford Foundation and for the program chairs who received foundation grants.

The Ford Foundation and Black Studies: Questions for Program Officers

Instructions: I would be grateful if you could answer these questions about black studies and the Ford Foundation.

1. Could you briefly describe your association with the Ford Foundation? How did you come to work for the Ford Foundation?
2. Were you involved in administering grants, or did you work at the executive level?
3. What kind of work were you doing when black studies emerged on college campuses in the late 1960s?
4. What role did you have in awarding, administering, or evaluating grants for black studies programs?
5. When black studies programs were founded in the late 1960s, many critics thought...
that they were fads or were destined for failure. Did you agree or disagree with these criticisms?

6. What did program officers or other Ford administrators think about the status of black studies as an academic discipline?

7. How did Ford Foundation officers, such as yourself, evaluate the uncertain status of the field?

8. Who were the strongest advocates of black studies within the foundation?

9. Were there significant differences in support for black studies between program officers and executives such as Harold Howe II and McGeorge Bundy? If so, could you say a few words about these differences?

10. What criteria did program officers and administrators use in awarding grants to black studies programs?

11. How did program officers choose programs to fund? Did foundation officers develop new criteria specific to black studies, or did they use preexisting criteria developed for other projects? If the latter is true, what projects provided models for the selection of black studies grants?

12. How did the awards to black studies programs fit in with the larger goals of the Ford Foundation?

13. One goal of the foundation was to promote the status of minorities in higher education. Were the grants to black studies programs considered a part of that project? How did the grants fit in with other Ford Foundation projects?

14. What criteria were used in evaluating the success of a grant? If possible, could you describe a grant that was considered successful and one that was problematic?

The Ford Foundation and Black Studies: Questions for Black Studies Program Chairs

Who Received Ford Foundation Grants

Instructions: I would be grateful if you could answer these questions about black studies and the Ford Foundation.

1. Could you briefly describe your educational background?

2. Could you discuss how you became the chair of the black studies program at ____?

3. Were you involved in the submission of a grant application to the Ford Foundation? If so, why did you choose to submit a grant to the Ford Foundation?

4. Why did you think the Ford Foundation chose to fund your program?

5. Did foundation funding help legitimize your program within the university?

6. Did foundation funding draw attention to your program from outside the university?

7. Were there any other responses to the foundation’s sponsorship of your program?

8. Did foundation funding help the program survive its early years? How so?

9. Do you have any other comments on the foundation’s sponsorship of your program?

Appendix F: Interviews Collected by Others

President Lyndon B. Johnson established the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to examine urban riots and campus revolts. During their investigation of the Third World Strike, the commission conducted interviews with the fol-
lowing individuals, which I consulted in writing this book. These are to be found in Box 13 of the commission’s papers at the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library in Austin, Texas. These interviews were collected in the fall of 1968 and the spring of 1969. There is also a collection of anonymous interviews with about fifty students and other staff members in the commission papers that I examined. Here is the list of people whose interview transcripts I consulted:

Boyd, Ron. Student activist.
DeBerry, Clyde. Faculty member at San Francisco State College.
Dellums, Ron. Former congressman from Berkeley, California.
Garrett, James. Black Student Union leader in 1966 at San Francisco State College.
Goodlett, Carlton. Psychologist and black activist. Friend of the black student strikers.
Hare, Nathan. Activist and sociologist. Was supposed to become first black studies chair at San Francisco State College.
Johnson, Wesley F. Physician and black community leader.
Oliver, James John. KQED reporter. He was injured during the strike.
Ridley, Rip. Student activist.
Salop, Claire. Staff member at San Francisco State College.
Westbrooks, Elouise. Community relations staff member at San Francisco State College.

Appendix G: Quantitative Data Used

Chapters 5 and 6 use statistical evidence. The analysis of Ford Foundation grant patterns uses data on applicants collected from a document called “Ford Foundation Central Index. Index of rejected applications in General Correspondence under term ‘Afro-American Studies.’ 1969–1971.” Data on the entire population of American colleges and universities comes from the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) and the Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS). These data sets contain information from the National Center for Education Statistics yearly surveys and are available from the electronic archive www.icpsr.umich.edu.


Chapter 6 analyzed biographical and academic data on black studies professors. This was drawn from personal and department Web sites. The exception was doctoral degree data, which was obtained from Dissertation Abstracts International. I conducted the Survey of Issues in Africana Studies in 2004–2005 through the Indiana University Center for Survey Research Web site. Two hundred professors answered at least one question, and about 160 answered all questions in the survey. Appendix H describes this study in more detail.
Appendix H: The Survey of Issues in Africana Studies

The Survey of Issues in Africana Studies collected data on the attitudes, backgrounds, perceptions, social contacts, and pedagogical practices of African American/Africana studies (AAS) professors. The survey focused on five issues: (1) What is the demographic composition of the AAS professoriat? (2) How do AAS professors view their own field and African American issues in general? How do AAS professors feel about their own departments? (3) What is the professional background of an AAS professor? Are most of them social scientists or humanities scholars? How many AAS professors are appointed only in AAS, and how many have joint appointments? (4) What books are considered “canon” in AAS? Are canonical books assigned in AAS classes? What determines whether a text is canonical AAS? (5) With whom do AAS professors interact? In what kinds of academic networks do AAS professors participate?

Methods

The survey instrument asked respondents about their demographic characteristics, attitudes, pedagogical practices, and social networks. To help develop questions for the survey, I also discussed my research goals with AAS program chairs and colleagues. In these discussions, I developed a sense of the pressing issues in AAS and the texts that might be considered “classics” in the field.

In the fall of 2003 and winter of 2004, a list was compiled of every single degree-granting AAS program in the United States. I included bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degree programs in my study, as well as any program listed as “Africana studies,” “African American studies,” “Afro-American studies,” “black studies,” “black world studies,” and “Pan-African/a studies.” Higher education reference guides, such as the College Board’s Index of College Majors, were used to create the list. I focused on degree-granting programs because they are stable, independent academic units with curricula leading to a recognized AAS degree. There are other forms of AAS, such as nondegree courses of study or concentrations within other degree programs. For the purposes of this study, I focused on the most institutionalized forms of AAS with free-standing instructional units, professors of AAS, and at least a major course of study.

A list of every person who teaches in a degree-granting AAS program was created by downloading the faculty roster from every program’s Web site. When there was no Web site, we contacted the program’s office or the course catalog for a faculty listing. We found 866 individuals who were AAS professors. Later, we found that some of these individuals had retired or were deceased or that the listing was in error. This reduced the number of AAS professors to 855.

From March 2004 to January 2005, I attempted to contact all these individuals through e-mail, letters, and, in a few cases, phone calls. I also placed an advertisement in the newsletter of the National Council for Black Studies and posted messages to the “H-Afro” electronic mailing list. At the time of this writing, 220 individuals have responded to the survey by logging in to the survey Web site. Two hundred respondents answered at least one question (24 percent). One hundred eighty-five individuals reached the end of the survey (23 percent), and more completed large portions of the survey. This response rate is typical for a survey of employees within an organization, such as a university, which yields response rates between 20 and 40 percent, and for a
survey conducted through e-mail and Web browsers.¹ The response rate is also typical of a target population composed primarily of an ethnic minority.²

Individuals were asked to use their Web browser to complete the survey on the Indiana University Web site at www.africanasurvey.indiana.edu. Interested readers were directed to the Web site if they wanted to examine the questions in detail. A few individuals asked for the survey to be administered over the phone, and a handful preferred to complete a paper version. Responses to the telephone and paper versions of the survey were entered into the database using the Web site.

Selection Bias

Although our response rate is typical of Web-based research and surveys targeting ethnic minorities, I wanted to see how representative our sample was of the entire population of African American Studies professors. To answer this question, we performed a statistical analysis of survey participation. Table A.1 shows the results of individual characteristics on the probability that a black studies professor will participate in our survey. There is almost no statistical difference between respondents and nonrespondents. The only predictor of participation at the α = .05 level is the age of the program in which the person works. Professors in younger programs are a little more likely to respond to the survey. Recent research on selection bias suggests that conclusions drawn from this data will not be substantially different than those drawn from a completely random sample because of the modest differences between the sample and total population.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>−0.10814</td>
<td>0.171437</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically black college</td>
<td>−0.58658</td>
<td>0.831782</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African or African American</td>
<td>0.250019</td>
<td>0.1699</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>−0.06273</td>
<td>0.179409</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research university</td>
<td>0.054456</td>
<td>0.18922</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Ph.D.</td>
<td>−0.01347</td>
<td>0.05428</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>−0.02575</td>
<td>0.210089</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0.164127</td>
<td>0.199601</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment only in black studies</td>
<td>0.34527</td>
<td>0.186875</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year program created</td>
<td>0.053926</td>
<td>0.013691</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>−107.891</td>
<td>27.05801</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.0264 \( \chi^2 = 23.05 \) N=818