

The Perceptions of the Alabama Legislature Toward Higher Education

by

Willard Hazley Ammons III

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
May 5, 2019

Keywords: Alabama legislature, higher education, perceptions, politics

Copyright 2019 by Willard Hazley Ammons III

Approved by

James Witte, Chair, Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
George Flowers, Dean, Graduate School and Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Jane Teel, Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Maria Witte, Associate Dean, Graduate School and Professor, Educational Foundations,
Leadership, and Technology

Abstract

With state legislatures across the nation decreasing funding in higher education, many higher education administrators are seeking new and creative ways to increase funding and decrease waste in colleges and universities. Since the Great Recession, very little research has been conducted toward the Alabama Legislature and its important link to higher education. This research was conducted to examine the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward issues in higher education. Specifically, the study focused on the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature towards duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards. Also, this study observed the similarities/differences in Parker's (1985) study. This study used quantitative research measures in its design through the use of an electronic online survey. The survey, focused on the members of the 2008 Legislative Session, was used to measure responses to each of the research questions. The sample for this study consisted of one independent variable which was the Alabama Legislature; the dependent variables were the issues in higher education: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards. The results of the Chi-square analysis indicated that no significant interaction existed between the Alabama House of Representatives and the Alabama Senate regarding issues in higher education. However, the results of the Chi-square analysis did indicate that a significant interaction existed between legislator's demographics and higher education issues. Also, there was very little change in outcomes between Parker's study and the current study.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Ammons, Jr. for their love, support, and encouragement in every endeavor I have attempted throughout my life. I thank God daily He choose Bill and Connie Ammons to be my parents because you both are the wind beneath my wings. To my brother and best friend, Dr. Kevin Ammons, thank you for your time, wisdom, and support. I have enjoyed our hours of conversations regarding Alabama history and politics and hope we can now have these conversations on the Orlando Clipper while speckle trout fishing at Crooked Creek and bream fishing at John's Little Acre. To my sister-in-law, Emily who is the sister I never had, thank you for your support and words of encouragement. I thank God every day for the Christian leadership you and Kevin share with our family and community. To my Aunt Frankie who took me to my first Auburn University football game and introduced me to the loveliest village on the plains, thank you for teaching me to love Auburn like you love Auburn. Finally, to my hero, W. H. Ammons, Sr. (Paw Paw) whose guidance I try to follow by leading by example. Thank you for giving me the best gift possible, a last name with honor and integrity.

Special thanks are also given to my grandparents who have gone on to their heavenly reward. To my paternal grandmother, Jeanette Ammons (MiMi) who taught me to pray, grow a vegetable garden, and to love and help my neighbor. I miss you every day and thank God daily for your influence on my life. To my maternal grandparents Collis (Mac) Miller and Bertie Lou Padgett Miller who showed me the importance of education and to strive to go farther than what

I thought was possible. These three special grandparents taught me to be a scholar in their own way and encouraged me to read, travel, and engage in lifelong learning.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to a very special lady who served as my Sunday school teacher, Children's Church teacher, and fourth grade teacher Mrs. Daisy Gary. Thank you for teaching me the Alabama State Song, Alabama history, and Alabama politics. Also, thank you for teaching your students to say the Pledge of Allegiance, to observe a morning prayer, and to bless our lunch, and teaching us to be courageous to live out our Christian faith.

This dissertation would have never come to fruition without the advice, wisdom, and support of my dissertation committee, Dr. James Witte, Dr. George Flowers, Dr. Jane Teel, and Dr. Maria Witte. Special thanks to Dr. James Lindner for serving as the University Reader. Thank you for your guidance and instruction during this fun and exciting journey, which without your support would not have been possible.

This dissertation is dedicated to my two special nephews, Haze and William Ammons. I am very proud to be your Uncle eeL and look forward to watching you boys grow into strong Christian men. Always do your very best and never settle for mediocrity. I expect great things from both of you spiritually and academically.

This dissertation is also dedicated to my church family at Maple Avenue Baptist Church, Geneva, Alabama and to the citizens of Geneva, Alabama. Thank you for your love, support, and encouragement.

This dissertation is also in honor of the Great State of Alabama as we celebrate our Bicentennial 1819-2019. May the citizens of this great state continue our motto, "Audemus jura nostra defendere."

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	viii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Research Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Limitations and Assumptions	7
Limitations	7
Assumptions.....	7
Definition of Terms.....	8
Chapter Summary	10
Chapter II: Review of the Literature.....	12
Historical Perspective	12
Historical Development of Legislation Affecting Higher Education In Alabama	18
Private Higher Education in Alabama	22
Military of The University of Alabama	25
Higher Education in Alabama during the War Between the States	26

Higher Education and Reconstruction	27
Public and Private Historical Black Colleges and Universities	28
Normal Colleges and Institutions for Women	32
World War I and Higher Education	36
The Alabama Community College System.....	36
Higher Education and The Great Depression	43
World War II and the G.I. Bill or Rights	44
Higher Education and the End of Segregation.....	47
The Creation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education	49
Higher Education and the End of the Twentieth Century	51
Higher Education and the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century	53
Opinions of Legislators.....	53
Opinions of Legislators versus Educators.....	55
Opinions of Legislators versus Public	55
Opinions of Legislators versus Lobbyists.....	56
Factors Influencing Legislators.....	57
Summary	58
Chapter III: Methods.....	59
Purpose of the Study	59
Research Questions	60
Design of the Study.....	61
Protection of Human Participants	62
Sample Selection.....	63

Data Collection Procedures.....	64
Instrument Development.....	65
Data Analysis	65
Chapter IV: Results.....	67
Purpose of the Study	67
Research Questions.....	68
Instrumentation of Reliability and Validity	69
Description of Sample.....	70
Quantitative Data Findings	71
Demographics	71
Age.....	73
Alabama Legislator’s Perceptions of Higher Education Issues	74
House versus Senate	83
Relationship of Alabama Legislator’s Demographics and Perceptions.....	84
Similarities/Differences	94
Chapter Summary	96
Chapter V: Discussion, Implications, and Areas for Further Research	98
Implications.....	104
Areas for Further Research.....	104
Chapter Summary	105
References.....	107
Appendix A: Alabama Legislature Perceptions Questionnaire Instrument.....	123
Appendix B: Members of the Alabama Legislature	134

Appendix C: Alabama Legislature Approval of Research Project	141
Appendix D: Institutional Review Board Approval	144
Appendix E: Information Letter.....	147

List of Tables

Table 1: Instrument Content Reliability	70
Table 2: Participating Legislator’s Seat in Alabama Legislature	71
Table 3: Participating Legislator’s Highest Education Degree Level	72
Table 4: Participating Legislator’s Race.....	72
Table 5: Participating Legislator’s Gender	73
Table 6: Participating Legislator’s Town/City of Residence Population	73
Table 7: Participating Legislator’s Living North or South of Clanton, AL.....	73
Table 8: Participating Legislator’s Political Party Affiliation	74
Table 9: Participating Legislator’s Political Ideology	74
Table 10: Chi-Square Tests.....	84
Table 11: Collapsed Response in Legislative Survey Analysis.....	85
Table 12: Item 2 - Race.....	86
Table 13: Item 6 - Race.....	87
Table 14: Item 7 - Race.....	87
Table 15: Item 11 - Race.....	88
Table 16: Item 12 - Race.....	88
Table 17: Item 14 - Race.....	88
Table 18: Item 16 - Race.....	89
Table 19: Item 19 - Race.....	89
Table 20: Item 22 - Race.....	89

Table 21: Item 3 - Party Affiliation	90
Table 22: Item 14 - Party Affiliation	90
Table 23: Item 18 - Party Affiliation	91
Table 24: Item 3 - Philosophical Base	91
Table 25: Item 16 - Philosophical Base	91
Table 26: Item 18 - Philosophical Base	92
Table 27: Item 14 - Educational Level	92
Table 28: Item 12 - Geographic Location.....	93
Table 29: Item 24 - Geographic Location.....	93
Table 30: Item 9 - Size of Town or City.....	93

Chapter I: Introduction

The citizens of Alabama have been witnessing a massive change in the political power structure of state government since the beginning of the twenty-first century. Most of this change is occurring as the result of political power shifting from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in the Alabama Legislature. Ellington (2011) Republicans took control of Alabama government in November [2010], reminding voters that their sweeping victory put the party in power for the first time in 136 years, since Reconstruction. Other areas of political change is the demise of the once major political influencer of the democratic party, the Alabama Education Association (AEA), who according to The Hawthorn Group (2018), argues AEA is an irrelevant political machine in Alabama. Archibald (2016) AEA has been replaced by the Business Council of Alabama (BCA) as one of the most powerful lobbies in Alabama and it is clear they are today's AEA.

Male dominance of Alabama politics is changing in the twenty-first century with more women being elected to participate in the political process. One of the most recent political changes is the swearing in of Lieutenant Governor Kay Ivey to serve as Alabama's fifty-fourth governor after the resignation of Governor Robert Bentley, in 2017. According to Lyman (2017) Ivey is the second woman to hold the office of governor in Alabama, and Ivey's swearing in by Alabama's Acting Chief Justice Lyn Stuart was the first time in Alabama history a woman administered the governor's oath of office to another woman. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (2017) Alabama has an all-time high of women serving in the legislature heading into the 2018 elections with seventeen in the House of Representatives and four in the Senate for a total of twenty-one women serving out of one hundred and forty legislative seats for a fifteen percent total for women serving in the Alabama Legislature.

With these changes to political power over the past few years Alabama citizens watched old regimes fall and new coalitions advance; however, some political realities remain the same as education continues to be the most political issue in the state. According to the Birmingham Business Journal (2015) business leaders feel education and workforce training are the biggest issues for Alabama. Linked to the issue of education is the Education Trust Fund and the budgeting and allocation of state dollars that raise political issues that create some of the best political drama of legislative sessions. Robertson (2014) states, “Alabama’s budget is bifurcated, or split, into the General Fund (GF) and the Education Trust Fund (ETF) and has been in existence since 1927 when public education began in Alabama” (p. 1). This bifurcation leads to heated political debates in the legislature of members wanting to borrow money from the Education Trust Fund to help support funding for the General Fund, Dial (2015) states, “we also cannot support the unrealistic notion of sitting on the sidelines and continuing to rob education funds in order to fix problems with prisons, state troopers, and others” (p. 4).

While education and funding the General Fund and Education Trust Fund are the top two issues in Alabama politics conservatism and protestant ideology continue to be the political philosophies of a majority of Alabama citizens. Newport (2015) Alabama is the second ranked conservative state with 46.5 % of residence identifying as conservative, only Mississippi had more with 48.9 % of its residents identifying as conservative. Newport (2014) shares a Gallop Poll identifying Alabama and Mississippi as tied as the highest ranked Protestant states with 77% of their residents as identifying as Protestant. These two polls explain the social conservative and religious conservative policies that come from the Alabama State House and how they influence public policy, i.e. education. One area of education that remains very political is higher

education and despite academic research on higher education in general, research has not focused on Alabama's legislators' perceptions toward higher education.

What is needed is a more complete understanding of the relationship and values among the leaders in higher education and Alabama legislators. Boswell (1998) asserts higher education leaders could be more effective if they had the perspectives and perceptions of all stakeholders including especially state legislators. Boggs (2010) states, "education at all levels, must be seen as an important state and federal investment in our future, and policies must be put in place to ensure maximum return on that investment" (p. 5). Alabama, like many states, will be making challenging educational policy decisions regarding higher education and how to invest resources to benefit students, communities, and the state.

Far too little research has given attention to state legislators and their perceptions toward higher education. Spellings (2006) suggest the need for more studies to focus on the lack of knowledge and information that would help state policy makers to create a competitive higher education system. According to Lingenfelter (2011) academics may be tempted to fault irrationality, ideology, or ignorance for the failure of research to inform policy and practice more powerfully, but policy makers and practitioners want academics to tell them what works in order to find a practice or method that will reliably yield desirable results. Martinez (2004) states the majority of legislators understand how higher education contributes to the future growth of their states. Martinez further asserts, "policymakers and college leaders will need to work together to meet state priorities and the growing demand for postsecondary education" (p. 2). Parker (1985) argues educators need to understand the knowledge legislators have about the mission of higher education and how they feel resources should be distributed if effectiveness is to be improved.

Statement of the Research Problem

Very few studies exist analyzing state legislature's perceptions toward higher education. While there is significant research at the federal level of Congress' attitudes and perceptions toward higher education, there are very few academic studies examining these perceptions at the state legislature level, especially for the Alabama legislature. Parker (1985) is the only study found to examine the attitudes of the Alabama legislature toward higher education; however, as mentioned above much has changed politically since the study in the mid- nineteen eighties. Examining the demographics of the Alabama legislature, and understanding the relationships between the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education will aid educational leaders to understand legislator's perceptions and opinions regarding higher education.

Further, a better understanding of the Alabama legislature's perceptions toward higher education will help educational leaders in higher education be more effective in their relationship with the legislature helping stakeholders reach their educational goals. This study examines the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in the 2018 legislative session compared to the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in Parker's (1985) study.

Purpose of the Study

Understanding the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education is vital for educational leaders at Alabama's public colleges, universities, and community colleges to be effective and reach their educational goals. The purpose of this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in the 2018 legislative session compared to the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in Parker's (1985) study. This study, like Parker's, investigated legislators'

perceptions toward major issues facing higher education in Alabama and sought to discern what are the perceptions of Alabama Legislators in regard to duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards? Parker (1985) identifies fourteen topical areas as issues in higher education, these include: mission, political involvement of employees, purpose, coordination and control, duplication of programs, financing private higher education, financing public higher education, unified budgeting, research institutions, athletics, general information, competency based education, tenure, and admission standards.

This study will narrow the fourteen domains from the Parker (1985) study to five domains that the researcher feels are the most important and contemporary for the study in 2018. The researcher for this study has identified the five most important issues in higher education from Parker (1985) as duplication of programs, financing of private higher education, financing of public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. Parker's (1985) list of issues was narrowed to the current five mentioned above by examining the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2017) Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017.

Significance of the Study

This study examined the comparisons between the perceptions and demographic characteristics of the Alabama legislature toward higher education. By creating awareness and dialog, it is the intent of this study that a better understanding of legislators' perceptions toward higher education will emerge. Currently, there is a lack of research toward the perceptions of state legislatures toward higher education. The political dynamics of Alabama have changed since Parker's (1985) study. The Alabama legislature has changed from a super majority of the Democratic Party to a super majority of the Republican Party, the Alabama Education Association has lost much political power in the legislature while The Business Council of

Alabama has significant political power in the legislative process, and the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education with an elected State Board of Education is now the Alabama Community College System with an appointed Board of Trustees, along with many other political changes in the state. By focusing on the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education leaders in higher education can better serve their respective public colleges, universities, or community colleges.

This study is significant in that it produced information that could be applied by leaders in higher education in their goal of improving the political process. Kimbrough (1964) asserts: Factual data about why leaders take action upon issues, projects, and problems is necessary to understand the political structure. The absence of such data leads to the inaccurate and incomplete impressions which could mean the difference between success and failure for the educational leader. (p. 108).

The findings presented from this research study can aid the Alabama Legislature and higher education leaders to better understand their working relationship and implement ways to be more effective with Alabama's colleges, universities, and community colleges.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What are the demographics of the Alabama legislature?
2. What are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards?
3. What is the relationship of Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions?
4. What similarities/differences exist between Parker (1985) and the current study?

Limitations and Assumptions

Limitations. As a result of the limited research on Alabama's legislature development of policies toward higher education, data on the impact of how legislators' perceptions affect their policy is subsequently limited. Also lacking is how legislators socio-demographic status impacts their decisions on policy development in higher education. Participants in this study included Alabama State Senators and Representatives of the Alabama House. The study then reflects the views and opinions of legislators in one state and presents the following limitations.

1. The study was limited to the opinions of members of the 2018 Alabama Legislative Session in response to their responses to the survey.
2. Findings should not be generalized to other states.
3. Findings should not be generalized to other legislatures in Alabama
4. The exploratory nature of survey research revealed a weakness in surveys for studying behavior because they lack the ability to make inferences at the level of cause and effect (Creswell, 2008).
5. Ottati, Steenbergen, and Riggle (1992) stated, "when responding to questions, respondents typically do not retrieve all of the judgment relevant information stored in memory but typically respond on the basis of whatever materials come to mind at the moment of answering" (p. 424).

Assumptions.

1. The participants of the study will understand the instrument administered for data collection and will answer all questions posted as accurately and honestly as possible.
2. Participants responses to the questions regarding their socio-demographics will be reflective of their own personal experiences.

Definition of Terms

- **Alabama Education Association:** The Alabama Education Association (AEA) is the largest education association in the state of Alabama. The AEA is an advocate organization that leads the movement for excellence in education and is the voice of education professionals in Alabama. Our mission is to promote educational excellence (<http://www.myaea.org/contact/about-aea/>).
- **Alabama Legislature:** The Legislature convenes in regular annual sessions on the first Tuesday in February, except (1) in the first year of the four-year term, when the session will begin on the first Tuesday in March, and (2) in the last year of a four-year term, when the session will begin on the second Tuesday in January. The length of the regular session is limited to 30 meeting days within a period of 105 calendar days. There are usually two meeting or "legislative" days per week, with other days devoted to committee meetings. Special sessions of the Legislature may be called by the Governor, with the Proclamation listing the subjects which the Governor wishes considered. These sessions are limited to 12 legislative days within a 30 calendar day span. In a regular session, bills may be enacted on any subject. In a special session, legislation must be enacted only on those subjects which the Governor announces in his proclamation or "call." Anything not in the "call" requires a two-thirds vote of each house to be enacted. (<http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/default.aspx>).
- **Business Council of Alabama:** Working on behalf of nearly three-quarters of million working Alabamians through its member companies and local chambers of commerce, the BCA is *the* voice for Alabama business. (<https://www.bcatoday.org/about/>).

- **Community College:** an institution on higher learning regionally accredited to award the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science as its highest degree. The community college's primary goal is to serve the needs of the citizens in the local community in either learning a skill, trade, or preparing to enter a university or college setting.
- **Funding:** term refers to the portion of the state or local budget allocation by elected officials to financially support educational needs.
- **House of Representatives (Alabama):** The Alabama House of Representatives is comprised of 105 members. Each member represents a district of approximately 40,000 people. The members of the House are elected to four-year terms. Members of the House must be 21 years of age at the time of their election, and must have been citizens of Alabama for three years, having lived in their respective districts for at least one year immediately preceding their election. The Speaker of the House represents one of the 105 districts in the House, and is elected by his or her colleagues to serve as the presiding officer. It takes a quorum of 53 members to conduct business in the Alabama House of Representatives, and a majority of a quorum can pass any bill except a constitutional amendment, which requires 63 votes. During a special legislative session any measures not included in the Governor's call require a 2/3 majority for passage. All revenue raising legislation must originate in the House just as in the Congress of the United States. An appropriation to a non-government organization, such as a private college, requires a two-thirds vote of those elected. (http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/ISD/Splash_House.aspx).

- Senate (Alabama):** The Alabama State Senate is composed of 35 Senators, in keeping with Article IV, Section 50, of the Constitution, which limits the House of Representatives at 105 members, and the Senate at 35, and with Article IX, Sections 197 and 198, which establishes membership in the Senate at not less than one-fourth, nor more than one-third, the total membership of the House of Representatives, and allows for additional representation in the event new counties are created. Thus, the Alabama Senate is precisely one-third the size of the House of Representatives, and each Senator represents a district of approximately 137,000 Alabamians. Senators, as well as Members of the House of Representatives, are elected for four-year terms, and take office at midnight of the day of their election. Amendment 97, to the Constitution, provides that should a vacancy occur in either house of the Legislature, the governor is required to call a special election to fill such vacancy. Like the United States Senate, the Alabama Senate has sole power of Confirmation of certain appointees designated by the Constitution and by statute. The legislative antecedent of this role is a similar power vested in the Roman Senate, during the period of the Republic. (http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/ISD/Splash_Senate.aspx).
- Socio-demographic:** this term refers to a variety of personal descriptors that include gender, race, age, educational level, occupation, and political party.

Chapter Summary

Chapter I provides an introduction to the research study, the statement of the research problem, research questions and key definitions of terms used throughout the research study. Chapter II discusses a review of literature regarding a historical development of legislation affecting higher education in Alabama, opinions of legislators, opinions of legislators versus

educators, factors influencing legislators, and theoretical frameworks. Chapter III explores the procedures used in the research study including the research study's population, instrument employed, data and collection procedures, and measures for data analyses. Lastly, Chapter IV discusses the research findings while Chapter V reveals the summary of the research study, conclusions, implications, and potential areas for further research.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

Understanding the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education issues is vital for educational leaders at Alabama's public colleges, universities, and community colleges to be effective and reach their educational goals. This review of relative literature will provide a foundation for the perceptions associated with the Alabama legislature toward higher education issues.

Historical Perspective

The federal government's historical role in higher education reflects the intertwined conflicts with state governments since the ratification of the United States Constitution in 1787 (Pelsue, 2017). Parker (1985) held that since, "many of the founding fathers preferred the state's rights approach whereby decisions concerning higher education would be made primarily by the state legislative bodies, while others felt the federal government should be responsible for higher education" (p. 1). The latter were the Federalists like James Madison. Their philosophy advocated for a national university organization that would provide a more equal opportunity for education and eliminate regionalism in higher education (Babbridge and Rosenzweig, 1962). President George Washington expected a national university to be a useful instrument in the shaping of patriotic citizens and of able civil servants; he hoped that a national university would enable the United States to develop a class of men free from the restricting prejudices of provincialism and sectionalism (Rudolph, 1990, p. 42). The Federalist arguments in favor of a national university or federal university were to prepare students for public service, promote national unity, concentrate resources, employ the best professors, the primary objective would be the study of the science of government, expand patriotism and strengthen the national

government; it would have served as a beacon as an institution setting standards for curriculum, degrees, professional qualifications, and possible for college admissions. (Cohen, 1998).

Rush (1787), published the first public mention of the idea of a national university. Rush was supported in his proposal of a national university by other founding fathers such as James Madison of Virginia, Charles Pickney of South Carolina, and James Wilson of Pennsylvania (Castel, 1964). Harley (1899) asserts, “after the close of the Revolution, one of the first subjects to demand the attention of statesmen was the intellectual improvement of the people” (p. 273). However, the idea of a national university remained in a quiescent state and never came to fruition (Chase, 1931). There are many possible reasons why a national university failed to become a reality, lack of financial resources in the early years of the new federal government, simmering tensions that prevented close cooperation on social questions, the pace of westward expansion which dispersed the young countries population (Koganzon, 2012). While public debate about a national university was to continue through the administration of Andrew Jackson, federal involvement in higher education was insignificant until the passage of the G. I. Bill of Rights, in 1944 (Zeiger, 2008).

While there was a strong voice and movement to secure a national university for the new nation, those with the states’ rights political philosophy succeeded in steering power of higher education to the individual states. Though higher education is not included in the United States Constitution, it was certainly a priority issue for the founders; where they differed was on the degree of government involvement in education (Zeiger, 2008). Under the leadership of the Anti-Federalist citing the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution higher education was delegated to the states. The Tenth Amendment states, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states

respectively, or to the people” (Skillman, 1825). Butts states, “from the very beginning of the American colonies education was one of the powers and rights of political sovereignty transferred to American shores by the charters, patents, and governmental regulations of the sovereigns of the mother countries” (1955, p. 213) After the Revolution and ratification of the Constitution a majority of the founding fathers argued with conviction that it was within the jurisdiction of the states to fulfill the need for higher education by establishing institutions through chartering, incorporating, and licensing (Kaplan, 1979). As The United States evolved, traditional assumption, has been that education should be a function of state and local control rather than of federal control” (Butts, 1955). In Alabama, this traditional assumption holds true with the state’s historical rhetoric advocating states’ rights.

In Alabama’s two-hundred-year history, the state has operated under six constitutions (An Overview of Alabama’s Six Constitutions, 2018). The first constitution, the Constitution of 1819, in Article VI, called for the State General Assembly to support a Seminary of learning and a “fund for the exclusive support of a State University, for the promotion of the arts, literature, and the sciences: and it shall be the duty of the General Assembly, as early as it may be, to provide the effectual means for the improvement and permanent security of the funds and endowments of such institution” (Constitution of 1819, 2018, para. 6). The constitutions of 1861, 1865, and 1868 were operable during the Civil War and the Period of Reconstruction and will not be examined during this study mainly because they “were not submitted to the electorate for ratification, but instead became operable upon adoption of the Conventions that framed them” (An overview of Alabama’s Six Constitutions, 2018).

Dating from 1875, the Alabama State Constitution provides guidelines for the Alabama Legislature with issues pertaining to higher education. Article XIII, Section 9 of the 1875 Alabama State Constitution reads:

The State University and the Agricultural and Mechanical College shall each be under the management and control of a board of trustees. The board for the university shall consist of two members from the congressional district in which the university is located, and one from each of the other congressional districts in the state. The board for the Agricultural and Mechanical College shall consist of two members from the congressional district in which the college is located, and one from each of the other congressional districts in the state. Said trustees shall be appointed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, and shall hold office for a term of six years, and until their successors shall be appointed and qualified. After the first appointment each board shall be divided into three classes, as nearly equal as may be. The seats of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of two years, and those of the second class in four years, and those of the third class at the end of six years, from the date of appointment, so that one-third may be chosen biennially. No trustee shall receive any pay or emolument, other than his actual expenses incurred in the discharge of his duties as such. The governor shall be ex officio president, and the superintendent of education ex officio a member of each of said boards of trustees. (Constitution of 1875, 2018).

Section 9 of Article XIII, outlines the legislative responsibilities for the governance of public institutions by the selection and appointments of members of the board of trustees at the two major state institutions of higher education.

The current Constitution of Alabama 1901 details legislative responsibility for Education in Article XIV. Section 264 of Article XIV details the management and control of the state university by the board of trustees (Constitution of Alabama 1901, 2018). Section 264 of Article XIV was repealed by Amendment 399, in 1982, which supersedes the original section. Stewart (1994) states:

The section did not alter the basically self-perpetuating character of the board, but it did seek to make the board somewhat more open to more open to new ideas and individuals by: (1) increasing the number of trustees from the central campus congressional district from two to three, (2) (more importantly) significantly enlarging the board by doubling the number of members from the other congressional districts from one to two, (3) decreasing the length of trustees' terms from twelve to six years, (4) limiting members to three consecutive terms (formerly there were no limits), and (5) forcing members to leave the board after age seventy (formerly there was no retirement age). Furthermore, the Alabama Senate has recently shown itself quite willing to substitute its own choices for trustees for those of the existing board (p. 139).

No longer the Agriculture and Mechanical College as was named in the 1875 Constitution, Auburn University serves as Alabama's Land Grant University and in 2016, Section 266 of Article 14 of the Constitution of Alabama 1901 was repealed and amended by Amendment 670. Little (2016) informs the amendment "add[ed] two new at large members to

the Auburn University board of trustees and prevent[s] more than three trustee's terms from expiring in the same year...the [fourteen] member board is made up of trustees from Alabama's congressional districts as they were in 1961 with one trustee from Lee County, three at-large trustees and the governor, who serves as a non-voting member" (O A News, 2016). According to Amendment 670, governance and appointments to the Board of Trustees of Auburn University shall follow the following guidelines:

Appointment of the initial two at-large members shall be made by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Otherwise, the trustees from each congressional district, from Lee County, and all subsequent at-large trustees, including the at-large position created upon the vacating of office of the current State Superintendent of Education, shall be appointed by the appointing committee created herein, by and with the advice and consent of the senate. The appointment of members to fill a vacated position with a partially expired term of office shall also be made by the appointing committee as provided herein (Constitution of Alabama 1901, 2018).

Advocating the state legislative role in higher education, The Council of State Governments (1952) affirms that the state legislature is the best place for the decision making process concerning higher education because as an elected body it is perceptive to its constituents, subject to public transparency and critical review, and states, "[b]ecause of [the state legislature's] central vantage point, it is ideally placed to make decisions relating to the major activities undertaken and supported by the state" (p. 7).

Historical Development of Legislation Affecting Higher Education in Alabama

On December 14, 1819 the State of Alabama became the twenty-second state to be admitted in the Union (Stewart, 1920). However, education started much earlier in Alabama with the Native American Indians who inhabited the state, “although the Alabama [Native American] Indians could not read or write long after the coming of the whites and until Sequoyah invented the Cherokee alphabet in 1821, they loved oratory and used this method to instruct their children in the history of the widespread migrations and heroic exploits of their tribes” (Alabama Bulletin, 1975, p. 10). In 1742, under French control, the governor of Louisiana, LeMoyne de Bienville requested to the French government the creation of a college in Mobile (Alabama Bulletin, 1975). The request was denied, since Mobile with a population of scarcely 300, “was considered too small and unimportant for a college” (p. 12). Formal education was left to Catholic and Protestant missionaries who were instructing Native Americans and European pioneers to read using Bibles and prayer books (Alabama Bulletin, 1975).

The development of legislation affecting higher education in Alabama did not originate until the 1800’s.

Not long afterward the Mississippi Territorial Legislature in Natchez, Mississippi, chartered Washington Academy (later St. Stephens Academy) at St. Stephens in 1811 and Green Academy at Huntsville in 1812. This was the first educational legislation in Alabama. On December 13, 1814, the Mississippi Territorial Legislature appropriated the first public money for education in Alabama when it granted \$500 to each academy. The Legislature exempted both from taxation and allowed the schools to raise additional funds by lottery (p. 13).

By an act of Congress approved March 3, 1817, the eastern part of the Mississippi Territory was made a separate Territory, and called Alabama (Clark, 1889). In 1818, an act of Congress was passed ordering a survey of all the lands in the Alabama Territory to which the Native American Indian title had been extinguished, and the creation of an entire township which shall be located by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the support of a seminary of learning within Alabama. By the enabling act for the admission of Alabama as a State into the Union, approved on March 2, 1819, “the State of Alabama, with these splendid gifts as the foundation of her system of public education, was formally admitted to the Union by a joint resolution of Congress, December 14, 1819” (Clark, 1889, p. 28). With land being granted to the people of Alabama for the purposes of higher education, the Secretary of the Treasury under the direction of the President of the United States, James Monroe, reserved and vested the responsibility of higher education and the location of the seminary of learning and its appropriation to the Legislature of the State of Alabama (Clark, 1889).

On July 5, 1819, The Constitutional Convention, which was meeting in Huntsville, Alabama Territory, adopted the following article:

Schools and the means of education, shall forever be encouraged in this state. * *

* The General Assembly shall take like measures for the improvement of such lands as have been or may be hereafter granted by the United States to this state for the support of a seminary of learning, and the moneys which may be raised from such lands by rent, lease, or sale, or from any other quarter, for the purpose aforesaid, shall be and remain a fund for the exclusive support of the State University, for the promotion of the arts, literature, and the sciences; and it shall be the duty of the General Assembly, as early as may be, to provide effectual

means for the improvement and permanent security of the funds and endowments of such institution (The University of Alabama, 1906, p. 2).

As Alabama transitioned from a territory to a sovereign state, education became one of the main topics for the “framers of the 1819 state constitution, as lands were set aside for the support of a state university and for the promotion of the arts, literature, and sciences throughout the state” (Alabama Bulletin, 1975, p. 14). Seventy-two sections of land were reserved for a seminary of learning and the sixteenth section in every township was granted to the citizens of each township for the support of schools during the first session of the General Assembly (Alabama House Journal, 1819). What would equal to 46,080 acres of land donated by the United States Congress become “denominated the University of Alabama” by the General Assembly during the second session on December 18, 1820 (Barnwell, 1912).

At the third session of the General Assembly, on the 13th day of December, 1821, an act was passed providing that His Excellency, the Governor, ex-officio, together with twelve trustees, two from each judicial circuit, to be selected by joint ballot of both houses of the General Assembly, to continue office for the term of three years, should constitute a body politic and corporate in deed and in law, by the name of the Trustees of the University of Alabama, and that the Governor should be ex-officio president of the board. The first meeting of the Board of Trustees was held at the town of Tuscaloosa on the 6th of April, 1822. On the 29th of December, 1827, the General Assembly, by joint ballot of both houses, selected Tuscaloosa as the seat of the University. The site whereon to erect buildings, one mile and a quarter east of the courthouse in Tuscaloosa, was

selected by the Trustees on the 22nd of March, 1828 (The University of Alabama, 1906, p. 3-4).

On April 12, 1831, the University of Alabama inaugurated Dr. Alva Woods as the first president in a public ceremony in Christ Church, in Tuscaloosa; within a week the university was enrolling students for admission with fifty-two matriculating the first day (The University of Alabama, 1906). “The early history of the university was one of reverence of Enlightenment ideas of reason” (Brophy, 2008).

Alabama’s first governor, “in his initial message to the Legislature, Governor William Wyatt Bibb stressed the need for education in Alabama” (p. 14). Bibb emphasized, “the importance of an educated citizenry to a state where all power is derived from the people, and warned the legislature against the dangers of faction and the evils of the demagogue” (Atkins, 1970, 32). As the opening of The University of Alabama came near, in his 1830 address to the legislature, Governor Gabriel Moore, “spoke eloquently about the imminent opening of The University of Alabama, which aimed to extend the benefits of education to even the humblest of our citizens” (Amos Doss, 2000, p. 169). Moore promoted education, “observing that the increase of knowledge is the best security for sound public morality” (p. 169). While The University of Alabama opened in 1831 to students, it would be another twenty years before the state legislature would establish a general system of public education (Cain, 1976). Like other Southern states, Alabama developed education from the top downward in line with the theory of Thomas Jefferson (Cain, 1976).

An incident involving inappropriate use of funds from the selling of lands appropriated for The University of Alabama led to the intervention of the legislature in 1833.

In the 1833-1834 legislative session, a joint committee was appointed between the two houses of the General Assembly to inquire into the expenditures made by the board of trustees of the University in building and other improvements. This committee discovered . . . that the books and the accounts relating to the affairs of the University have been kept in such a manner as to place the affairs of that . . . institution in a most perplexed and confused condition (Clark, 1889, p. 40).

The legislative committee reported to the Alabama Legislature the recommendation the appointment of a comptroller to investigate all the accounts and sales of the university land (Clark, 1889).

Private Higher Education in Alabama

Private higher education, headed by religious denominations, are popular in the South (Crowther, 1991). Ten reasons have been listed to explain the importance of private higher education after 1800, instruction of clergymen top the list

[b]ut churchmen also believed that church schools would link secular education to moral training; that church schools would lower the cost of higher education, thereby bringing the possibility of erudition to poorer folk; that founding schools was proper stewardship of the bounty of Providence that a particular denomination commanded; that church schools would strengthen denominational ties; that schools would provide a base for the propagation of sectarian doctrines and attitudes; that denominations should provide educational opportunities for their members lest they fall behind rival groups in founding schools; that southern religious schools would protect southern children from northern theological and

philosophical error; and that strong schools would provide an accurate measure of a denomination's vigor (Crowther, 1991, p. 17).

Like their counterparts throughout the United States,

private colleges in Alabama have contributed to the business, civic, educational, professional, and political leadership of the state...and they continue to be a valuable asset as a group, they have provided educational opportunities for a significant portion of the state's citizens at no direct cost to the state, and they have contributed to the diversity and the vitality of higher education in [Alabama]" (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p. 60).

Alabama, like the rest of the South, was a popular location for the development of private higher education, thus the need for legislative action in the creation of charters for these institutions of higher learning. 6

Spring Hill College was the first institution of higher education in Alabama (Spring Hill College, 2018). Founded in 1830 by Mobile's first Catholic bishop, Micheal Portier, "Spring Hill is also the first Catholic College in the Southeast, the third oldest Jesuit College and the fifth oldest Catholic College in the United States (Spring Hill College, 2018). The legislative charter was approved and signed by Alabama's eighth governor, Clement Comer Clay on January 8, 1836 (Spring Hill College, 2018).

Howard College, known today as Samford University, with the support of General Edwin D. King, Reverend James H. DeVotie, pastor of Marion's Siloam Baptist Church, and the Alabama Baptist Convention, petitioned for and were granted a charter by the Alabama legislature to be located in Marion, Alabama. According to Allen the college was, "[c]hartered

by the Legislature on December 29, 1841, classes began on January 3, 1842, with nine young men” (Allen, 2001, p. 34).

In 1838, the idea of private Alabama Baptist college in Marion came to fruition; however, this college was to be for young women (Judson College, 2018). At a time when higher education for women was uncommon, “[b]usinesswoman Julia Tarrant Barron and General Edwin Davis King, with the support of other members of Siloam Baptist Church, enlisted the help of Dr. Milo P. Jewett, a recent graduate of Andover Theological Seminary, who had come to Alabama with the goal of establishing a school for young women that would provide them with the same quality of education that young men received at Harvard and Yale” (Judson College, 2018). Judson College began holding classes on January 7, 1839 with nine students, in 1840 the present site of “The Judson” was donated by Barron, and in 1841, “the Alabama legislature granted Judson an official charter of incorporation” (Judson College, 2018).

Mobile College, began with the idea of the Mobile Baptist Association and matching funds came a few years later in 1959 from the Alabama Baptist Convention (Mobile College, 2018). According to Mobile College’s website, “[w]hen Alabama Governor John Patterson signed the college’s charter on December 12, 1961, Mobile College became the first senior college to be chartered in the state in 57 years” (Mobile College, 2018).

Tuskegee Female College, now Huntingdon College, was chartered by the Alabama legislature, and “was signed by Alabama Governor John Winston on February 2, 1854” (Huntingdon College, 2018). The Alabama Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1872 assumed full management and control of the college (Huntingdon College, 2018). With new management control, “the present governing body – a board of trustees” was created and today, “Huntingdon College is a college of the United Methodist Church” (Huntingdon

College, 2018). Other Methodist institutions of higher education chartered by the Alabama legislature are Southern University, now Birmingham Southern, in 1856 (Birmingham-Southern College, 2018) and East Alabama Male College, now Auburn University, in 1856 (Auburn University, 2018). Although a number of church-related, private institutions were established in this period, The University of Alabama remained the only public institution of higher education in the State before the Civil War (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

Militarization of The University of Alabama

The Alabama legislature at the 1859-1860 session, most likely in anticipation of the upcoming War Between the States, took necessary action to create a military department at The University of Alabama and in September, 1860, students enrolled for the first time entering into camp on the college campus as a military body under the name of the Alabama Corps of Cadets (Causey, 2018). However, early in its history, The University of Alabama earned a reputation for a lack of discipline and in 1847, the Alabama legislature passed a law that would fine \$500.00 to merchants found guilty of selling liquor to students of the university (Eckinger, 2013). The university lobbied successfully to the Alabama legislature allowing the university to establish a military department “believ[ing] that the military system had the potential to transform their pupils from spoiled young men who were ‘ruined in moral character’ into productive citizens” (Eckinger, 2013, p. 164). On February 23, 1860, with anxiety and “fear generated by John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry and looming uncertainty about the stability of the Union” the Alabama Senate, ignoring fiscal concerns, passed the bill into law (p. 170). The legislature must have asserted military discipline would encourage students to secure a better education than that of other American colleges; however, “the legislature’s concerns about the financial drain of a military department proved well-founded, and by the end of 1860, the

university was badly in need of funds” (p. 175). On January 11, 1861, the Alabama Secession Convention passed an Ordinance of Secession, declaring Alabama a Sovereign and Independent State and became the fourth state to join the Southern Republic and the educational system in the state immediately felt the effects of secession and the resultant War Between the States (Alabama Bulletin, 1975).

Higher Education in Alabama during the War Between the States

Before the Civil War, regional patriotism created a substantial improvement in southern colleges and most competed with northern colleges in the number of enrolled students (Flynt, 1968). By 1860, as Alabama headed toward secession, Flynt asserts, “this regional patriotism had substantially improved southern colleges in some ways, and they competed with their northern counterparts at least in quantity of students” (Flynt, 1968, p. 211). At the University of Alabama, the legislature had enacted the Alabama School of Cadets on campus, and as the war began in 1861, many cadets withdrew from the university and traveled home to join their local home town companies (Flynt, 1968). However, as Flynt explains, “many students remained enrolled at the university and were called on by the governor to train volunteer companies and by using the university as a military training institution for cadets, enrollment was maintained at a relatively high level” (Flynt, 1968, p. 215). Alabama was the only school in the South to record attendance increases during the war, of course officer training rather than education was the major attraction at the university (Flynt, 1968).

In 1860, as Flynt reports, “Alabama had seventeen “colleges” which varied greatly in their degree of academic proficiency, with The University of Alabama, La Grange College, Howard College, and Spring Hill providing relatively high quality instruction” (Flynt, 1968,

217). Before the end of the war all seventeen closed except Spring Hill and two women's colleges (Flynt, 1968).

Higher Education and Reconstruction

After the Civil War, Reconstruction changed Alabamians' Antebellum lifestyle with a new set of significant challenges for Southern society with the rebuilding of a new social order (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975). Reconstruction brought about a massive change in the social, political, and economic systems of the post-war South (Stetar, 1985). After the Civil War, the national regions of the East, West, and Midwest saw areas of growth in higher education due to implementing programs to promote economic development, but little or no economic development was evident in the post-war campus as colleges and universities were trying to reopen and survive (Stetar, 1985). In 1865, The University of Alabama was scheduled to open, but only one student came to campus to enroll for classes, the son of former Governor Thomas H. Watts, and the challenge of reopening the university was not successful (Stetar, 1985). As Stetar averred:

Reconstruction compounded the political problems confronting the University of Alabama. In November, of 1867, a new state constitution transferred control of the University of Alabama from its trustees to an elected board, The Board of Regents of the State University. These Regents were delegated broad powers of governance including the appointment of a president and faculty, there were widespread reports of the dismissal of the ante-bellum faculty for political rather than scholarly reasons (Stetar, 1985, p. 341-342).

However, in the 1870's the State of Alabama began witnessing years of expansion and growth in higher education. With the construction of railroads tying Alabama to the national

economy, the development of the steel industry in the Birmingham area higher education was in demand to meet the technical needs of the new order as well as to improve agriculture practices in the region (Alabama Commission of Higher Education, 1975). As a result, institutions of higher learning were created for African-Americans who were in need of an education after becoming free men and women, the demand for teachers during this time created normal schools to train public school teachers, and women started entering colleges to further their education.

Public and Private Historical Black Colleges and Universities

In the late 1800's when many of the historical black colleges and universities were being established in Alabama, African-Americans were denied opportunities of employment in the workforce areas of business, industry, and commerce (Jones, 1962). The course of study for African-Americans was to educate teachers or preachers (Jones, 1962).

Alabama State University was founded after the Civil War by “black Southerners with the assistance of Northern white missionaries and the leaders of African-American churches [who] set out to establish educational institutions for the freedmen” (Alabama State University, 2018). Founded as Lincoln Normal School, in Marion, in 1867, Alabama State University received its first appropriations from the Alabama legislature, in 1870, in the amount of \$486 and the state's appropriations increased to \$1,250 in 1871 (Alabama State University, 2018). After twenty-four months of requesting the Alabama Legislature to establish a “university for colored people” Peyton Finley's petition came to fruition, in 1873, when the “Alabama Legislature established a “State Normal School and University for the Education of Colored Teachers and Students” (Alabama State University, 2018). Within the legislative act was a provision consolidating the assets of the Lincoln School and the new normal school and with the help of the first president George N. Card, in 1874, the school in Marion became “America's first state-

supported liberal arts educational institution for blacks” (Alabama State University, 2018).

Other actions taking by the Alabama Legislature in regard to Alabama State University are in 1887, “the state authorized the establishment of the Alabama Colored People’s University” (Alabama State University, 2018). From 1887 to 1889, the state did not fund the university due to opposition of relocating the university to Montgomery and a state supreme court ruling that declared it unconstitutional to establish a university for African-Americans (Alabama State University, 2018). However, by act of the legislature in 1889, the state resumed its support for the school and re-established the \$7,500 state appropriation. (Alabama State University, 2018). Similar to Alabama A&M, in 1920, the state legislature reduced Alabama State to a two-year normal program primarily for teachers, however soon resumed their four-year baccalaureate program in education in 1929 (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

The Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University (AAMU), was established in 1873 when the Alabama State Legislature passed a bill to create a Normal School and University for the Education of Colored Teachers and Students creating the Huntsville Normal School (Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical University, 2018). The Huntsville Normal School opened its doors in May 1875 and William Hooper Council, an ex-slave, became the school’s first president (Alabama Department of Archives and History, 2005). According to the AAMU 2011 Faculty Handbook, “Council founded the “Huntsville Normal School,” later AAMU, with an appropriation of one thousand dollars per year to meet the needs of its first class of sixty-one students and two teachers” (AAMU Faculty Handbook, 2011, p.1). AAMU reached a transitional period in its history in 1891 as the Alabama State Legislature designated the school as a land grant college under the terms of the Morrill Act of 1890 (AAMU Faculty Handbook, 2011). In 1896 with authorization from the state legislature, the school changed its name to “The

State Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes” and moved from Huntsville to Normal (AAMU Faculty Handbook, 2011). In 1919, by order of the state legislature, the instructional program at AAMU was reduced to a two-year program with emphasis on agriculture and industrial education, however it was soon resumed its four-year program and in 1939 undertook a four-year baccalaureate program in education (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975). In the 1940s, AAMU was authorized to grant degrees in the arts and sciences. According to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, “[s]ince degree programs at the two major state universities were then inaccessible to blacks, both Alabama State and Alabama A&M were authorized to offer graduate work in education in the 1940’s” (1975, p. 12-13).

Miles College began with the leadership of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, today known as the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church (C.M.E.) and was chartered by the Alabama State Legislature “to educate African-American young people” (Miles College Student Handbook, 2015, p. 6). The story of Miles College begins in 1898 when “[t]he noble founders of the institution saw educated leadership as the paramount need in the black community” (Miles College, 2018). In 1905, the school along with the blessing of the Board of Trustees expanded the scope of the curriculum and changed the location of the campus to its present site (Miles College, 2018). In 1908, “the organization of the School was completed and it was chartered under the laws of the State of Alabama as Miles Memorial College in honor of Bishop William H. Miles” (Miles College Student Handbook, 2015).

Oakwood University started in 1896 as a vocational school to help educate blacks in the southern region of the United States (Lundy-Wagner, 2009). Founded by the Seventh-day Adventist Church as Oakwood Industrial School, the school offered “two curricular tracks, one for evangelists and related careers, the other for carpenters, teachers, farmers, masons, nurses,

and cooks” (Lundy-Wagner, 2009). The school was renamed in 1904 to Oakwood Manual Training School and in 1907 was granted a charter to award degrees, which were the equivalency of a high school diploma (Lundy-Wagner, 2009).

Selma University was founded in 1878 to develop leaders for both the church and the classroom (Selma University, 2018). The university evolved into reality “with such noted men as the Reverends W. H. McAlphine, James A. Foster, and R. Murrell leading the effort” (Selma University, 2018). In 1881, “the school was incorporated by an act of the legislature under the name of Alabama Baptist Normal and Theological School of Selma...[o]n May 14, 1908, the name was officially changed to Selma University” (Selma University, 2018).

In 1875, Stillman College “was authorized by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and held its first classes in 1876 and was chartered as a legal corporation by the State of Alabama in 1895” (Stillman College, 2018). With the enacting of the charter, the school’s name was changed from Tuscaloosa Institute to Stillman Institute in honor of Dr. Charles Allen Stillman, pastor of First Presbyterian Church of Tuscaloosa whose vision led to the creation of Stillman College (Stillman, 2018).

Talladega College became a reality, “on November 20, 1865 when two former slaves, William Savery and Thomas Tarrant, both of Talladega, met in convention with a group of new freedmen in Mobile, Alabama” (Talladega College, 2018). After starting classes in a one room school house the need for more space soon became an issue and the school’s leadership soon purchased the nearby Baptist Academy which was sold for mortgage default in the sum of \$23,000 (Talladega College, 2018). The building had been built in 1852-1853 with slave labor including both Savery and Tarrant, “thus a building constructed with slave labor for white students became the home of the state’s first private, liberal arts college dedicated to servicing

the education needs of blacks” (Talladega College, 2018). In 1869, the school “was issued a charter as Talladega College by the Judge of Probate of Talladega County, twenty years later, in 1889, the Alabama State Legislature exempted properties of the college from taxation” (Talladega College, 2018).

Tuskegee University was “[f]ounded in a one room shanty, near Butler Chapel AME Zion Church, thirty adults represented the first class – Dr. Booker T. Washington was the first teacher” (Tuskegee University, 2018). On July 4, 1881 The Alabama House of Representatives authorized House Bill 165 establishing the school that would become Tuskegee University (Tuskegee University, 2018). The history of the university dates back to a former slave owner, George Campbell, and a former slave and tinsmith who also served as a community leader, Lewis Adams. Senator W. F. Foster, who was running for re-election accosted Adams to help him win support of the black community in Macon County (Tuskegee University, 2018). Tuskegee Institute received both a charter and a modest appropriation from the state in 1881 and has received state funds since its founding and since 1943 has had five members of its board of trustees appointed by the Governor, thus Tuskegee University occupies a position unique among institutions of the State serving as a private institution with public affiliation (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

Normal Colleges and Institutions for Women the Alabama Legislature

The first normal school in the United States was initiated, in 1839, in Lexington, Massachusetts (Diener, 2008). According to Null, “[a]ll normal schools were founded for the sole purpose of teaching teachers for the public schools of the state within which they existed” (Null, 2007, p. 47). The demand for teachers in the developing public school system was so great in Alabama, that in the years between 1872 and 1887, four state normal schools were founded:

Florence in 1872, Jacksonville and Livingston in 1883, and Troy in 1887 (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975). Livingston and Montevallo, founded in 1896 were established specifically for women, and in the 1890's The University of Alabama and Auburn began admitting women to help ease the burden for the demand of teachers (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

As the South began to recover from the Civil War and regain local control after the era of Reconstruction, there was a significant need for an increase in teachers. The University of North Alabama, located in Florence, was founded as LaGrange College near Leighton, on January 11, 1830 and became the first state-charted college in Alabama (Lindley, 2017). Established by the Methodist Church, the college renamed in 1856 and was called Florence Wesleyan University (Lindley, 2017). After the Civil War, the university could not support its financial obligations due to declining enrollments and in 1870, "the North Alabama Methodist Conference offered the property to the state of Alabama on the condition that it be converted to a training school for teachers, known as a normal school" (Lindley, 2017). Alabama accepted the offer, and in 1872 the school was renamed the State Normal School at Florence (Lindley, 2017).

Troy University's roots are in education and the university has a "tradition of teaching excellence dat[ing] to its founding on February 26, 1887, when an act of the Alabama Legislature established Troy State Normal School as an institution to train teachers for Alabama's schools" (Troy University, 2018). The school was renamed Troy State Normal College, in 1893 (Troy University, 2018).

Daphane State Normal College was established on October 1, 1907 and "follow[ed] the regulations and ideals projected by the State board of trustees, appointed under act of April 18, 1911" (Causey, 2018). The Alabama Legislature on April 13, 1911 "appropriated \$2,500

annually for four years to be used for the purchase of necessary lands, for the erection of new buildings, and for their furnishing and equipment” (Causey, 2018). During the same legislative session, an amendment was adopted to the general provision for the maintenance of the State normal schools, “directing an annual appropriation of \$5,000 to be set aside for the school at Daphane” (Causley, 2018). Daphne State Normal School operated until 1940 when it closed and all files were transferred to Livingston State College. (Causey, 2018).

The University of West Alabama “was chartered in 1835 as a church related female academy and admitted its first students in 1839” (The University of West Alabama, 2018). Julia Tutwiler was the leader of the school at Livingston from 1881 to 1910 and she lobbied and was successful in gaining a small appropriation from the State Legislature in 1883 “to establish normal school training for girls at Livingston Female Academy” (The University of West Alabama, 2018). According to the archives at the University of West Alabama, this is believed to be the first State appropriation in Alabama made exclusively for the education of women (The University of West Alabama, 2018). Livingston Female Academy and State Normal College remained a private college with some State support until 1907, when the State assumed full control (The University of West Alabama, 2018). The college continued under its own board of trustees, until the State Legislature created a State Board of Trustees for all the normal schools in 1911 (The University of West Alabama, 2018). In 1919, “this board was abolished and all state normal schools were placed under the supervision of the State Board of Education” (The University of West Alabama, 2018). The college saw three significant changes due to legislative control, in 1929 the school at Livingston became State Teachers College, Livingston, Alabama, in 1957, the name was again changed by an act of the Legislature –this time to Livingston

College, and in 1967 an act of the Legislature created Livingston University, with its own Board of Trustees” (The University of West Alabama).

Jacksonville State University started from modest beginnings by “[t]he Alabama Legislature in the 1882-83 session [and it was] created as a state normal school when Governor Edward O’Neal signed into law a bill creating the school on February 22, 1883” (Jacksonville State University, 2017, p. 4). The institution became known as Jacksonville State Normal School and as stipulated in the establishing act, the normal school conducted a preparatory school for children of the town and surrounding areas” (p.4). According to the online Jacksonville State University Catalog, “the normal school remained in operation until 1930 when it became Jacksonville State Teachers College, reflecting an increasing higher education role for the institution” (p. 4). The school changed its name again, in 1957, to Jacksonville State College (Jacksonville State University, 2017). Two other significant changes occurred, “[o]n August 2, 1966, the Legislature authorized the State Board of Education to elevate the college to university status [and] [o]n August 17, 1967, the Legislature established an independent Board of Trustees for the university and divested jurisdiction from the State Board of Education” (p. 4). Thus, by 1900, “with two major state institutions, four normal schools, one college for women, and two public institutions for blacks, the framework of state-supported higher education higher education that prevailed during the first six decades of the twentieth century had been established (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

In 1896, the University of Montevallo was established as an institution for women focusing on vocational training, but gradually developed into a four-year liberal arts college for women and in 1956, the college became co-educational (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

War World I and Higher Education

According to El-Khawas, “World War I was a short war in military terms for the United States, officially lasting 19 months” (El-Khawas, 2011, p. 35). Alabama’s economy began to suffer as a result of the war with cotton prices falling, Alabama’s port of Mobile saw reduced traffic, and human resources were heading to Europe to fight the war, which all impacted the state’s economy (Olliff, 2016). With young men joining the armed forces instead of enrolling in colleges and universities, revenues took a steep dive hurting the higher education economy (El-Khawas, 2011). To offset the low enrollment and declining finances, the federal government awarded some colleges and universities federal grants in research on explosives and industrial processes to contribute to the war effort (Cohen, 1998). Colleges and Universities also helped with the war effort by agreeing to participate in the federal government’s Student Army Training Corps with more than 500 universities and colleges becoming training grounds for active duty soldiers (Levine, 1986). However, the program was short lived and lasted only months, as World War I ended shortly after it was put into place (Devane, 1965; Geiger, 1986).

The Alabama Community College System

Fountain and Tollefson cited Former Chancellor of the Alabama Postsecondary System, Charles Payne, as stating, “the first state-operated trade school, the Alabama School of Trades, opened in Gadsden on September 14, 1925” and “there were four program offerings, including printing, electricity, bricklaying, and cabinetmaking with thirty-five students enrolling in the school (Fountain and Tollefson, 1989, p. 3). However, [s]everal of the [former] private two year institutions trace their roots to the late 1800’s” (ACCS, 2018).

The Alabama Legislature, on October 9, 1947, passed the Regional Vocational and Trade Shop Act No. 673, “which approved the creation of five regional trade schools: George C.

Wallace State Trade School, Dothan, 1949 (now George C. Wallace State Community College); Wenonah State Technical Institute, Birmingham, 1949 (now Lawson State Community College); Tennessee Valley State Technical School, Decatur, 1947 (now John C. Calhoun State Community College); Shelton State Technical Institute, Tuscaloosa, 1951 (now Shelton State Community College; and Southwest State Technical Institute, Mobile, 1953 (now [Bishop State Community College])” (Fountain and Tollefson, 1989, p. 3). Also significant in 1947 was President Harry S. Truman’s call for the “creation of public “community” colleges—two-year institutions of higher education located in communities for general academic education as a doorway to universities and for technical training and degrees” (ACCS, 2018). President Truman’s vision was “to make higher education more accessible and to fuel America’s booming economy that required ever-increasing workplace skills” (ACCS, 2018).

In 1958, the Committee on Higher Education of the Alabama Education Commission proposed a state system of junior colleges in Alabama (Alabama State Department of Education, 1976). Before “the Alabama Junior College and Trade School program was launched, the impetus for the establishment of junior colleges remained essentially in the hands of the local communities” (Alabama State Department of Education, 1976, p. 2). However, “[m]any in the state realized that, in relation to their ability to pay, Alabama citizens matched and exceeded the state contribution to higher education of many wealthier states...that the State undertook an expanded commitment to education in the 1960’s is testimony to the faith of Alabamians in education and to their realization that only by even great effort could Alabama hope to improve the quality of life for its citizens” (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p. 18-19). In May of 1963, through Act Nos. 92, 93, and 94 the Alabama Legislature formed Alabama’s two –year college system (Fountain and Tollefson, 1989). According to Chancellor Payne, “the

system was created largely through the leadership of Governor George C. Wallace, the father of Alabama two-year colleges, who wanted to enhance the quality of life in Alabama by making postsecondary education accessible, affordable, and responsive to the unique needs of individuals” (Fountain and Tollefson, 1989, p. 2). According to the Alabama Community College System, “over the years, a dual system of primarily African-American trade schools and primarily white junior and technical colleges were merged into a single system” (ACCS, 2018).

Former Governor, Albert Brewer, who was serving as Speaker of the House in 1963 recounted in 1980 how the two-year college system became a reality stating:

So [Rep.] Rankin Fite, [Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee,] and I went downstairs to the Governor’s office, and we went in and I’ll never forget this: We went through the usual amenities and then Rankin said, “Governor I’ve got something here that will make you famous.” And Wallace immediately perked up and he said, What’s that?” And Rankin said, “I’ve got a bill to create five trade schools and five junior colleges.” Now Wallace had sponsored legislation fifteen years earlier to create four or five trade schools. And Wallace said, “How are you going to finance it?” And Rankin said, “With a 2 [cent] beer tax.” And Wallace turned to me and he said, what do you think about it?” And I said, “Well I guess it sounds alright.” And he said, “Well, that’s alright with me!” And so casually, and in less than ten minutes was the “Trade School and Junior College” program born in Alabama. We went back upstairs, Rankin introduced the legislation that day, and it became law! (Gibbons, 1980, p. 130-131).

According to the Montgomery Advertiser, the three bill package introduced was the work of acknowledged master bill drafter, Speaker Pro-Tem Rankin Fite (1987). Katsinas asserts,

there were only three limitations placed on the power of the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority: (1) No more than \$1.5 million could be spent on the physical construction of a single trade school or junior college; (2) Authority funds could only be spent on “original,” new equipment; and (3) Authority funds could not be spent on real estate” (Katsinas, 1994, p. 455).

While the three pieces of legislation creating the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority moved rapidly through the Alabama House of Representatives, it was met with opposition and a record long filibuster in the Alabama Senate (Gibbons, 1980). Katsinas states, “[o]pposition to the two-year college package in the Alabama Senate centered around four arguments: first, taxpayers from the twenty-one “wet” of the state’s sixty-seven counties would bear the entire cost of the proposed two cent beer tax; second, there was no plan or major study showing the need for a junior college or trade school program; third, existing state resources had already been stretched so far that diverting money to a new educational program when existing program needs were unmet made little sense (an argument educators including the state superintendent of education, the superintendents of schools in the state’s three largest school districts, and officials from the University of Alabama and Auburn University would make); and fourth, there was the general fear in the state senate that Wallace was becoming too powerful” (Katsinas, 1994, p. 457). Katsinas, citing John M. Tyson, Sr., of Mobile, the youngest filibustering state senator at the time, “the specific tactic used by Wallace to break the filibuster was to call out agents of the Alabama Alcoholic Beverage Commission (ABC) to “audit” beer distributors in the thirteen wet, most urbanized counties around the state” (Katsinas, 1994, p. 462).

Governor Wallace argued the passage of the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority would make Alabama “the Athens of the South” and he went on to elaborate to the *Birmingham News* adding,

This is the greatest educational program in the history of Alabama. I believe this is the beginning of a new era in education and industrial growth Alabama. We have enough money to start each institution in the proper manner. Then the legislature will be back in session in two years, and I will ask it to enhance and expand this program to make it the best anywhere (*Birmingham News*, 1963, p. 46).

Katsinas explains, “[c]ritics later would say that the two-year college program represented the worst of the Wallace era – an unaffordable dream of a college in every community of size and significance in the state, financed through regressive taxation and record bonded indebtedness, with little or no thought about planning, and staffed with administrators who earned their positions on the basis of politics not competence in postsecondary education” (Katsinas, 1994, p. 465). Katsinas further explains, that this came to fruition on the basis of “the populist sentiments in a legislative power structure dominated by rural interest, the pent-up demand for higher education in the state, and the presence of a strong and ambitious governor who used the fullest extent of his political and legal powers to patch together a rural-based legislative coalition to finance the beginnings of a system of two year colleges” (p. 468).

In 1982, “the Alabama Legislature created the Department of Postsecondary Education, separating it from the State Department of Education, and creating the position of Chancellor” (ACCS, 2018). In the late twentieth century and the early twenty first century, the Department of Postsecondary Education merged several junior colleges and technical colleges to create more

community colleges for the state. According to Ammons (2016) “merging these institutions resulted in merging faculty, staffs and different cultures” (p. 8).

In 2015, the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education was reformed to meet the educational and economic needs of the state (ACCS, 2018). One of the major changes to take place was “[t]he Alabama Legislature establish[ing] an independent Board of Trustees for the Alabama Community College System and renam[ing] the Department of Postsecondary Education to the Alabama Community College System” (2018). With the name change came new governance and the state legislature called for “more advanced technology, guaranteed college-credit transfer, specialized workforce development training for new and expanding industry as well as for existing businesses, adult education, access to distance learning, and education for healthcare professionals” (2018, para 3).

Before establishing the Alabama Community College System, the postsecondary leaders had been accountable to an elected State Board of Education overseeing primary, secondary, and postsecondary education. Since March 13, 2016 the Alabama Community College System is overseen by a Board of Trustees consisting of

- (1) The Governor, who shall be ex officio president of the Board.
- (2) Seven members appointed by the Governor so that one member of the Board is a resident of each of the seven congressional districts in the State of Alabama. If a member appointed from a congressional district ceases to be a resident of the district from which he or she was appointed, the member shall vacate his or her office.
- (3) One ex officio, non-voting member appointed by the Governor who is actively serving on the State Board of Education.

(4) One member appointed by the Governor from the state at large.

All appointees to the Board shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate and shall be confirmed before beginning a term of office. As vacancies occur on the Board for any cause, they shall be filled by the Governor for the unexpired term, subject to confirmation by the Senate in accordance with Alabama law before beginning service (Code of Alabama 16-60-111).

Community colleges are complex institutions whose “roles and responsibilities have never been completely agreed upon by the rest of the higher education world—the students, the faculty, the administrators—or even the taxpayers, the policy makers, and the corporate world” (Desai, 2012, p. 111). The Alabama Community College System mission statement reads, “[t]o provide a unified system of institutions dedicated to excellence in delivering academic education, adult education, and workforce development” (ACCS, 2018). Moreover, the ACCS vision statement is, “[t]o develop an educated, prosperous population by providing an affordable pathway to help citizens of any walk or stage of life succeed through quality education and training; a community college system where education works for all” (ACCS, 2017).

The Commission on Higher Education asserts, “[w]ith higher education increasingly viewed both as a growth industry itself and as a prerequisite to the attraction of high quality industrial prospects, areas of the state which felt they had been bypassed by public higher education, especially the great urban centers, demanded that state government remedy what was perceived as past inequity” (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p.17) With minimal tuition, wide geographic distribution, and open door admission policies, the community and technical colleges represent a significant step towards achieving the goal of wide and equal access to post-secondary education.

Higher Education and the Great Depression

In October of 1929 came the collapse in the American market which ushered in the Great Depression, “the effects of the crash were immediate and far reaching as prices dropped sharply; factories cut production or closed forever; real estate values declined new construction stopped; banks failed; and farms formerly mortgaged passed into the hands of insurance companies” (Rippa, 1964, p. 41). The 1929 stock market crash did not have an immediate effect on higher education in the United States, “[b]ut American higher education had been expanding throughout the 1920s, and the full force of the Depression did not strike the academy until the Depression reached its nadir, during the academic year 1932-33” (Schrecker, 2009). In the 1930s, institutions of higher learning fought for survival as low enrollments and decreases in state funding took its toll on higher education, however only a few institutions were forced to close their doors (Rudolph, 1962; Levine, 1986). During the Great Depression, one of the “more serious threat[s] came from the state legislators to cut cost by bringing colleges under tighter control” (Schrecker, 2009).

In December of 1932, President Herbert Hoover called a citizens’ conference on the crisis of American education where “a committee created by the Progressive Education Association [over] the past year held a number of conferences with representatives of colleges in different part of the United States (Judd, 1933). The 1931 Hoover Commission Report, more formally known as the Federal Relations to Education, Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education and other such reports discovered “[f]our overlapping themes emerged in policymakers’ and educators’ efforts to make sense of this difficult era for public higher education: 1) power and control (who governs); 2) money, efficiency, and productivity; 3) the inseparability of money and control; and 4) the merits of voluntary cooperation and self-

regulation” (Novak and Leslie, 2000, p. 62) Enrollments did decline at private colleges and universities, however students who had once attended private colleges were now enrolling in more cost affordable public institutions of higher learning (Schrecker, 2009).

Historical Black Colleges and Universities were feeling the Depression the most severe. Dr. Kelly Miller, a member of the Board of Contributing and Advisory Editors for The Journal of Negro Education stated that enrollment had declined at such a pace for African American institutions that “the Negro college and university cannot escape the tendency of the times which economy and efficiency demand” (Miller, 1933, p.3). Miller also asserts that many of the Historical Black Colleges and Universities were established with the motive of evangelical training and as a result “the motive was promoted by evangelical fervor and denominational aggrandizement” Miller goes on to declare in the editorial that “[p]resent day conditions, accentuated by the depression, call for educational statesmanship...and...the several denominations, instead of operating its chain of schools, now existing at a poor, dying rate, might well consider the feasibility of consolidating them into one adequate provision for high grade college work” (Miller, 1933, p. 3).

During the 1930s, institutions of higher learning engaged in salary reduction as the main cost-cutting measure, “public colleges cut faculty salaries more commonly than private ones, sometimes as public relations gestures to show their state legislators that they were already practicing austerity and should be exempt from further budget cuts” (Schrecker, 2009).

World War II and the G.I Bill of Rights

The impact of World War II effected all aspects of Alabama as a state. From population, public welfare, public health and education just to name a few (Sparks, 1943). With a history of depending on agriculture as the primary staple of the economy, Alabama began to invest in the

war effort in the industries of steel, aluminum, chemicals, textiles, aerospace, and people (Sparks, 1943). The southern economy began “mov[ing] from an agrarian and low wage, non-durable economy to one centered on petrochemicals, aerospace, and tourism” (Lewis, 2007, p. 866). According to Governor Chauncey Sparks, “Alabama’s contribution to the war effort has been largely material, let it be noted that Alabama stands among the first two or three States in men enlisted in the armed forces in proportion to population” (Sparks, 1943, p. 3)

Even institutions of higher learning contributed to the war effort, Governor Sparks argues, “while it is not sound thinking even in war time to consider colleges and universities as military establishments, it is true nevertheless that Alabama’s institutions of higher learning are rapidly losing their peacetime character and taking on more and more air of military schools” (Sparks, 1943, 3). World War II emphasized the need for education in our modern world (Norton, 1943). Norton asserts, “[a]ll the specialized training provided by the armed forces to prepare men for special, technical, wartime occupations must be built upon a general education including a mastery of the tools of learning, reading, writing, arithmetic, and our best modern fighters are those who have come to have broader understanding of and appreciation for the historical background of our liberty and the glorious heritage that is ours” (Norton, 1943, p. 46). Special training was offered also at the University of Alabama, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, three of the teachers’ colleges, Tuskegee Institute, and Alabama A&M Institute (Norton, 1943).

As Alabamians came to realize victory and the end of World War II, the same state at the end of the war was very different than it was at the beginning of the war and many Alabamians started asking themselves, what may Alabama expect now that the war was over (Farmer, 1943)? Many in economic and workforce development started asking critical questions about what was to come of the locations of plants that were engaged in the military production, the number of

men employed in them, the amount of production, and the plans for future use of these plants and towns as many Alabamians feared another major economic depression after the economic boom of the World War II years (Farmer, 1943). According to Loss, “[w]artime opinion polls highlighted widespread anxiety about the postwar economy: 70 percent of Americans expected to be worse off after the war; 60 percent anticipated lower wages; and 75 percent expected fewer jobs” (Loss, 2005, p. 886-887) However, as servicemen and servicewomen made their way back to their hometowns, many began to enroll in colleges and universities, and the years following World War II were years of growth and change in higher education in Alabama, and the United States (Alabama Higher Education Commission, 1975).

In 1944, “Congress opened the door for veterans to college campuses with the passage of Public Law 346, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill of Rights” (Alsobrook, 2017, p.1). The G. I. Bill placed a college education within reach of thousands of young Americans for whom in an earlier age it would have been unattainable and many Alabamians took advantage of the G. I. Bill with the conviction that an education was a means not only in alleviating social ills, but also of individual improvement and advancement, which created extraordinary demands upon higher education in the state. (Alabama Commission of Higher Education, 1975). El-Khawas asserts, “The GI Bill, which provided funding for further study to those leaving military service between the 1950s and the 1970s, was also a significant boom to college and university enrollments” (2011, p. 37). The GI Bill paid for thousands of veteran students’ tuition and college study who otherwise would not have entered higher education without it (Thelin, 2004) and it also provided most of the financial support for graduate students (Phillips and Shen, 1982; Geiger, 1986).

In March of 1945, Alabama Polytechnic Institute's President Luther N. Duncan recognized the potential financial opportunities inherent in the GI Bill and predicted to Congressman George W. Andrews, in a letter that "since postwar employment in engineering, agriculture, and veterinary medicine required 'definite preparation along scientific, technical, and practical lines, [...] we shall have as many of these veterans as we shall be able to house and teach" (Alsobrook, 2017, p. 317).

While the GI Bill was influential in helping white veterans, it helped widen the racial gap, in higher education, in the southern United States. The Jim Crow South, without exception, with large flagship state universities were closed to blacks in the post-World War II period" (The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2003). Moreover, "[fo]r many blacks the GI Bill was the equivalent of getting a \$500 balance on a credit card that was not accepted at the only places blacks were permitted to shop" (2003, p.36).

Olson asserts, "by the time the GI Bill's education title officially ended 37 percent of all veterans had used it benefits" and further, "at the college level alone a total of 2,232,000 veterans utilized their GI Bill, with over a million veterans crowding on American campuses during the year of 1947-48" (Olson, 1973, p. 602). Economist, historians, and social scientist have stated the GI Bill created an avenue to higher education to millions and helped set the stage for the decades of widely shared prosperity that followed World War II (Stanley, 2003).

Higher Education and the End of Segregation

In the Heart of Dixie, Alabama, African-Americans had few opportunities for public higher education. The laws in ante-bellum Alabama prohibited the education of slaves and free blacks. Following their emancipation at the end of the Civil War, the Alabama freedmen were generally illiterate and without education. Myers asserts, "[n]egroes instinctively realized that

the great difference between themselves and the white man was not color but knowledge” (Myers, 1971, p. 163). According to Karpinski, “[w]ith the end of Reconstruction and the strengthening of a social caste system sustained by Jim Crow laws, the public education system in states like Alabama had little to offer African-Americans”, Karpinski further elaborates, “when the US Supreme Court handed down the decision in *Plessy v Ferguson* (1896), the ‘separate but equal’ ruling institutionalized an educational system that kept African-Americans in separate schools” (Karpinski, 2010, p. 52).

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court’s *Brown v. Board of Education* was “[b]rought by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) attorneys on behalf of plaintiffs from Kansas, Delaware, Virginia, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that legal segregation in public education was a violation of the rights of African-American children under the 14th Amendment guarantee of “equal protection of the laws” for all U.S. citizens” (Franklin, 2005, p.1). However, many of Alabama’s citizens, politicians, and higher education administrators were not ready to enforce integration.

In 1962, as George C. Wallace was campaigning for governor, Wallace promised the people of Alabama that he would prevent integration even if he had to stand in the schoolhouse door (Carter, 1968, p. 436). On June 11, 1963 Governor Wallace kept his promise standing in front of the schoolhouse door of Foster Auditorium at The University of Alabama trying to block two African-Americans Vivian Malone and James Hood from enrolling at the university. (Rogers, Ward, Atkins, Flynt, 1994). President John F. Kennedy federalized the Alabama National Guard and requested Governor Wallace to step aside allowing the two students to enroll for classes. However, “The University of Alabama first desegregated in February 1956, when

Autherine Lucy attended for several days by order of a federal court in *Lucy v. Adams*”
(Southern Education Reporting Service, 1964, p. 4).

From 1955 to 1964 the Alabama legislature enacted 35 pieces of legislation trying to prolong segregation for as long as possible even going so far in 1956 in the first special session in Act 40 that modified teacher tenure in Macon County to permit firing of teachers who advocated desegregation (Southern Education Reporting Service, 1964, p. 4).

The Creation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education

The justification in creating the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) was based

upon a belief that the present system has evolved over time to meet the needs of a changing society and that with proper coordination and cooperation and with an informed view of the educational, economic, social, and demographic changes now underway that system can fulfill the aims of Act 14, Special Session 1969, establishing the Commission On Higher Education to promote ‘an educational system that will provide the highest possible quality of collegiate and university education to all persons in the State able and willing to profit from it’ (Alabama Commission On Higher Education, 1975, p. viii). Planning Document Number One for The System of Higher Education in Alabama, outlines “under Act 14, Special Session 1969, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is charged with reviewing ‘periodically all existing programs of instruction, research, and public services funded by state appropriations at the State Universities and colleges,’ with studying ‘needless duplication of education, research, or service programs and programs which are not adequately provided in the State,’ with

causing ‘to be made such surveys and evaluations of higher education as is believed necessary for the purpose of providing appropriate information to carry out its powers and duties,’ with recommending ‘legislation as it deems necessary or desirable to insure the highest quality of higher education in this State taking into consideration the orderly growth and overall development of the State system of public higher education,’ with causing ‘studies to be made for the purpose of classifying and prescribing the role and scope for each public institution of higher education in Alabama,’ and with conducting ‘a program of public information in order to inform citizens of the State matters of importance to higher education in Alabama’ (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p. v).

According to Planning Document Number 1, ACHE was also designed to help those in higher education navigate the system as a whole and establish relationships that would help achieve the goals and expectations of higher education, which are:

(1) To preserve the heritage of the past and to inculcate a critical appreciation Values, aspirations, achievements, and failures of preceding generations in order to equip the rising generation with the knowledge and perspective to meet the recurrent problems of human society. (2) to instill in the young the knowledge, skills, perspective and tolerance necessary for a sound and productive life in democratic society. (3) To serve as an interlude between adolescence and adulthood, as a place and time and circumstance of maturation and character formation. (4) To provide the highly skilled professionals required in modern society—the doctors, lawyers, teachers engineers, dentists, architects, chemists, biologist, economists, among host of others. (5) To contribute to the general

social, cultural, and economic well being and improvement of the State. (6) To serve broadening range of occupational and vocational needs and aspirations through both two-year and four-year programs, and thus to train the skilled craftsmen, mechanics, technicians, and service personnel needed in a modern economy. (7) To extend the frontiers of knowledge through basic research. (8) To apply that knowledge to the economic and social problems of our society. (9) To provide a means for individual self-fulfillment and self-realization through the offering of diverse curricula to meet diverse needs (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p. 26-27).

Higher Education and the End of the Twentieth Century

Since the early 1800s, Alabama's public higher education system has grown very slow responding to the needs of the time and the era. By the 1950s, "there were two comprehensive state universities, four state teachers colleges for whites, two institutions for blacks, and a four-year liberal arts college for white women; in addition, there were numerous private institutions located throughout the state, several of them antedating the Civil War and most of them affiliated with a religious denomination" (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p. 13-14). However, the demographic, governmental, economic, and social pressures of the upcoming decades of the end of the twentieth century were building up under the surface of a system unchanged for sixty years and the growth of the sixties was salutary. The change of the 1960's was rapid and far reaching for Alabamians as "first, the generation on war babies began to reach college age, creating enormous pressures for new facilities and expanded faculties" (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975, p.14). Also, as the post-war era had seen a healthy growth and structuring of a middle class with it came rising levels of affluence and expectations

of education beyond high school. According to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, “an accurate gage of this increase in the rate of college attendance indicates that the number of first-time entering freshman in Alabama institutions as a proportion of the preceding spring’s high school graduating class rose from approximately 33% in 1961 to 54% in 1971” (1975, p. 15).

By 1970, the branches of the University of Alabama in Birmingham and Huntsville had become four-year degree granting institutions with graduate programs in varied fields (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975). The University of South Alabama was also created in the 1960’s to meet the needs of the state’s citizens in Mobile and the surrounding region, and in 1967, legislation authorizing the establishment of Auburn University in Montgomery was enacted (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 1975).

The 1996 Session of the Alabama Legislature passed a package of bills that “established legislative priorities for Alabama higher education, including 1) creation of a Higher Education Funding Advisory Commission to propose a new funding approach that is performance-based and uses other incentive funding approaches; 2) viability analysis of existing programs; 3) student and faculty databases; 4) facilities master plans; and 5) definition of resident student and prescribed tuition rates nonresident students” (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 2000, p. 5). During the same timeframe, ACHE submitted a State Plan to higher education stakeholders with five goals for Alabama higher education: 1) access – to provide each Alabama resident an equal opportunity for and reasonable access to higher education programs most appropriate to his or her needs and abilities; 2) cooperation – to enhance and improve education at all levels and to promote efficient use of resources by forming partnerships and academic alliances across sector, governing board, agency, institutional, community, and legislative lines ;

3) excellence – to provide high quality programs of instruction, research and service through continuous program evaluation, adequate financial support, application of standards, rigor in the educational process, and demonstration of competence of graduates; 4) responsibility – to demonstrate the effective and efficient use of resources, and 5) responsiveness – to provide a system of higher education that responds to the changing needs of individuals and society by offering high quality programs of instruction, research, and service of appropriate to instructional role (Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 2000).

Higher Education and the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century

From December 2007 to June 2009, during the first decade of the Twenty-first century, the effects of the Great Recession were felt on a global scale (Rivers, Wright, Ellis, 2015). The effects were especially felt hard by higher education as tuition rates increased “not because of increased spending on the part of institutions, but rather the steep decline in state and local government support in the wake of the Great Recession” (Johnson, 2014, p. 4).

Opinions of Legislators

The following is a list of studies reviewed for this study and involves surveys and the opinions held by legislators from various states and members of other related groups toward higher education. Included in the review are studies of opinions of the legislators themselves and studies of their opinions as compared with those of educators, the general public, and lobbyists. Studies of factors influencing opinions of the legislators’ perceptions of higher education are also included.

Ruby (1973) surveyed the attitudes of the Mississippi legislature toward higher education. Ruby’s survey contains 64 statements that are divided into five categories: personal data, current issues, quality and performance of state supported institutions, opinions regarding

the value of higher education, and problems of financing higher education in Mississippi. The members of the legislature had favoring opinions of college administrators facilitating control over student activities; however, legislators supported the first amendment and the right for students to speak on various points of view on campus. A majority of the Mississippi legislature were against allowing college and university faculty to unionize in the state and also opposed tenure as many had the opinion the practice was no longer necessary in higher education.

A few other outcomes of the Ruby study showed most members of the legislature were not in favor of raising the admission requirement in public colleges and universities, and they were not in favor of admitting academically disadvantaged students who did not meet admission standards. However, the members of the Mississippi legislature did agree that athletics was not over emphasized at the college and university level of postsecondary, members shared in the opinion that attending a college or university is a privilege and not a right, and members were satisfied with the quality of higher education in Mississippi. Ruby's study also discovered a link between accountability and spending for higher education in Mississippi.

Eulau and Quinley (1970) learned that state legislators had a favorable opinion of long range planning and centralizing coordination in colleges and universities as a means of holding institutions and administrators accountable and for positive use of resources. The most important issue in Eulau and Quinley's higher education study was taxpayers receiving the best return on their tax dollars. Palaich's (1983) national survey study indicated state legislators had the strongest opinions regarding higher education issues that involved the effective and efficient use of state funds.

Opinions of Legislators Versus Educators

Dodson's (1967) study reported the opinions of legislators and educators and showed members of the legislature considered the information which they received regarding school finances to be generally unsatisfactory, while educators considered the information as satisfactory. Dodson also learned that the sophistication of the education lobby was seen as quite low by members of the legislature, but was seen as fairly sophisticated by educators. However, both groups were of the opinion that the education lobby was highly fragmented.

Moreover, Dodson's study elaborated other findings suggesting the educational lobbyist's aggressiveness was in direct ratio to the stability of their position with the legislators, the lobbyist also viewed themselves as being more effective than they actually were, each institution's effectiveness was in direct ratio to the preparation of factual materials, negative communication was more effective than positive communication, and it was discovered that communication from education lobbies would be reduced considerably by the establishment of adequate research facilities by the state government.

Holsenbeck and Tiffany's (1980) study examined the availability of accurate, meaningful information to legislators regarding higher education in Alabama. Holsenbeck and Tiffany reported that while 67% of the educators said that legislators' opinions of the effectiveness of higher education had decreased, the majority of the legislators surveyed did not show that opinion.

Opinions of Legislators Versus Public

Smith's (1976) study focused on the attitudes of the Tennessee general public compared to Tennessee legislators. He found that:

The majority of Tennesseans (58%) have positive attitudes toward higher education and view it as a priority. The public and the legislators were found to have limited knowledge and understanding of higher education's multiple roles.

Over all, the opinions of both groups were similar (p. 140).

Thomson's (1977) study presented similar results in Louisiana. The study established no significant differences in the rating of important educational issues by the public and the legislators.

Hardee (1983) discovered in Alabama that 51.3% of the public and 50% of the members of the Alabama legislature agreed that too much attention was given to higher education and not enough to primary and secondary education. Also, 50% the public and 50% of the legislators agreed that the Alabama Education Association (AEA) had too much influence over educational policy, and both groups revealed they would be willing to pay slightly higher state and property taxes in order to have better public school systems. Hardee also found "53.9% of the public and 87.2% of the legislators felt that duplication of degree programs was a major problem of higher education in Alabama" (p. 22).

Opinions of Legislators Versus Lobbyists

Sandage (1974) surveyed the attitudes of the members of the Indiana Legislature and lobbyists on issues pertaining to higher education. Both legislators and lobbyists were asked about the purpose, quality, accountability, and duplication of programs of postsecondary education in Indiana. Sandage discovered that "[a]ccountability, adult and career education, and vocational education were highly acceptable by both parties as priorities" (p. 135). Sandage also learned that members of the legislature expressed a need for more accurate information regarding the expenditure of funds.

Gaston (1982) reported that lobbying efforts to increase funding for four-year universities could improve by more influence of university presidents and close personal friends of members of the legislature. Gaston also reported in the study that the most effective strategy for influencing members of the legislature was to provide accurate information from a reliable source.

Factors Influencing Legislators

Jewell (1982) interviewed members of state legislatures in nine states to learn what factors affected the legislators' opinions. Three major factors were isolated: the district, whether or not the college or university was located in the member's district; the electoral variable; and the lobbyists. Jewell also confirmed legislators will become more involved in committees relating to higher education if a college or university is located in their district. Moreover, legislators will become more involved with educational policymaking if the constituency calls for it.

Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1980) surveyed 420 state legislators throughout the United States who were identified as leaders in education and reported three reasons why a legislator becomes involved in educational policy. First, the legislator's demographic background; education, occupation, civic and political experience, and the number of school age children or other family members involved in educational institutions all were involved in the legislator's committee and assignment request. Second, was the legislators district. A member will become more involved in educational policy decision making if there is a college or university located in his or her district. The third reason was the legislator's sense of which policy domain is most important.

Scott (1977) examined state executives and their senior staff members to learn if they had an accurate appreciation of which information sources legislators believed most influenced their attitudes toward higher education. The study found that legislators' opinions toward higher education were independent of their perceptions about other levels of education. The study went on to reveal that legislators were able to evaluate generally the influence which selected information sources exercised over their broad attitudes. Also, legislators expressed that some had appreciably greater influence than others.

Finally, Francis (1967) showed that education was ranked as an important issue by legislators. The study revealed that the three issues most often named as significant were taxation, apportionment, and education, in that order.

Summary

The research indicates education is a significant issue to state legislators. The most significant issues pertaining to education for legislators focus on economics. The research studies reveal that legislator concerns are most often agreed with the concerns of the general public and educators. Moreover, the responsibility for allocating funds to colleges and universities is one members of the state legislator take seriously, especially if an institution of higher learning is located within his or her district. Overall, the literature strongly supports the need for more accurate information from trustworthy sources to be made available to both educators and legislators so that better decisions can be made.

Chapter III: Methods

In November 2010, the Republican Party gained control of the Alabama Legislature for the first time since Reconstruction (Ellington, 2011). The Democratic Party ruled the 136 years prior, and the political shift to the Grand Ole Party was a massive change in the political power structure of state government in Alabama. As Alabama citizens move further into the twenty-first century and with Alabama under new leadership from the Republican Party many higher education administrators are waiting and looking to see what changes, if any, will effect higher education as the political winds continue to shift further to the right, in the conservative red state of Alabama.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of the 2018 Alabama Legislature toward issues in higher education and to identify the issues on which members agree and disagree regarding certain aspects of higher education based upon personal demographics and statistical data. Also it was to examine and compare the attitudes of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education issues in Parker's (1985) study. This study, like Parker's (1985), investigated legislators' perceptions toward major issues facing higher education in Alabama and sought to discern the perceptions of Alabama Legislator's in regard to duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. However, Parker's (1985) study had fourteen domains, and the researcher for this study identified the five domains previously mentioned as the most important issues to focus on for this study by examining the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2017) Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017 and the researchers fifteen-year experience in Alabama

higher education and the assumption these issues will still be of significant importance and relevant in Alabama in 2018.

Understanding the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education is vital for educational leaders at Alabama's public colleges, universities, and community colleges to be effective and reach their educational and administrative goals. The study was conducted to compare the 2018 and Parker (1985) perceptions of the Alabama legislatures toward higher education; as well as to, identify areas where legislators perceived as ineffective in higher education in which they recommend changes in 2018. Leaders in higher education should be able to review these recommendations to develop a better partnership with the state legislature.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What are the demographics of the Alabama legislature?
2. What are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards?
3. What is the relationship of Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions?
4. What similarities/differences exist between Parker (1985) and the current study?

This chapter presents a description of the process used in this research study.

Specifically, it describes the research design employed, the sample selection, description of the sample, data collection procedures, protection of human subjects, development of instrumentation, data coding, and statistical analysis used for the study's collected data.

Design of the Study

This study used quantitative research measures in its design through the use of an electronic online survey (Appendix A). The survey was used to measure a sample of members of the 2018 Alabama Legislature (Appendix B). The survey was modified with permission from Parker (1985). The survey according to Parker, “was developed, analyzed, revised, piloted, revised again, and then administered to the participants in the study” (1985, p. 22). The modified survey instrument consisted of thirty-six items divided into the domain areas as listed below:

<u>Domain Area</u>	<u>Items</u>
Duplication of Programs	1-5
Financing of Private Higher Education	6-10
Financing of Public Higher Education	11-15
Athletics	16-20
Admission Standards	21-25
Demographic Data	26-36

Items 1-25 of the survey instrument were created for the purpose of identifying the members of the legislature attitudes toward a series of important cross section issues that are currently facing stake holders in higher education. Available responses to the first twenty-five survey items included multiple choice responses for some of the items and response sets ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree for other items.

The items in the demographic data section, items 26-36, requested personal data from the members of the Alabama Legislature. These data were utilized to determine if there was a relationship between the legislators’ perceptions expressed in items 1-25 and the personal circumstances identified in in items 26-36. Respondent items elicited information on the number

of years served in the legislature; educational background; race; age; gender; size of hometown or city; region of the state (north or south of Clanton, Alabama); party affiliation; business or profession; political philosophy (conservative, liberal, or other).

The SPSS statistical analysis program and Qualtrics was used to analyze participant data gathered through this research study.

Protection of Human Participants

The purposes and procedures for this research study were thoroughly detailed through written directives and responses (Appendix C Letters from House and Senate). The research protocol, information letter, invitational email, invitational reminder email, and survey instrument were carefully reviewed and approved by the researcher's dissertation committee, and Auburn University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB) (Appendix D IRB Approval).

Members of the Alabama House of Representatives and Alabama Senate were emailed an information letter (Appendix E) which served as the Waiver of Documentation of Consent. Further, the electronic online survey stated, "this survey is confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only...it will not be released in any way that will allow it to be identified with individual legislators".

Member of the Alabama House of Representatives and members of the Alabama Senate were sent an invitational email which invited the legislator to participate in the research study. The invitational email also provided a short overview of the purpose of the research study, the electronic online survey link, and information on the benefits of such research. The invitational email also briefly discussed any associated risks for research participants as well as the precaution taken to reduce such risks so as to better preserve anonymity and confidentiality of

research study participants. The members of the Alabama Legislature were also encouraged to review accompanying information letter for additional information regarding the research study.

Sample Selection

A research study request email along with an attached information letter was sent to the Speaker Mac McCutcheon, Speaker of the Alabama House of Representatives, and Mr. Patrick Harris, Secretary of the Senate requesting permission to survey members of the House and Senate, respectively, and permission was granted. After receipt of both chambers permission to survey the House and Senate, this research email and information letter, an Application for Human Subjects form, Project Description, invitational email, invitational reminder email, and survey instrument was submitted to the researcher's dissertation committee. After a full review of these materials, the researcher's dissertation committee granted the researcher approval to conduct the research study contingent upon receiving official notification that the researcher's project was approved through Auburn University's Institutional Review for the Protection of Human Research. Once approval was granted through Auburn University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, proof of such approval was submitted to the researcher's dissertation committee and full approval was granted for the researcher to utilize members of the Alabama House of Representatives and Alabama Senate for this research study.

The sample used in this research study was comprised of members of the Alabama House of Representatives and the Alabama Senate. The survey was submitted to members of the 2018 Alabama Legislature and all members were asked to respond. This included the 105 members of the house and 35 members of the senate. The group of legislators chosen for this study was

unique in that several members of the legislator were not seeking re-election in the 2018 election year and the researcher assumed a higher participation rate for the study.

Data Collection Procedures

Once full approval to conduct the research study was granted by Auburn University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research and the researcher's dissertation committee, an invitational email along with the link to the electronic survey was sent to all 105 members of the Alabama House of Representatives and 35 members of the Alabama Senate. The invitational email provided a short overview of the purpose of the research study, the electronic survey link, and information on the benefits of such research. The invitational email also briefly discussed any associated risks for research study participants as well as the precaution taken to reduce such risks so as to better preserve anonymity and confidentiality of research study participants. The members of the house and members of the senate were also encouraged to review the accompanying information letter for additional information regarding the research study. The information letter served as the Waiver of Documentation of Consent. An invitation reminder email was sent four weeks after the initial invitation sent the members of the 2018 Alabama Legislature. The Survey was open for 8 months for completion.

The survey was administered using Qualtrics and no personal identifiers were tied to the participant survey responses. After the data collection was complete, all survey responses were compiled using Qualtrics and then taken and securely stored for computation in the SPSS statistical analysis program. No personal identifiers were listed so as to ensure anonymity and confidentiality; no research study participants were linked to their responses. Further, no inducements were offered and participants were reminded that participation was completely

voluntary and research participants could discontinue their participation in the research study at any time.

Instrument Development

The survey instrument used for this study was a modified version of Parker's (1985) Survey of Attitudes and Opinions of Members of the Alabama Legislature Toward Higher Education. Parker's (1985) survey was "developed, analyzed, revised, piloted, revised again, and then administered to the participants in the study (p. 22). The survey was modified with permission from Parker (1985).

Parker's (1985) research instrument was "first piloted among five former legislators and five persons employed in higher education" (p. 23). These ten individuals were asked to give opinions and suggestions regarding the length of the survey, make-up of items, and general impression of the survey. According to Parker, "their suggestions included adding directions to request only one response to each question and to keep the survey to a reasonably short length" (1985, p. 23). The suggestions were incorporated, and the research instrument revised accordingly.

Data Analysis

An invitational email along with the link to the electronic survey was sent to 105 members of the Alabama House of Representatives and 35 members of the Alabama Senate by the researcher. This invitational email provided a short overview of the purpose of the research study, the electronic survey link, and information on the benefits of such research. The invitational email also briefly discussed any associated risk for research study participants as well as the precaution taken to reduce such risks so as to better preserve anonymity and confidentiality of research study participants. The members of the legislature were also

encouraged to review accompanying information letter served as for the additional information regarding the research study. The information letter served as the Waiver of Documentation of Consent. An invitation reminder email was sent four weeks after the initial invitation email was sent to the members of the Alabama Legislature.

The survey was administered using Qualtrics and no personal identifiers were tied to the participant survey responses. After the data collection was complete, all survey responses were compiled using Qualtrics and then taken and securely stored for computation in the SPSS statistical analysis program. No personal identifiers were listed so as to ensure anonymity and confidentiality; no research study participants were linked to their responses. Further, no inducements were offered, and participants were reminded that participation was completely voluntary and they could discontinue their participation in the research at any time.

Three different analyses were performed on the data collected from the survey. The data collected from the survey were first analyzed by counting the number of responses to each choice on every item maintaining separate counts for the house and the senate surveys. Parker (1985) because of the differences of each item, careful examination of responses was necessary and, therefore, required that each item be considered as an independent line of inquiry. Response rates were computed for items 1-25 to determine what percentage of those responding held a like or similar perception. The data collected was evaluated further in discussing the recommendations and conclusions of the study. These data were central to the primary purpose of the study, since the answers obtained to items 1-25 provided the basic information as to how the members of the legislature perceived the information on domain areas regarding the educational realm.

Chapter IV: Results

Working to better understand the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education will aid higher education administrations at the community college level, four-year college level, and university level in gaining better insights into how to better assist and support their campuses. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward four domains in higher education; including, duplication of programs, financing of public and private higher education, athletics, and admission standards. This study identified the stated contemporary four domains pertaining to issues in higher education as compared to the numerous domains in Parker's (1985) study. There was a great need for this research as the Alabama Legislature and its perceptions of issues in higher education have yet to be fully explored, especially in the Twenty-first century.

Purpose of the Study

Understanding the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward issues in the higher education setting in the twenty-first century is vital as higher education administrators are having to lobby the state legislature to reach their educational and administrative goals. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of the 2018 Alabama Legislature toward issues in higher education and to identify the issues on which members agree and disagree regarding certain aspects of higher education based upon personal demographics and statistical data. Also, it was to examine and compare the attitudes of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education issues in Parker's (1985) study. This study, like Parker's (1985), investigated legislators' perceptions toward major issues facing higher education in Alabama and sought to discern the perceptions of Alabama legislator's in regard to duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. However, Parker's (1985) study had fourteen domains, and the researcher for this study identified the five domains previously

mentioned as the most important issues to focus on for this study by examining the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2017) Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017 and the researchers fifteen-year experience in Alabama higher education and the assumption these issues will still be of significant importance and relevant in Alabama in 2019.

Understanding the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education is vital for educational leaders at Alabama's public colleges, universities, and community colleges to be effective and reach their educational and administrative goals. The study was conducted to compare the 2018 and Parker (1985) perceptions of the Alabama legislatures toward higher education; as well as to, identify areas where legislators perceived as ineffective in higher education in which they recommend changes in 2018. Leaders in higher education should be able to review these recommendations to develop a better partnership with the state legislature

Research Questions

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What are the demographics of the Alabama legislature?
2. What are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards?
3. What is the relationship of Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions?
4. What similarities/differences exist between Parker (1985) and the current study?

This study had four primary goals: (1) to determine the demographics of the members of the Alabama legislature; (2) to determine the perceptions of the Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards; (3) to determine the relationships of Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions; and (4) to determine what similarities/differences exist between Parker (1985)

and the current study. There was a need for this study as at present, there is a lack of research in this area for higher education administrators to explore. By focusing on the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature higher education administrators can work better to serve their constituencies and stake holders specific needs and meet their educational and administrative goals.

Chapter IV explores the results of the research data analysis. This chapter will first begin with the internal consistency reliability and validity information for the survey instrument used to gather the participant data. After this has been discussed, a description of the sample will be explored. And lastly, the quantitative data results from the research data analysis will be provided. The last portion of Chapter IV will provide a summary of the research study's findings.

Instrumentation of Reliability and Validity

Parker's (1985) survey instrument was "designed for the purpose of identifying the legislators' attitudes on a number of important topics which dealt with a cross section of issues currently facing decision-makers in higher education" (p. 22). According to Parker, "the research instrument was piloted among five former legislators and five persons employed in higher education" moreover, "they were asked to give opinions and suggestions regarding the length of the survey, make-up of items, and general impression of the survey (p. 23). The former legislators and higher education employees provided suggestions that included, "adding directions to request only one response to each question and to keep the survey to a reasonably short length, and these suggestions were incorporated, and the research instrument was advised accordingly" (p.23).

The author of this study requested permission from Parker and was granted permission to use the survey instrument with modifications narrowing the original fourteen domains to the

current five of this study: duplication of programs, funding of private higher education, funding of public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. Parker’s (1985) list of issues was narrowed to the current five mentioned above by examining the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2017) Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017. After careful examination, the modified survey was approved for validity by the author’s dissertation committee, the survey was approved by the dissertation committee and Auburn University’s Institutional Review Board. Further, the content reliability of the survey was established using Cronbach’s alpha. Results showed that the reliability of the survey was low with a Cronbach’s alpha of .588 meaning there is not a lot of internal consistency between the items in the survey. The item total statistics table shows that taking out any single item does not greatly improve the reliability, indicating the survey asked about a variety of things that did not prompt similar responding from participants. Because of the differences of each item, careful examination of responses was necessary and, therefore, required that each item be considered as an independent line of inquiry.

Table 1. *Reliability Statistics*

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.558	.554	25

Description of the Sample

The sample used in this research study was comprised of a survey sample of members of the 2018 Alabama Legislature. The survey instrument was electronically submitted to all 105 members of the Alabama House of Representative, and all 35 members of the Alabama Senate, totaling 140 members of the Alabama Legislature, during the summer and fall of 2018. The Alabama Legislature was chosen based on the author’s residents, interest, and career based in

Alabama; as well as, the lack of research studies on the Alabama Legislature’s relationship with higher education.

The population sample for this research study was pulled from the 140 members of the Alabama Legislature who had to be at least 19 years of age and serving in the Alabama Legislature during the summer and fall of 2018 to volunteer to participate in the research study. Of the 140 members of the Alabama Legislature, 32.85% volunteered to participate in the research study. Of those participating in the research study, 28.57% were members of the Alabama House of Representatives and 53.33% were members of the Alabama Senate.

Table 2. *Participating Legislator’s Seat in Legislature*

Seat	House	Senate
Total	30	16

Quantitative Data Findings

Demographics. In this section, the research study results in relation to the previously discussed research questions will be fully explored. The first research question, what are the demographics of the Alabama legislature, will be discussed below using the following tables to further illustrate the sample description.

The participants serving in the Alabama Legislature on average served at least 4 terms with the average (mean) years served being 16.17. Three participants have served for 40 years as members of the Alabama Legislature, which is the longest term of service, while 6 participants served 4 years.

The members’ highest educational level was as follows: 0% had completed less than high school, 2.17% had completed high school, 8.70% had completed some college, 47.83% had completed a college degree, and 41.30% had completed graduate or law school.

Table 3. *Participating Legislator's Highest Education Degree Level*

Degree Level	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
< High School	0	0	0
High School	1	1	0
Some College	4	4	0
College Degree	22	11	11
Graduate or Law	19	14	5
Total	46	30	16

To identify heterogeneity within the participant sample, members of the Alabama Legislature were asked to answer a basic demographic question regarding race: 0% identified as being Asian/Pacific Islander, 17.39% identified as being Black, not of Hispanic origin, 0% identified as being Hispanic, 0% identified as being Multiracial, 0% identified as being Native American, 78.26% identified as being White, not of Hispanic origin, and 4.35% identified as being Other.

Table 4. *Participating Legislator's Race*

Race	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	8	7	1
Hispanic	0	0	0
Multiracial	0	0	0
Native American	0	0	0
White, not of Hispanic Origin	36	20	16
Other	2	2	0
Total	46	29	17

Age. The average age of the participants is 62.77 years, while the oldest participant identified their age as 81 years old and the youngest participant identified their age as 38 years old. Of these participants, 21.74% were female and 78.26% were male.

Table 5. *Participating Legislator's Gender*

Gender	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
Female	10	9	1
Male	36	21	15
Total	46	30	16

Additionally, the members were residents in rural towns or urban cities with populations as follows: 33.33% lived in towns or cities with a population of 0-4,999, 15.56% lived in towns or cities with a population of 5,000-14,999, 26.67% lived in towns or cities with a population of 15,000-49,000, 4.44% lived in towns or cities with a population of 50,000-99,000, and 20.00% lived in towns or cities with a population of 100,000 and up.

Table 6. *Participating Legislator's Town/City of Residence Population*

Size/ Town	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
0-4,900	15	10	5
5,000-14,999	7	4	3
15,000-49,999	12	7	5
50,000-99,999	2	1	1
100,000 and up	9	7	2
Total	45	29	16

When looking at geographic region of Alabama, regions north of Clanton, Alabama were considered North Alabama and regions south of Clanton, Alabama were considered South Alabama. 47.73% of members of the legislature lived north of Clanton, Alabama, and 52.27% members lived south of Clanton.

Table 7. *Participating Legislator's Living North or South of Clanton, AL*

Clanton, AL	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
North	21	12	9
South	23	16	7
Total	44	28	16

When identifying party affiliation, 28.26% identified as Democrat, 63.04% identified as Republican, and 8.70% identified as Other.

Table 8. *Participating Legislator's Political Party Affiliation*

Political Party	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
Democrat	13	12	1
Republican	29	16	13
Other	4	2	2
Total	46	30	16

The members' political ideologies were as follows: 6.67% Liberal, 71.11% Conservative, and 22.22% identified as Other.

Table 9. *Participating Legislator's Political Ideology*

Political Ideology	<i>n</i>	House	Senate
Liberal	3	3	0
Conservative	32	19	13
Other	10	7	3
Total	45	29	16

Members of the Alabama Legislature participating in the survey have diverse careers with 12 identified as retired, 6 identified as being business owners, 5 identified as being an attorney/lawyer, 4 identified as being educators, 4 identified as being pharmacist, 2 identified as sales, 2 identified as forestry, and 1 identified as a banker, physician, mortician, marketing, engineer, automobile, farmer, construction equipment, real estate broker, and consultant, respectively.

Alabama Legislators Perceptions of Higher Education Issues. This section contains an analysis of the data collected from the research survey completed by the participants of this study to answer the second research question, what are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private higher education, financing of public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards? Of the 46 legislators responding, 30 were

house members and 16 were senators. Analysis of the data required the responses be classified into categories. Items 1-25 having four different responses were analyzed by all four responses and those having strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree as the responses were collapsed into agree and disagree categories.

Throughout the study, separate analysis was maintained for the house and senate responses. Although the two divisions represented one body, the separate analysis provided more useful data.

The analysis of the individual survey items was performed on the responses to items 1-25. The data were separated into senate and house groups. Items 1-25 were selected by examining the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2017) Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017 and Parker's (1985) study so the perceptions of the legislators could be identified in specific contemporary areas of concern toward issues in higher education.

Following Parker's (1985) survey "possible responses to individual content items were either four different responses or four responses on a scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree" (p. 28).

The first five items of the survey pertained to duplication of programs. Item 1, focused on excessive duplication of programs and the responsibility of the state. As a whole, the participants of the Alabama Legislature did not have a strong opinion over who should bear the responsibility of the unnecessary duplication of programs as 33% of the Alabama legislature would reduce duplication by consolidating programs, but not close institutions, 35 % would reduce duplication by consolidating programs and close institutions where cost effectiveness dictates, 9% would create no new programs where another program already exist at an institution

within the state, and 22% would create whatever programs are necessary wherever there is a need. When examining the perceptions of each individual chamber, no clear majority was reached with 40% of the house and 25% of the senate wanting to reduce duplication by consolidating programs, but not consolidating institutions, 26% of the house and 50% of the senate would reduce duplication by consolidating programs and close institutions where cost effectiveness dictates, 13% of the house and 0% of the senate would create no new programs where another program already exist at the institution within the state, and 20% of house and 25% of senate would create whatever programs are necessary wherever there is a need.

Regarding item 2, participants of the Alabama Legislature were divided when asked who should be responsible for decisions regarding consolidation of institutions: 15% answered the legislature should be responsible, 19% answered a centralized coordinating agency should be responsible, 40% answered the Alabama Commission on Higher Education should be responsible, and 17% answered the specific institutions involved should be responsible. Further examining showed that 16% of the house and 13% of the senate were in favor the legislature being responsible, 16% of the house and 19% of the senate would be comfortable with a centralized coordinating agency being responsible, 46% of the house and 30% of the senate agree that the Alabama Commission of Higher Education should be responsible, and 20% of the house and 13% of the senate would like to see the specific institutions involved be responsible for the decisions pertaining to the consolidation of institutions.

Item 3 continued to focus on the duplication of programs and suggested no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence, in Alabama, and a majority of participants disagreed with the statement, with 43% of the Alabama Legislature agreed with this statement and 57% disagreed. By examining each chamber participants revealed 50% of the

house and 44% of the senate agreed and 50% of the house and 46% of the senate disagreed.

While the house was evenly divided that no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence, the participants of the senate held a small majority disagreeing with the statement possibly making way for future medical schools in Alabama.

Asking who should take responsibility for the duplication of administrative and academic programs in higher education, item 4 was a statement that again divided the participants. Most members at 44% felt the Alabama Commission on Higher Education should take responsibility, 31% stated the individual institutional Board of Trustees should take responsibility, 15% felt the institutions should take responsibility, and 10% felt the legislature should take responsibility. By observing each chamber, again members reveal in each house of the legislature their division over responsibility for the duplication of administrative and academic programs with 43% of the house and 38% of the senate asserted the Alabama Commission on Higher Education should take responsibility, 30% of the house and 38% of the senate stated the individual institutional Board of Trustees should take responsibility, 16% of the house and 13% of the senate asserted the institutions should take responsibility, and 10% of the house and 13% of the senate asserted the legislature should take responsibility for the duplication of programs in higher education.

The last item pertaining to the duplication of programs sought to find unnecessary program duplication as a problem at which program level. A small majority of participants of 51% feel the problem of duplication is at the undergraduate level; while 21% feel duplication of programs is not a problem, 15% saw duplication of programs a problem at the associate level, and 13% saw duplication of programs a problem at the graduate level. Most members of the house 43% and senate 73% felt the problem is at the undergraduate level; while 13% of the house and 0% of the senate felt the problem is at the graduate level, 20% of the house and 6% of

the senate felt the problem is at the associate level, and 23% of house and 20% of senate felt duplication of programs is not a problem.

The next five items pertained to the financing of private higher education and the participants disagreed with state funds being allocated toward private colleges and universities. Item 6 questioned participants if state funds should be allocated toward need based tuition grants for students attending private institutions and 45% agreed and 55% disagreed. The findings were similar from participants in both houses of the legislature with 47% of house and 33% of senate agreed and 53% of the house and 67% of the senate disagreed with the statement.

Participants were strong of their opinion in Item 7, when asked if state funds should be allocated to private institutions in financial need 20% agreed and 80% disagreed. When narrowing down to the individual chamber participants, 23% of the house and 19% of the senate agreed, and 77% of the house and 81% of the senate disagreed with allocating state funds to private institutions in financial need.

Item 8 focused on decisions regarding state funding for private higher education should be made by: 74% believed the legislature, 13% believed the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 4% believed a centralized agency, and 9% believed a referendum of the people. Both the house and senate participants felt the legislature should make decisions regarding state funding for private higher education with 66% of the house and 86% of the senate; although 6% of the house and 0% of the senate believed the Alabama Commission on Higher Education should make the decisions, 3% of the house and 7% of the senate believed a centralized coordinating agency should make decisions, and 10% of the house and 7% of the senate believed it should be left to a referendum of the people.

When asking if Alabama should invest in economic and workforce development programs with state tax dollars at private institutions of higher education in Alabama, on item 9 participants has strong opinions as 36% agreed and 63% disagreed with the statement. 47% of participants from the house agreed and only 25% of the senate agreed with the statement, while 53% of the house and 75% of the senate disagreed.

The last item pertaining to private funding for higher education was divided as no option proved to hold a majority when focused on state tax dollars being used to support institutions through the use of scholarship and grants 44%, general operations 20%, general education support and libraries 4%, research 32%. When looking at the chambers of the house and senate, 27% of the house and 13% of the senate were in favor of scholarship and grants, 7% of the house and 13% of the senate was in favor of using state tax dollars for general operations. None of the participants in the house and 6% of the senate were in favor of general education support and libraries, while 13% of the house and 25% of the senate were in favor of state funds supporting private institutions with research.

Items 11-15 are concerned with financing public higher education institutions. Item 11 questioned if formula funding provided the single best index for the allocation of funds to higher education with 55% of those participants having agreed and 45% disagreed. When examining participants from each chamber 55% and 56% of the senate agreed, and 45% of the house and 44% of the senate disagreed. However, with item 12, participants agreed the legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula, with 83% in favor and 17% opposed. Both chambers had strong majorities with the house at 90% and the senate at 69% agreement, and 10% of the house and 31% of the senate having disagreed with the statement.

Item 13 questioned how much latitude should college administration be given in deviating from a funding formula? Those participating asserted with 6% total latitude, 21% considerable latitude, 58% some latitude, and 15% very little, if any, latitude suggesting college administrators should not be allowed any latitude in deviating from a funding formula. When examining participants from the house, zero participants were in favor of total latitude, 23% agreed with considerable latitude, 60% were in favor of some latitude, and 17% were in favor of very little, if any, latitude. Participants on the senate side were 19% wanting total latitude, 19% with considerable latitude, 50% with some latitude, and 13% with very little, if any, latitude.

Item 14 stated the state should adopt a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service. A majority of the participants, 58% agreed with the statement while 42% disagreed. However, the participants of the house were in favor of a salary schedule at 67% and disagreed at 38% while the senate was not in favor of a salary schedule with only 33% of participants favoring the idea and 62% disagreed with the salary schedule.

Item 15 examined the opinions of participants regarding salaries for personnel in higher education and if they should be performance based. There was a strong majority of participants agreeing with 90% agreeing salaries should be performance based and 10% disagreeing. Participants from the house had an 87% approval rating as 13% disagreed. Those in the senate had a 94% approval rating for performance based salaries as only 6% disagreed.

Items 16-20 focused on athletics in higher education. When asked if there is too much emphasis placed upon athletics in higher education 52% of participants in the legislature agreed while 48% disagreed. While a small majority in the senate agreed with the statement and 43% disagreed, the house was evenly split at 50% having agreed and disagreed with the statement.

Asking who should have the authority to regulate athletics in item 17, 2% asserted the legislature, 58% asserted an individual institutional Boards of Trustees, 10% asserted The Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and 29% asserted a state athletics commission. When observing the reactions to the participants of each chamber, 3% of the house and 0% in the senate feel regulation authority for athletics should come from the Alabama Legislature, 53% of the house and 69% of the senate asserted from an individual institutional Boards of Trustees, 10% of the house and 13% of the senate asserted the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and 33% of the house and 19% of the senate asserted a state athletics commission should have authority to regulate athletics in higher education.

Item 18 asked if student athletes should be paid a stipend along with their scholarship to help cover educational and living expenses. Participants in the legislature held a small majority at 56% that students should get a stipend along with their scholarship, while 44% disagreed. The members of the house agreed with stipends with 63% having agreed with the statement and 37% having disagreed; however, the participants from the senate disagreed with having a stipend at 56%, while 44% were in favor.

Item 19 asked participants of the legislature if revenue made from collegiate athletic events should be used for academic programs supporting the most current need for the state's economic and workforce development having 73% agreed and 27% disagreed. The results were identical with 73% having agreed in the house and senate and 27% have disagreed in the senate.

Item 20 asked participants if a collegiate athletic sporting tax should be raised to help fund higher education in the state. A majority of participants in the legislature disagreed with this becoming policy as only 17% agreed and 83% disagreed with the idea of a sporting tax used to help fund higher education, in Alabama. Majorities of both participants of the house and

senate disagreed with 83% of the house and 87% of the senate said no, while 17% of the house and 13% of the senate said yes to the idea of having a collegiate sporting tax.

Finally, items 21-25 focused on admission standards in Alabama's institutions of higher education. Item 21 asked if the admissions standards of institutions of higher education in Alabama are generally too low, 80% disagreed, while 20% agreed this was an accurate statement. Both the house with 83% and the senate with 75% disagreed with the statement and 17% of the house and 25% of the senate agreed that admission standards of institutions of higher education in Alabama are generally too low.

Item 22 was interested if students who do not meet university level admissions requirements should be referred to the Alabama Community College System and 83% of the participants in the legislature agreed and 17% disagreed. The house participants had an 80% approval of the statement and 20% disagreed, while the senate participants had 88% who agreed and 12% disagreed.

Item 23 questioned who should set the admissions standards for the various public institutions of higher education with 50% stating the individual institutions of higher education, 39% stated the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, 11% stated a centralized coordinating agency, and no participant stated the legislature. The house had 53% and the senate had 44% who stated individual institutions should set the admissions standards, while 40% of the house and 38% of the senate felt the Alabama Commission of Higher Education should set the admissions standards, 7% of the house and 19% of the senate asserted a centralized agency should set the admissions standards, and no participants from the house or senate felt the legislature should set the admissions standards for institutions in higher education.

Item 24 stated that limits should be placed upon the number of out-of-state students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education having 41% agreed and 59% disagreed. Participants in the house agreed with 47% and disagreed with 53%, while senate members agreed at 31% and disagreed at 69%.

Item 25 stated that limits should be placed upon the total number of students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education having 17% agreed and with having 83% disagreed. In the house 13% agreed and 87% disagreed while in the senate, 25% agreed and 75% disagreed.

House versus Senate. After observing and calculating the percentages of the above items, the second part of the research study of the second research question involved the comparisons between the perceptions of house members and the perceptions of the senators on items 1-25 of the survey. Before the research study, it was hypothesized that there would be no significant relationship between the perceptions of the two groups since the Republican Party had super majorities in each chamber of the legislature. Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if the data revealed a greater than chance relationship. Only one item was found to be significant to the .05 level and that was item 14.

On item 14, the house and senate revealed disagreement on the state adopting a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service. The participants of the house agreed with this statement at 67%, while the participants of the senate disagreed at 62%. The difference proved to be statistically significant with a $p = .048$.

Table 10. *Chi-Square Tests.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.892 ^a	3	.048
Likelihood Ratio	10.275	3	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.208	1	.073
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .70.

Relationship of Alabama Legislators' Demographics and Perceptions. The third research question asked what is the relationship of Alabama's legislators' demographics and perceptions? This portion of the research study examined the comparison of the participants' perceptions of educational issues as expressed in items 1-25 and the participants' demographic data as expressed in items 26-35. The ten variables investigated in items 26-35 were experience (number of years in the legislature), educational level, race, age, gender, size of hometown or city, region of the state (north or south of Clanton, AL), party affiliation, business or profession, and philosophical base. The variables were divided into categories for analysis.

The responses in items 26-36 were collapsed into categories as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. *Collapses Response Categories in Legislative Survey Analysis.*

Item	Topic	Choices	Collapsed Category
26	Experience	0-4 years	Freshman
		5-8 years	Non-freshman
		9-12 years	Non-freshman
		13-16 years	Non-freshman
		17-20 years	Non-freshman
		20+ years	Non-freshman
27	Education level	Less than high school	Non-college
		High school	Non-college
		Some college	Non-College
		College degree	College
28	Race	Graduate or law degree	College
		Black	Black
29	Age	White/Other	White
		19-45	45 or under
30	Gender	46 and older	Over 46
		Male	Male
31	Size of Town	Female	Female
		0-4,999	Rural
		5,000-14,999	Rural
		15,000-49,999	Urban
		50,000-99,999	Urban
32	Geographic Location	100,000 and up	Urban
		North of Clanton, AL	North
33	Party Affiliation	South of Clanton, AL	South
		Democrat	Democrat
34	Business/Profession	Republican/Other	Republican
		Open-ended Question	Not Applicable
35	Philosophical Base	Liberal	Liberal
		Conservative	Conservative
36	Chamber Member	Other	Conservative
		House of Rep	House
		Senate	Senate

Each of the ten items regarding participant's data was analyzed utilizing chi-square analysis to determine if there was a greater than chance relationship between the participant's demographic data in items 26-35 and the participant's perceptions of higher education issues of the information obtained in items 1-25.

For the purposes of this research study, it was hypothesized that no systematic relationship would be found between the participant data and the data collected in the first 25 items. However,

if the chi-square was significant at the .05 level, the two variables were considered to have a greater than chance relationship.

The responses to item 34 pertaining to business and profession were not found to be usable for this comparison because the answer to the item 34 was left open-ended and the responses were too varied to collapse into categories.

After running the Chi-square analysis, race had the most significant items pertaining to issues in higher educations in the legislature with nine items revealed significant at the .05 level. The first item where race influenced perceptions was item 2 which questioned who should have responsibility making decisions regarding consolidation of institutions. Those participants who identified as black were evenly spread with 13% revealing the legislature, 25% a centralized coordinating agency, 25% the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and 38% the specific institution involved. Those identifying as white were just barely a majority with 55% revealing the Alabama Commission on Higher Education should make decisions regarding consolidation, 16% suggested the legislature and 16% chose a centralized coordinating agency, and 13% chose the specific institutions involved should make decisions regarding consolidation.

Table 12. *Item 2 - Race*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.472 ^a	6	.017
Likelihood Ratio	11.626	6	.071
Linear-by-Linear Association	.855	1	.355
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

The second item that revealed race was a significant issue was item 6 which asked if state funds should be allocated toward need based tuition grants for students attending private intuitions.

The item revealed a majority at 63% of blacks agreed and 38% disagreed, while a majority of whites at 62% disagreed and only 39% of whites agreed with allocating state funds for grants for students attending private institutions.

Table 13. *Item 6 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.640 ^a	6	.016
Likelihood Ratio	12.354	6	.055
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.554	1	.033
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .22.

Again, when private institutions were concerned, race was a significant with item 7 when asked if state funds should be allocated to private institutions in financial need with 63% of blacks having agreed and 13% of whites having agreed. However, 87% of whites disagreed and only 13% of blacks disagreed.

Table 14. *Item 7 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.159 ^a	6	.013
Likelihood Ratio	13.801	6	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.698	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .09.

The fourth item that revealed race was a significant issue was when respondents were questioned on item 11 about formula funding providing the single best index for the allocation of funds to higher education those responding who identified as white agreed with 66% while only 25% of those identifying as black agreed, on the other hand, 75% of blacks disagreed compared to only 40% of whites.

Table 15. *Item 11 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.008 ^a	6	.009
Likelihood Ratio	14.313	6	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.070	1	.024
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .09.

When asked about item 12, if the legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula, 100% of blacks agreed and none disagreed, while 83% of whites agreed and 22% disagreed.

Table 16. *Item 12 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.052 ^a	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	15.778	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.465	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .30.

The next finding of significance was on item 14 and race when asked if the state should adopt a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon both their education and years of service. Ironically, 50% of whites said yes and 50% said no, so there was no clear majority of whites, however 88% of blacks were in agreement with only 12% in disagreement.

Table 17. *Item 14 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.604 ^a	6	.050
Likelihood Ratio	10.694	6	.098
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.466	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .09.

Item 16 observed athletics and asked if there was too much emphasis on athletics 88% of blacks agreed and 12% disagreed, while 45% of whites agreed and 55% disagreed.

Table 18. *Item 16 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.939 ^a	6	.021
Likelihood Ratio	13.592	6	.035
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.015	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .09.

When asked in item 19 if revenue made from collegiate athletic events should be used for academic programs supporting the most current need for the state's economic and workforce development, 88% of blacks agreed and 70% of whites agreed, 12% of blacks disagreed and 29% of whites disagreed.

Table 19. *Item 19 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.118 ^a	6	.013
Likelihood Ratio	13.169	6	.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.113	1	.013

In item 22, participants were asked if students who do not meet university level admission requirements should be referred to the Alabama Community College System, 50% of blacks agreed and 50% disagreed, while 90% of whites agreed and 11% disagreed.

Table 20. *Item 22 - Race.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.314 ^a	6	.012
Likelihood Ratio	15.560	6	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	.406	1	.524
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

The next area of demographics that had .05 level or less of statistical significance regarding higher education issues was three regarding party affiliation. Item 3 stated that no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence, 77% of Democrats agreed with the statement, while 64% of Republicans disagreed.

Table 21. *Item 3 - Party Affiliation.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.839 ^a	6	.004
Likelihood Ratio	16.913	6	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.958	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .35.

Item 14 examined the opinion of if the state should adopt a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service. 100% of the Democrats agreed with this statement, while 61% of Republicans disagreed.

Table 22. *Item 14 - Party Affiliation.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.442 ^a	6	.002
Likelihood Ratio	27.384	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.312	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

The last item pertaining to party affiliation was item 18, which questioned if student athletes should be paid a stipend along with the scholarship to help cover educational and living expenses. 85% of Democrats agreed with the statement, while 55% of Republicans disagreed.

Table 23. *Item 18 - Party Affiliation.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.065 ^a	6	.002
Likelihood Ratio	23.214	6	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.635	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .35.

When examining political philosophical base, three items were statistical significant.

Item 3 stated that no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence. 67% of liberals agreed with this statement, while 56% of conservatives disagreed with the statement.

Table 24. *Item 3 - Philosophical Base.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.661 ^a	6	.003
Likelihood Ratio	17.639	6	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.385	1	.239
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Item 16 stated there is too much emphasis placed upon athletics in higher education with 100% of liberals having agreed and 52% of conservatives having disagreed with the statement.

Table 25. *Item 16 - Philosophical Base.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.128 ^a	6	.009
Likelihood Ratio	16.524	6	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.632	1	.057
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Item 18 stated student athletes should be paid a stipend along with their scholarship to help cover educational and living expenses. 66% of liberals disagreed with this statement, while 75% of conservatives agreed with the statement.

Table 26. *Item 18 - Philosophical Base.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.260 ^a	6	.012
Likelihood Ratio	17.245	6	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	.607	1	.436
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

The next demographic to show statistical significance was educational level of the members of the Alabama legislature. Item 14 stated the state should adopt a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service. 63% of those having a college degree agreed with the statement, while 60% of non-college members disagreed with the statement.

Table 27. *Item 14 - Educational Level.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.160 ^a	9	.518
Likelihood Ratio	8.562	9	.479
Linear-by-Linear Association	.152	1	.696
N of Valid Cases	46		

a. 14 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Geographic location had two instances of statistical significance. Item 12 Stated the legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula. 53% of those who lived in North Alabama disagreed, while 59% of those who lived in South Alabama agreed with the statement.

Table 28. *Item 12 - Geographic Location.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.400 ^a	2	.025
Likelihood Ratio	8.006	2	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	.571	1	.450
N of Valid Cases	44		

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.34.

Item 24 stated that limits should be placed upon the number of out-of-state students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education. 81% of North Alabama legislators disagreed with the statement, while 60% of South Alabama legislators agreed with the statement.

Table 29. *Item 24 - Geographic Location.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.846 ^a	12	.716
Likelihood Ratio	9.142	12	.691
Linear-by-Linear Association	.677	1	.411
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 18 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

Finally, the last demographic to show statistical significance was regarding size of town or city. Item 9 stated that Alabama should invest in economic and workforce development programs with state tax dollars at private institutions of higher education in Alabama. 83% of rural legislators disagreed with this statement, while 60% of urban legislators agreed with the statement.

Table 30. *Item 9 - Size of Town or City.*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.383 ^a	12	.009
Likelihood Ratio	31.851	12	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.021	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	45		

a. 18 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.

Similarities/Differences

The fourth and final research question asked, what similarities/differences exist between Parker's (1985) and the current study? On the issue of the perceptions of duplication of programs, Parker's study concluded that a majority in both the house and senate chose to reduce duplication of programs in higher education by consolidating programs and close institutions where cost effectiveness dictates. However, with the current study, there was no clear majority on what the state should do regarding excessive duplication of programs, but half of the senate did confirm Parker's conclusion.

The results were the same concerning who should make decisions regarding consolidation of institutions. In Parker's study and the current study, it was revealed that legislators could not agree on who should make the decisions regarding the consolidation of institutions. The same results were concluded in both the house and senate, respectively. However, there was a change of perception when it came to the statement that no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence. In Parker's study the legislature and both chambers disagreed to the addition of new medical schools, in Alabama, but in the current study a majority of the legislature and the senate agreed for the approval of new medical schools in the state. Half the house was in agreement, so there was no solid majority, but there was an increase in support for medical schools since Parker's study.

When focusing on funding of private higher education, there was no change. A majority of the legislature in Parker's study and the current study concluded state tax dollars should not be allocated to private higher education. In both studies, there was a solid majority that the legislature should continue making decisions regarding funding for private higher education.

When examining funding of public higher education, Parker's study and the current study saw legislators and both chambers having agreed that formula funding provides the single best index for allocations of funds to higher education. Also, in both studies, the legislators and both chambers were in agreement that by solid majorities the legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula.

There was a slight change in perception when legislators were asked how much latitude should college administrators be given in deviating from a funding formula. In both studies, both members of the legislature held majorities with the perception that some latitude should be permissible and both members of the house held majorities with college administrators having some latitude to deviate from a funding formula. However, the senate increased its approval for some latitude from 43% in the Parker study to 50% in the current study.

When asked their perceptions of the state adopting a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon both their education and years of service, both the Parker (1985) study and the current study showed strong approvals. During both studies, the house had a greater than 60% agreement with idea. However, there was a change in the senate, in the Parker study over 60% of senators were in favor of the policy, but now in the current study 62% of the senators disagreed with the statement.

The next issue in higher education to be examined was athletics. When asked their opinion if there was too much emphasis placed upon athletics in higher education, the legislature and senate in both studies agreed. However, in both studies only half of the house members agreed. So there were no changes of opinion regarding the perception of too much emphasis placed upon athletics. There was no change of perception when asking who should have the authority to regulate athletics in higher education. In the Parker study and the current study,

majorities of both chambers agreed and the legislature as one body agreed that the individual Boards of Trustees should regulate athletics.

The final items of higher education to review was admissions standards in higher education. In Parker's study members of the legislature and members of both chambers agreed that admission standards of institutions of higher education in Alabama were generally too low, however 80% of the members of the legislature in the current study disagreed and a majority in both chambers disagreed with the statement.

When asked if students who do not meet university level admission requirements should be referred to the Alabama Community College System, both studies of the legislature agreed with the statement, as well as both chambers. When asked who should set the admission standards for various public institutions of higher education the legislators were divided in both the Parker study and the current study. However, in both studies the greatest percentage of participants felt the individual institutions should set the standards, but never reached a 50 plus one total.

The biggest difference found when it comes to admissions standards was found regarding whether limits should be placed upon the number of out-of-state students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education. In the Parker study, over three-fourths of the senators agreed with that there should be limits while only a little more than one-half the house members agreed. However, in the current study 59% disagreed there should be limits and 53% of the house and 69% of the senate disagreed.

Chapter Summary

This chapter explored the results of the statistical analyses from the collection of

participant data. When Chi-square analysis test were performed to examine the potential relationship between members of the Alabama House of Representatives and Alabama Senate the results indicated a statistical significance occurred on item 14 on the approval of the state adopting a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon both their education and years of service. No other significance was found through the analyses of research and study and participant data.

When Chi-square analysis test were performed to examine the potential relationship between the members of the legislature demographics and higher education issues the results indicated a statistical significance occurred pertaining to race, party affiliation, philosophical base, educational level, geographic location, and size of town or city. No other relationship was found through the analysis of research study participant data. Chapter V discusses the findings of this study in further detail while also expounding on the implications for administrators of institutions of higher education and members of the Alabama Legislature. This chapter will also discuss areas for further research and summarization of the research study.

Chapter V: Discussion, Implications, and Areas for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in the 2018 legislative session compared to the perceptions of the Alabama legislature toward higher education in Parker's (1985) study. This study, like Parker's, investigated legislators' perceptions toward major issues facing higher education in Alabama and sought to discern what are the perceptions of Alabama Legislators in regard to duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards? Working to better understand the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward higher education issues will better aid college and university administrators in their attempts to work collaboratively with Alabama legislators moving forward in the twenty-first century.

This study had four primary goals: (1) to determine the demographics of the Alabama Legislature; (2) to determine the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards; (3) to determine the relationship of the Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions; and (4) to determine the similarities/differences that exist between Parker's (1985) study and the current study.

The sample for this study consisted of the one independent variable which was the Alabama Legislature (members of the Alabama House of Representatives and Alabama Senate); the dependent variables were the duplication of programs, funding of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards issues in higher education. Altogether, 46 members of the 140 member Alabama Legislature participated in this research study, 16 members of the senate and 30 members of the house. Further, the participants serving in the Alabama

Legislature on average served at least 4 terms with the average member having served 16.17 years. The majority of members had completed college or graduate school with 17.39% identified black and 78.26% identified as white, and 4.35 identified as Other. The average age of the participants was 62.77 years old with 21.74% identified as female and 78.26 identified as male. Half of the participants lived in rural areas of Alabama and half lived in urban areas. When looking at geographic location, about half of the participants lived in North Alabama and the other half lived in South Alabama. A majority of participants were Republican 63.04%, Democrats made up about one-quarter of the survey participants, and about 9% identified as Other regarding political party affiliation, and the members' political ideologies were as follows: 6.67% Liberal, 71.11% Conservative, and 22.22% identified as Other. The participants had very diverse careers, but some of the more popular professions were farmers, educators, and lawyers.

The sample used in this research study was comprised of a one third of the Alabama Legislature who participated in this research study. The survey instrument was administered to all members of the Alabama Legislature during the 2018 legislative session. The Alabama Legislature was chosen based on the interest, career, and residence of the researcher.

The first portion of the survey instrument consisted of questions pertaining to the duplication of programs, funding of private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards issues in higher education. The subsequent section of the survey instrument asked demographic questions pertaining to the legislators. Research study participants utilized a four-point Likert-style scale for survey question responses. Each question was scored on an ordinal scale using the following options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

The first portion of the survey consisted of 25 questions concerning higher education issues pertaining to duplication of programs, funding of private and public higher education,

athletics, and admission standards. The remaining questions consisted of descriptive data questions, as previously discussed.

The quantitative research data results indicated the following from the four research questions presented. For Research Question One, “What are the demographics of the Alabama Legislature?”, participants answering descriptive questions informed that 28.57% were members of the Alabama House of Representatives and 53.33% were members of the Alabama Senate. Members who participated in the research study had served 16.17 years in the legislature and 89% of them had a college degree or a graduate/law degree. The majority of members identified as white at 78%, black at 17%, and Other at 4%. The average age was 62.77 years old and 78% were male and 22% were female. Half of the participants were from urban communities and half from rural communities and half from North Alabama and half from South Alabama. When identifying party affiliation, 28.26% identified as Democrat, 63.04% identified as Republican, and 8.70% identified as Other. The members’ political ideologies were as follows: 6.67% Liberal, 71.11% Conservative, and 22.22% identified as Other. Members of the Alabama Legislature have very diverse careers with the most popular being farming, education, and lawyer.

For Research Question Two, “What are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards?”, the results of a Chi-square analysis showed the members of the legislature were in agreement on all issues except one. On item 14, the house and senate revealed disagreement on the state adopting a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service. The participants of the house agreed with this

statement at 67%, while the participants of the senate disagreed at 62%. The difference proved to be statistically significant with a $p = .048$.

For Research Question Three, “What is the relationship of Alabama legislators’ demographics and perceptions?”, the results of a Chi-square analysis showed statistical significance pertaining to issues of race, party affiliation, philosophical base, educational level, geographic location, and size of town or city.

Finally for Research Question Four, “What similarities/differences exist between Parker’s (1985) study and the current study?”, On the issue of the perceptions of duplication of programs, Parker’s study concluded that a majority in both the house and senate chose to reduce duplication of programs in higher education by consolidating programs and close institutions where cost effectiveness dictates. However, with the current study, there was no clear majority on what the state should do regarding excessive duplication of programs, but half of the senate did confirm Parker’s conclusion.

The results were the same concerning who should make decisions regarding consolidation of institutions. In Parker’s study and the current study, it was revealed that legislators could not agree on who should make the decisions regarding the consolidation of institutions. The same results were concluded in both the house and senate, respectively. However, there was a change of perception when it came to the statement that no medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence. In Parker’s study the legislature and both chambers disagreed to the addition of new medical schools, in Alabama, but in the current study a majority of the legislature and the senate agreed for the approval of new medical schools in the state. Half the house was in agreement, so there was no solid majority, but there was an increase in support for medical schools since Parker’s study.

When focusing on funding of private higher education, there was no change. A majority of the legislature in Parker's study and the current study concluded state tax dollars should not be allocated to private higher education. In both studies, there was a solid majority that the legislature should continue making decisions regarding funding for private higher education.

When examining funding of public higher education, Parker's study and the current study saw legislators and both chambers having agreed that formula funding provides the single best index for allocations of funds to higher education. Also, in both studies, the legislators and both chambers were in agreement that by solid majorities the legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula.

There was a slight change in perception when legislators were asked how much latitude should college administrators be given in deviating from a funding formula. In both studies, both members of the legislature held majorities with the perception that some latitude should be permissible and both members of the house held majorities with college administrators having some latitude to deviate from a funding formula. However, the senate increased its approval for some latitude from 43% in the Parker study to 50% in the current study.

When asked their perceptions of the state adopting a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon both their education and years of service, both the Parker (1985) study and the current study showed strong approvals. During both studies, the house had a greater than 60% agreement with idea. However, there was a change in the senate, in the Parker study over 60% of senators were in favor of the policy, but now in the current study 62% of the senators disagreed with the statement.

The next issue in higher education to be examined was athletics. When asked their opinion if there was too much emphasis placed upon athletics in higher education, the legislature

and senate in both studies agreed. However, in both studies only half of the house members agreed. So there were no changes of opinion regarding the perception of too much emphasis placed upon athletics. There was no change of perception when asking who should have the authority to regulate athletics in higher education. In the Parker study and the current study, majorities of both chambers agreed and the legislature as one body agreed that the individual Boards of Trustees should regulate athletics.

The final items of higher education to review was admissions standards in higher education. In Parker's study members of the legislature and members of both chambers agreed that admission standards of institutions of higher education in Alabama were generally too low, however 80% of the members of the legislature in the current study disagreed and a majority in both chambers disagreed with the statement.

When asked if students who do not meet university level admission requirements should be referred to the Alabama Community College System, both studies of the legislature agreed with the statement, as well as both chambers. When asked who should set the admission standards for various public institutions of higher education the legislators were divided in both the Parker study and the current study. However, in both studies the greatest percentage of participants felt the individual institutions should set the standards, but never reached a 50 plus one total.

The biggest difference found when it comes to admissions standards was found regarding whether limits should be placed upon the number of out-of-state students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education. In the Parker study, over three-fourths of the senators agreed with that there should be limits while only a little more than one-half the house members

agreed. However, in the current study 59% disagreed there should be limits and 53% of the house and 69% of the senate disagreed.

Implications

The results of this research study found that no statistically significant differences were found when looking at the issues of higher education between the house and the senate in the 2018 legislative session. However, a significant relationship was found to exist between the demographics and legislative members' perceptions of higher education issues pertaining to issues of race, party affiliation, philosophical base, educational level, geographic location, and size of town or city. With this in mind, the major implication that can be deduced is these members are looking out for their constituent needs who sent them to serve based on their district needs.

Areas for Further Research

The researcher recommends that this research study be replicated having more members of the Alabama legislature to participate in the study, especially members of the House of Representatives. Such research could also better aid college and university administrators better to help them with their message to the legislature regarding issues in higher education. Also, it will better help legislators understand the issues facing Alabama in higher education.

In addition, it would be of interest to survey the college and university stakeholders, members of the Boards of Trustees, Chancellors, and university presidents to learn their perceptions of the Alabama legislature and its work pertaining to higher education issues.

Also, qualitative methods might also be considered in future research studies of this nature to allow for a more extensive exploration of the research study participant responses.

Conducting interviews for members of the Alabama Legislature based on their perceptions of what are the most important issues in higher education could further explore this important topic.

Finally, it would be of interest to see if these findings could be replicated in a similar rural Southern state, like Mississippi and then if the findings could be replicated in a more populated northern liberal state, like New York.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this research study was to examine the perceptions of the Alabama Legislature toward issues in higher education pertaining to duplication of programs, financing private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. This study worked to identify potential differences in the perceptions of Alabama legislators toward the above issues in higher education. There was a great need for this research as no research study has been completed focusing on the Alabama legislature and issues in higher education since 1985. Since that time the Republican party has gained power of both chambers in the Alabama Legislature. The study examined the following research questions:

1. What are the demographics of the Alabama legislature?
2. What are the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and admissions standards?
3. What is the relationship of Alabama's legislators' demographics and perceptions?
4. What similarities/differences exist between Parker (1985) and the current study?

This research study had four primary goals: (1) to determine the demographics of the Alabama legislature; (2) to determine the perceptions of Alabama legislators in regard to: duplication of programs, financing of private and public higher education, athletics, and

admissions standards; (3) to determine the relationship of Alabama legislators' demographics and perceptions; and (4) to determine the similarities/differences between Parker (1985) and the current study.

The research study consisted of sample of 46 currently severing members of the Alabama Legislature that were 19 years of age or older. The research study participants completed the Survey of Attitudes and Opinions of Members of the Alabama Legislature Toward Higher Education Survey from Parker's (1985) study. The survey was modified with permission and narrowed down to five domains: duplication of programs, financing private and public higher education, athletics, and admission standards. Chi-square analysis were used to determine if there was any statistical significance. Issues to show statistical significance had to do with salary schedules based on education and years of service, demographics pertaining to race, party affiliation, philosophical base, educational level, geographic location, and size of town or city.

References

- AASCU Government Relations. (2017, January). Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2017. Retrieved January 16, 2018, from <http://www.aascu.org/policy/publications/policy-matters/Top10Issues2017.pdf>
- Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University. (2011). *Faculty Handbook: Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University*. Normal, Alabama.
doi:[http://www.aamu.edu/faculty-staff/facultysenate/Documents/AAMU Faculty Handbook September 16 2011.pdf](http://www.aamu.edu/faculty-staff/facultysenate/Documents/AAMU%20Faculty%20Handbook%20September%2016%202011.pdf)
- Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University. (2018). The Morrill Act of 1890: 1890 is Our History, Too! Retrieved April 11, 2018, from <https://www.aamu.edu/aboutaamu/1890/pages/default.aspx>
- Alabama Commission On Higher Education. (1975). *Planning Document Number One For The System Of Higher Education In Alabama: Historical Background, Current Situation, General Recommendations* (September ed., First in a Series of Planning Documents).
- Alabama Commission On Higher Education. (2000.). *Alabama Commission on Higher Education State Plan: Enhancing Our Strengths through a Shared Vision Planning for Alabama Higher Education, 1996-2000* (pp. 1-24, Rep. No. HE 033 426). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 446 586)
- Alabama Community College System. (2018). History. Retrieved May 10, 2018, from <https://www.accs.cc/index.cfm/about-accs/history/>
- Alabama Department of Archives and History. (2005). Functional and Organizational Analysis of Public Universities of Alabama. Retrieved April 11, 2018, from <http://www.archives.alabama.gov/officials/rdas/Universities.pdf>

Alabama Education Association Homepage, Retrieved September 10, 2017, from

<http://www.myaea.org/contact/about-aea/>

Alabama House of Representatives Homepage, Retrieved September 10, 2017, from

http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/ISD/Splash_House.aspx

Alabama Legislature. (2018). Constitution of Alabama 1819. Retrieved February 15, 2018, from

http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/constitutions/1819/1819_6.html#education

Alabama Legislature. (2018). Constitution of Alabama 1875. Retrieved February 14, 2018, from

http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/constitutions/1875/1875_13.html

Alabama Legislature. (2018). Constitution of Alabama 1901. Retrieved February 15, 2018, from

http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/alison/CodeOfAlabama/Constitution/1901/Constitution1901_toc.htm

Alabama Legislature. (2018). An overview of Alabama's six constitutions. Retrieved February 15, 2018, from

<http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/constitutions/constitutions.html>

Alabama Legislature. (2018). House Journal 1819 Annual Session, Oct 26. Retrieved February

21, 2018, from [http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/acts_and_](http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/acts_and_journals/House_Journal_1819_Oct_25-Dec_17/Page3_Oct26.html)

[journals/House_Journal_1819_Oct_25-Dec_17/Page3_Oct26.html](http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/history/acts_and_journals/House_Journal_1819_Oct_25-Dec_17/Page3_Oct26.html)

Alabama Legislature Homepage, Retrieved September 10, 2017, from

<http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/default.aspx>

Alabama Senate Homepage, Retrieved September 10, 201,

from http://www.legislature.state.al.us/aliswww/ISD/Splash_Senate.aspx

Alabama State Department of Education, Montgomery. Division of Instructional Services.:
Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga. (1975). History of Education in
Alabama. Bulletin 1975, No. 7. *Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.*, 1-136.
Retrieved February 20, 2018, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED191766.pdf>.

Alabama State Department of Education, Montgomery. Division of Vocational Education and
Community Colleges. (1976). *The History of Alabama State Junior Colleges*.
Montgomery, AL. doi:ED121392

Alabama State University. (2018). The ASU Legacy: Perseverance, Progress, and Promise.
Retrieved April 9, 2018, from [http://www.alasu.edu/about-asu/history--
tradition/index.aspx](http://www.alasu.edu/about-asu/history--tradition/index.aspx)

Allen, L. N. (2001). Howard College Flourishes in Spite of Hardships. *Alabama Baptist
Historian*, 37(2), 07th ser., 34-36.

Alsobrook, D. E. (2017). The Best Years of Their Lives: Alabama Polytechnic Institute's World
War II Veterans Era, 1946-1950. *The Alabama Review*, 70(4), october, 316-362.

Ammons, K. T. (2016). *The Establishment of Enterprise State Community College: The First
Twenty-five Years (1965-1990)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of
Alabama.

Amos Doss, H. E. (2000). The Rise and Fall of an Alabama Founding Father, Gabriel
Moore. *The Alabama Review*, july, 163-176

Archibald, J. (2016, June 15). Who suffers, prospers in Alabama's new political reality.
Retrieved January 10, 2018, from [http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/who
_suffers_prospers_in_alabama.html](http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/who_suffers_prospers_in_alabama.html)

- Atkins, L. (1970). The First Legislative Session: The General Assembly of Alabama Huntsville, 1819. *The Alabama Review*, January, 30-44.
- Auburn University. (2018). The History. Retrieved March 15, 2018, from www.auburn.edu/main/welcome/aboutauburn.html
- Babbridge, H. D., & Rosenzweig, R. M. (1962). *The Federal interest in higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers.
- Barnwell, C. H. (1912). The University of Alabama. *The Phi Beta Kappa Key*, 1(8), May, 17-20. Retrieved February 21, 2018, from www.jstor.org/stable/42913791.
- Birmingham Business Journal (2015, February 26). State business leaders: Education is the biggest issue for Alabama. Retrieved January 11, 2018, from <https://www.bizjournals.com/birmingham/news/2015/02/26/state-business-leaders-education-is-the-biggest.html>
- Birmingham-Southern College. (2018). History and Tradition. Retrieved March 14, 2018, from <https://www.bsc.edu/about/tradition.html>
- Boggs, G. R. (2012, August). Democracy's colleges: The evolution of the community college in America. Paper presented at the White House Summit on Community Colleges, Washington, D.C. American Association of Community Colleges.
- Boswell, K. (1998). Finding common ground: State leaders' perceptions about transforming postsecondary education. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertation and Theses database. UMI No. 9837906.
- Brophy, A. (2008). *The Age of Apology: Facing up to the Past* (M. Gibney, R. E. Howard-Hassman, J. Coicaud, & N. Steiner, Eds.). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press

- Business Council of Alabama Homepage, Retrieved September 10, 2017 from
<https://www.bcatoday.org/about/>
- Butts, R. F. (1955). Our Tradition of States' Rights and Education. *History of Education Journal*, 6(3), spring, 211-228. Retrieved February 13, 2018, from www.jstor.org/stable/3659246.
- Cain, L. C. (1976). Founding Public Schools in Alabama. *Alabama Historical Quarterly*, winter, 243-249.
- Carter, L. J. (1968). George C. Wallace: He's Not Just Whistling Dixie. *Science*, 162(3852), October, 436-440. Retrieved June 28, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1725280>
- Castel, A. (1964). The Founding Fathers and the Vision of a National University. *History of Education Quarterly*, 4(4), December, 208-302. Retrieved February 13, 2018, from www.jstor.org/stable/367502
- Causey, D. R. (2018). Daphne State Normal College was a college specifically for teachers. Retrieved April 25, 2018, from <http://www.alabamapioneers.com/college-daphne-state-normal-school/>
- Causey, D. R. (2018). University of Alabama was burned a week before the end of the War Between the States. Retrieved March 6, 2018, from <https://www.alabamapioneers.com/university-alabama-burned/>
- Chase, H. W. (1931). The State in Higher Education: A Review of the Development of State Universities in the United States. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 2(2), 57-56. Retrieved February 12, 2018, from www.jstor.org/stable/1974379.
- Clark, W. G. (1889). *History of Education in Alabama from 1702-1889*. Washington, DC: Washington Government Printing Office.

- Code of Alabama 16-60-111. (2016, April 14). 101.01: Board of Trustees: Governance Responsibility. Retrieved May 10, 2018, from <https://www.accs.cc/default/assets/File/Board/Policy/PDFs/101.01 Board of Trustees - Governance Responsibility.pdf>
- Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Crowther, E. R. (1991). Antebellum Community Support for Judson and Howard Colleges. *The Alabama Review*, *january*, 17-35.
- Desai, S. A. (2012). Is comprehensiveness taking its toll on community colleges?: An in-depth analysis of community colleges missions and their effectiveness. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *36*, 111-121.
- Devane, W. C. (1965). *Higher Education in Twentieth-Century America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dial, G. (2015, October 12). No more education dollars should be taken for General Fund. Retrieved January 11, 2018, from http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2015/10/no_more_education_dollars_shou.html
- Diener, D. (2008). The Intellectual Climate of the Late Nineteenth Century and The Fate of American Normal Schools. *American Educational History Journal*, *35*(1), 61-79.
- Dodson, E. S. (1967). *A Study of Communication between Nevada state legislators and certain lobbyists when related to financing public education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley: University Microfilm Order No. 68-16

- Eckinger, H. (2013). The Militarization of the University of Alabama. *The Alabama Review*, 66(3), 163-185.
- El-Khawas, E. (2011). The impact of economic crises on American universities: Lessons from the past. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 23(2), 27-40.
- Ellington, M. J. (2011, July 05). GOP control of Alabama gov't: 1870s style. *Decatur Daily*, pp. 1-3. Retrieved January 8, 2018, from <http://www.decaturdaily.com>
- Eulau, H., & Quinley, H. (1970). *State Officials and Higher Education*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Farmer, H., & Bureau of Public Administration. (1943). Postwar Prospects. In *War Comes to Alabama* (pp. 126-141). Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The Weatherford Printing Company.
- Flynt, W. (1968). Southern Higher Education and the Civil War. *Civil War History*, 14(3), September, 211-225.
- Fountain, B. E., & Tollefson, T. A. (1989). *Community Colleges in the United States: Forty-Nine State Systems*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Francis, W. L. (1967). *Legislative Issues in the Fifty States*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company.
- Franklin, V. P. (2005). Introduction: Brown v. Board of Education: Fifty Years of Educational Change in the United States. 1954-2004. *The Journal of African American History*, 90(1/2), winter, 1-8. Retrieved June 28, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20063972>

- Gaston, D. R. (1982). *An assessment of the influence by lobbyists on appropriations by the Alabama legislature to public four-year universities in Alabama* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Alabama: Microfilm Order No. DA8224273, 275
- Geiger, R. L. (1986). *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- George C. Wallace, A Change in the Heart of Dixie. (1987, January 11). *Montgomery Advertiser*, pp. 1-45.
- Gibbons, S. N. (1980). Public Policy in the Expansion of Higher Education in the State of Alabama, 1903-1978: A Case Study in the Policies of Higher Education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).
- Hardee, B. B. (1983). *Legislative and Citizen Attitudes about Public Issues in Alabama*. Tuscaloosa, AL: Center for Administrative and Policy Studies University of Alabama.
- Harley, L. R. (1899). A National University. *Education*, Vol. 19. 273-284.
- Holsenbeck, D. C., & Tiffany, D. M. (1980). A Survey of Legislative Attitudes and Influence Factors on Higher Education in Alabama. ED 222128.
- How the GI Bill Widened the Racial Higher Education Gap. (2003). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 41(Autumn), 36-37. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3133751>
- Huntingdon College. (2018). Huntingdon Past and Present. Retrieved March 14, 2018, from www.huntingdon.edu/about/past-and-present/
- Jewell, M. (1982). *Representation in State Legislatures*. University Press of Kentucky.
- Jacksonville State University. (2017). History of Jacksonville State University. Retrieved April 26, 2018, from <http://www.jsu.edu/catalogue/pdf/jsucatalog17-18.pdf>

- Johnson, N. (2014). *College Costs, Prices and the Great Recession* (April, pp. 1-24, Rep.). Lumina Foundation.
- Jones, G. W. (1962). The Negro Public Colleges in Alabama. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 31(3), summer, 354-361. Retrieved April 30, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2293874>
- Judd, C. H. (1933). Education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 38(May), 6th ser., 922-930. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2767401>
- Judson College. (2018). Heritage. Retrieved March 14, 2018, from <http://www.judson.edu/about-judson/heritage/>
- Kaplan, W. A. (1979). *The Law of Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Karpinski, C. F. (2010). "We have a long way to go": H. Council Trenholm, educational associations, and equity. *Paedagogica Historica*, 46(1-2), february - april, 51-67
- Katsinas, S. G. (1994). George C. Wallace and the Founding of Alabama's Public Two-Year Colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65(4), July-august, 447-472. Retrieved May 7, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2943855>
- Kimbrough, R. B. (1964). *Political power and educational decision-making*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Koganzon, R. (2012). "Producing a reconciliation of disinterestedness and commerce": The political rhetoric of education in the early republic. *History of Education Quarterly*, 52(3), august, 406-416.
- Levine, D. O. (1986). *The American College and the Culture of Aspirations, 1915-1940*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

- Lewis, R. (2007). World War II Manufacturing and the Postwar Southern Economy. *The Journal of Southern History*, 73(4), November, 837-866. Retrieved May 31, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27649570>
- Lindley, A. (2017, June 27). University of North Alabama (UNA). Retrieved April 24, 2018, from <http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-3009>
- Lingfelter, P. E. (2011, May/June). Evidence and impact: How scholarship can improve policy and practice. *Change*, 44-49.
- Little, J. (2016, October 30). Amendment 1 seeks to expand AU's board of trustees. *Opelika-Auburn News*. Retrieved February 15, 2018, from http://www.oanow.com/news/auburn/amendment-seeks-to-expand-au-s-board-of-trustees/article_cb0591ce-9e52-11e6-a62b-8397b2ba6421.html
- Loss, C. P. (2005). "The Most Wonderful Thing Has Happened to Me in the Army": Psychology, Citizenship, and American Higher Education in World War II. *The Journal of American History*, (December), 864-891.
- Lundy-Wagner, V. (2009, December 2). Oakwood University. Retrieved April 25, 2018, from <http://encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-2500>
- Lyman, B. (2017, April 10). Kay Ivey becomes governor; promises open administration. Retrieved January 10, 2018, from <http://on.mgmadv.com/2oSqtVc>
- Martinez, M. C. (2004, August). Meeting the challenges of population growth and the future demand for postsecondary education: Considerations for state higher education policy. *Education Commission of the States*, 2-11.
- Miles College. (2018). About Miles. Retrieved April 11, 2018, from <http://www.miles.edu/aboutMiles> College Office of Student Affairs. (2015). *Miles*

College Student Handbook.

doi:<https://www.miles.edu/sites/miles.edu/files/documents/StudentHandbookIII-Final.pdf>

Miller, K. (1933). Editorial Comment: Negro Education in the Depression. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 2(January), 1st ser., 1-4. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2292213>

Mobile College. (2018). Our History. Retrieved March 15, 2018, from

<https://umobile.edu/about/history/>

Myers, J. B. (1971). The Education of the Alabama Freedmen During Presidential

Reconstruction, 1865-1867. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 40(2), spring, 163--171.

Retrieved June 27, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2966728>

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2017, November 7). Women in State Legislatures for

2017. Retrieved January 10, 2018, from <http://www.ncsl.org/legislators->

[staff/legislators/womens-legislative-network/women-in-state-legislatures-for-2017.aspx](http://www.ncsl.org/legislators-staff/legislators/womens-legislative-network/women-in-state-legislatures-for-2017.aspx)

Newport, F. (2015, February 6). Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana Most Conservative States.

Retrieved January 13, 2018, from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/181505/mississippi->

[alabama-louisiana-conservative-states.aspx](http://news.gallup.com/poll/181505/mississippi-alabama-louisiana-conservative-states.aspx)

Newport, F. (2014, February 5). Mississippi and Alabama Most Most Protestant States in U.S.

Retrieved January 13, 2018, from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/167120/mississippi->

[alabama-protestant-states.aspx](http://news.gallup.com/poll/167120/mississippi-alabama-protestant-states.aspx)

New School Program May Get Boost with U. S. Funds. (1963, October 10). *Birmingham News*,

p. 46.

Norton, E., & Bureau of Public Administration. (1943). Education. In *War Comes to*

Alabama (pp. 46-58). Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The Weatherford Printing Company.

- Novak, R., & Leslie, D. (2000). Retrospective A Not So Distant Mirror: Great Depression Writings on the Governance and Finance of Public Higher Education. *History of Higher Education Annual*, 20, 59-78.
- Null, J. W. (2007). Curriculum for Teachers: Four Traditions Within Pedagogical Philosophy. *Educational Studies*, 42(1), august, 43-63.
- Olliff, M. T. (2016, January 28). World War I and Alabama. In [Http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-1545](http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-1545). Retrieved June 12, 2018.
- Olson, K. W. (1973). The G.I. Bill and Higher Education: Success and Surprise. *American Quarterly*, 25, 5th ser., 596-610. Retrieved June 14, 2018, from <http://jstor.org/stable/2711698>
- Ottati, V. C., Steenbergen, M. R., & Riggle, E. (1992). The cognitive and affective components of political attitudes: Measuring the determinants of candidate evaluations. *Political Behavior*, 14(12), 423-442.
- Palaich, R. (1983). Analysis: Survey Identifies Top State Educational Concerns. *State Educational Leader*, 2(2), spring, 1-18.
- Parker, S. D. (1985). *Attitudes of Alabama legislators toward higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Parker, S. D. (1985). Attitudes of alabama legislators toward higher education. (Doctoral dissertation). Photocopy. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1987. 21 cm
- Pelsue, B. (2017, August 29). When it comes to Education, the Federal Government is in charge of ... Um, What? Retrieved March 5, 2018, from

<https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/ed/17/08/when-it-comes-education-federal-government-charge-um-what>

- Phillips, D. I., & Shen, B. S. P. (1982). *Research in the Age of the Steady-State University*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Rippa, A. (1964). The Business Community and the Public Schools on the Eve of the Great Depression. *History of Education Quarterly*, 4(March), 1st ser., 33-43. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367255>
- Rivers, N., Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2015). The Great Recession and the Migration Redistribution of Blacks and Whites in the U.S. South. *Growth and Change*, 46(4), december, 611-630. doi:10.1111/grow.12107
- Robertson, K. G. (2014, September). Budget Basics: the facts about Alabama's budget system. Retrieved January 11, 2018, from <https://www.alabamapolicy.org/budget-basics-facts-alabamas-budget-system/>
- Rogers, W. W., Ward, R. D., Atkins, L. R., & Flynt, W. (1994). *Alabama: The History of a Deep South State*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Rosenthal, A., & Fuhrman, S. (1980). Shaping State Educational Policy. *Compact*, XIV(3), fall, 22-27.
- Ruby, R. H. (1973). *Attitudes of Mississippi legislators toward higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Mississippi: University Microfilm International, Order No. AAD74-11443
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Knopf.

- Rudolph, F. (1990). *American College and University: A History*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Rush, B. (1787). Address to the American People. Retrieved November 9, 2018, from <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/address-to-the-people-of-the-united-states/>
- Sandage, F. (1974). *Attitudes of Indiana legislators and lobbyists toward postsecondary education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University: Microfilms Order No. 76-6296
- Schrecker, E. (2009, June). The Bad Old Days: How Higher Education Fared during the Great Depression. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B9.
- Scott, R. L. (1977). *A study of the sources of legislative perceptions and attitudes toward higher education in the state of Florida* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Florida State University: Microfilm Order No. 77-24, 802, 200
- Selma University. (2018). Selma University: The History and Heritage. Retrieved April 11, 2018, from <http://selmauniversity.edu/history-heritage.html>
- Skillman, T. T. (1825). *The Constitution of the United States*. Lexington, KY.
- Smith, C. S. (1976). *A survey and comparison of attitudes held by the Tennessee general public and state legislators toward higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). George Peabody College for Teachers: University Microfilm Order No. 77-3117, 145
- Southern Education Reporting Service. (1964). *A Statistical Summary, State By State, of School Segregation-Desegregation in the Southern and Border Area from 1954 to the Present*. Nashville, TN: Southern Education Reporting Service.

- Sparks, C., & Bureau of Public Administration. (1943). The Impact of the War on Alabama. In *War Comes to Alabama* (pp. 1-9). Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The Weatherford Printing Company.
- Spellings, M. (2006). A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education. (ED-06-CO-0013). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/aboutbdscomm/list/hiedfuture/index.html>.
- Spring Hill College. (2018). History of Spring Hill College. Retrieved March 16, 2018, from <http://www.shc.edu/about/history/>
- Spring Hill College. (2018). Spring Hill College: Archives and Special Collections. Retrieved March 16, 2018, from <http://libguides.shc.edu/archives/history>
- Stanley, M. (2003). College Education and the Midcentury GI Bills. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(May), 2nd ser., 671-708. Retrieved June 14, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25053917>
- Stetar, J. M. (1985). In Search of a Direction: Southern Higher Education after the Civil War. *History of Education Quarterly*, 25(3), autumn, 341-367. Retrieved July 2, 2018, from <https://www-jstor-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/stable/pdf/368273>.
- Stewart, J. A. (1920). When Alabama Came Into the Union. *The Journal of Education*, 91(8), February 19, 200-201. Retrieved February 19, 2018, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42805482>
- Stewart, W. H. (1994). *The Alabama State Constitution: A Reference Guide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Stillman College. (2018). History and Mission. Retrieved April 12, 2018, from <https://stillman.edu/history-and-mission/>

Talladega College. (2018). Talladega College History. Retrieved April 12, 2018, from <http://www.talladega.edu/history.asp>

The Council of State Governments. (1952). *Higher Education in the Forty-Eight States: A Report to the Governors' Conference*. Chicago, IL: The Council of State Governments.

The Hawthorn Group. (2017, December 13). Alabama - The Morning After - The Hawthorn Group. Retrieved January 10, 2018, from <http://hawthorngroup.com/alabama-the-morning-after/#>

The University of Alabama. (1906). *University of Alabama: Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary 1831-1906*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press

The University of West Alabama. (2018). History and Traditions. Retrieved April 26, 2018, from <https://www.uwa.edu/about/historyandtradition>

Theelin, J. (2004). *A History of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Thompson, F. C. (1977). *Public and legislative survey of Louisiana educational problems: An opinion measurement and descriptive study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northeast Louisiana University: University Microfilm Order No, 7802874, 210

Troy University. (2018). The History of Troy University. Retrieved April 25, 2018, from <https://www.troy.edu/history.html>

Tuskegee University. (2018). History of Tuskegee University. Retrieved April 13, 2018, from <https://tuskegee.edu/about-us/history-and-mission>

Zeiger, H. (2008). Educating citizens: have we kept the founders' ideals for higher education? Retrieved February 13, 2018, from <https://publicpolicy.pepperdine.edu/academics/research/policy-review/2008v1/educating-citizens.htm>

Appendix A

Qualtrics Electronic Online Survey

The Perceptions of the Alabama Legislature Towards Higher Education

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to each item by selecting the ONE response that most closely reflects your perception and/or opinion.

NOTE: The term higher education, as used in this survey, denotes all formal educational efforts after high school. Unless otherwise specified, it refers to both two-and-four year institutions.

This survey is confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only. It will not be released in any way that will allow it to be identified with individual legislators.

1. When excessive duplication of programs exists, the state should _____
 - reduce duplication by consolidating programs, but not closing institutions.
 - reduce duplication by consolidating programs and close institutions where cost effectiveness dictates.
 - create no new programs where another program already exists at an institution within the state.
 - create whatever programs are necessary wherever there is a need.

2. Decisions regarding consolidation of institutions should be made by _____
 - the legislature.
 - a centralized coordinating agency.
 - the Alabama Commission on Higher Education.
 - the specific institutions involved

3. No medical schools should be established beyond those already in existence.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
4. Who should take responsibility for the duplication of administrative and academic programs in higher education?
- The legislature
 - The institutions
 - The individual institutional Board of Trustees
 - The Alabama Commission on Higher Education
5. Unnecessary program duplication is a problem at the _____ program level?
- associate
 - undergraduate
 - graduate
 - is not a problem
6. State funds should be allocated toward need based tuition grants for students attending private institutions.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
7. State funds should be allocated to private institutions in financial need.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
8. Decisions regarding state funding for private higher education should be made by _____.
- the legislature
 - the Alabama Commission on Higher Education
 - a centralized coordinating agency
 - a referendum of the people
9. Alabama should invest in economic and workforce development programs with state tax dollars at private institutions of higher education in Alabama.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
10. State tax dollars should be used to support private institutions through the use of _____
- scholarships and grants
 - general operations
 - general education support and libraries
 - research

11. Formula funding provides the single best index for the allocation of funds to higher education.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

12. The legislature should not be held to making appropriations based solely upon a funding formula.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. How much latitude should college administrators be given in deviating from a funding formula?

- Total latitude
- Considerable latitude
- Some latitude
- Very little, if any, latitude

14. The state should adopt a salary schedule for college and university faculty based upon their education and years of service.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. Salaries for personnel in higher education should be performance based.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. There is too much emphasis placed upon athletics in higher education.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

17. Who should have the authority to regulate athletics?

- The legislature
- Individual institutional Board of Trustees
- The Alabama Commission on Higher Education
- A state athletic commission

18. Student athletes should be paid a stipend along with their scholarship to help cover educational and living expenses.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. Revenue made from collegiate athletic events should be used for academic programs supporting the most current need for the state's economic and workforce development.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

20. A collegiate athletic sporting tax should be raised to help fund higher education in the state.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

21. The admission standards of institutions of higher education in Alabama are generally too low.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

22. Students who do not meet university level admission requirements should be referred to the Alabama Community College System.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

23. The admission standards for various public institutions of higher education should be set by _____

- The legislature
- The Alabama Commission on Higher Education
- A centralized coordinating agency
- Individual institutions

24. Limits should be placed upon the number of out-of-state students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher learning.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

25. Limits should be placed upon the total number of students allowed to attend Alabama institutions of higher education.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

26. How many years have you served in the legislature? (combined years in the house and senate, if applicable)

_____ years

27. Please indicate the highest educational level you have completed.

- Less than high school
- High school
- Some college
- College degree
- Graduate or law school

28. What is your race?

- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black, not of Hispanic origin
- Hispanic
- Multiracial
- Native American
- White, not of Hispanic origin
- Other

29. What is your age?

_____ years old

30. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

31. What size town or city do you live in or near?

- 0 – 4,999
- 5,000 – 14,999
- 15,000 – 49,999
- 50,000 – 99,999
- 100,000 and up

32. Do you live north or south of Clanton, Alabama?

- North
- South

33. What is your party affiliation?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Other

34. What is your business or profession?

35. Do you consider yourself a_____?

- Liberal
- Conservative
- Other

36. I am a member of the Alabama _____

- House of Representatives
- Senate

Appendix B

Members of the Alabama Legislature

Members of the 2018 Alabama House of Representatives

Representative's Name	Political Party	House District
Ainsworth, Will	Republican	District 27
Alexander, Louise	Democrat	District 56
Baker, Alan	Republican	District 66
Ball, Mike	Republican	District 10
Beckman, Paul	Republican	District 88
Beech, Elaine	Democrat	District 65
Black, Marcel	Democrat	District 3
Blackshear, Chris	Republican	District 80
Boothe, Alan	Republican	District 89
Boyd, Barbara	Democrat	District 32
Bracy, Napoleon	Democrat	District 98
Brown, K. L.	Republican	District 40
Buskey, James	Democrat	District 99
Butler, Mack	Republican	District 30
Carns, Jim	Republican	District 48
Chesteen, Donnie	Republican	District 87
Chestnut, Prince	Democrat	District 67
Clarke, Adline	Democrat	District 97
Clouse, Steve	Republican	District 93
Coleman, Merika	Democrat	District 57
Collins, Terri	Republican	District 8
Crawford, Danny	Republican	District 5
Daniels, Anthony	Democrat	District 53
Davis, Randy	Republican	District 96
Drake, Dickie	Republican	District 45
Drummond, Barbara	Democrat	District 103

Members of the 2018 Alabama House of Representatives

Representative's Name	Political Party	House District
Ellis, Corley	Republican	District 41
England, Chris	Democrat	District 70
Farley, Allen	Republican	District 15
Faulkner, David	Republican	District 46
Faust, Joe	Republican	District 94
Fincher, Bob	Republican	District 37
Ford, Graig	Democrat	District 28
Forte, Berry	Democrat	District 84
Fridy, Matt	Republican	District 73
Garrett, Danny	Republican	District 44
Gaston, Victor	Republican	District 100
Givan, Juandalynn	Democrat	District 60
Greer, Lynn	Republican	District 2
Grimsley, Dexter	Democrat	District 85
Hall, Laura	Democrat	District 19
Hanes, Tommy	Republican	District 23
Harbison, Corey	Republican	District 12
Harper, Alan	Republican	District 61
Henry, Ed	Republican	District 9
Hill, Jim	Republican	District 50
Hollis, Rolanda	Democrat	District 58
Holmes, Alvin	Democrat	District 78
Holmes, Mike	Republican	District 31
Howard, Ralph	Democrat	District 72
Hurst, Steve	Republican	District 35
Ingram, Reed	Republican	District 75

Members of the 2018 Alabama House of Representatives

Representative's Name	Political Party	House District
Jackson, Thomas	Democrat	District 68
Johnson, Ken	Republican	District 7
Johnson, Ron	Republican	District 33
Jones, Mike	Republican	District 92
Knight, John	Democrat	District 77
Lawrence, Kelvin	Democrat	District 69
Ledbetter, Nathaniel	Republican	District 24
Lee, Paul	Republican	District 86
Lindsey, Richard	Democrat	District 39
Lovvorn, Joe	Republican	District 79
Martin, Jimmy	Republican	District 42
McCampbell, Artis "A.J."	Democrat	District 71
McClammy, Thad	Democrat	District 76
McCutcheon, Mac (Speaker)	Republican	District 25
McMillan, Steve	Republican	District 95
Millican, Mike	Republican	District 17
Mooney, Arnold	Republican	District 43
Moore, Barry	Republican	District 91
Moore, Mary	Democrat	District 59
Moore, Parker	Republican	District 4
Morrow, Johnny Mack	Democrat	District 18
Nordgren, Becky	Republican	District 29
Pettus, Phillip	Republican	District 1
Polizos, Dimitri	Republican	District 74
Poole, Bill	Republican	District 63
Pringle, Chris	Republican	District 101

Members of the 2018 Alabama House of Representatives

Representative's Name	Political Party	House District
Reynolds, Rex	Republican	District 21
Rich, Kerry	Republican	District 26
Rogers, John	Democrat	District 52
Rowe, Connie	Republican	District 13
Sanderford, Howard	Republican	District 20
Scott, Rod	Democrat	District 55
Sells, Chris	Republican	District 90
Sessions, David	Republican	District 105
Shedd, Randall	Republican	District 11
Shiver, Harry	Republican	District 64
South, Kyle	Republican	District 16
Strandridge, David	Republican	District 34
Todd, Patricia	Democrat	District 54
Treadaway, Allen	Republican	District 51
Tuggle, Mark	Republican	District 81
Wadsworth, Tim	Republican	District 14
Warren, Pebblin	Democrat	District 82
Weaver, April	Republican	District 49
Whorton, Isaac	Republican	District 38
Whorton, Ritchie	Republican	District 22
Wilcox, Margie	Republican	District 104
Williams, Jack "J. D."	Republican	District 47
Williams, Jack W.	Republican	District 102
Williams, Phil	Republican	District 6
Wingo, Rich	Republican	District 62
Wood, Randy	Republican	District 36

*District 83 is Vacant

Members of the 2018 Alabama Senate

Senator's Name	Political Party	Senate District
Albritton, Greg	Republican	District 22
Allen, Gerald	Republican	District 21
Beasley, William	Democrat	District 28
Blackwell, Mark Slade	Republican	District 15
Brewbaker, Dick	Republican	District 25
Burkette, David	Democrat	District 26
Bussman, Paul	Republican	District 4
Chambliss, Clyde	Republican	District 30
Coleman-Madison, Linda	Democrat	District 20
Dial, Gerald	Republican	District 13
Dunn, Priscilla	Democrat	District 19
Figures, Vivian	Democrat	District 33
Glover, Rusty	Republican	District 34
Hightower, Bill	Republican	District 35
Holley, Jimmy	Republican	District 31
Holtzclaw, William	Republican	District 2
Livingston, Steve	Republican	District 8
Marsh, Del (President Pro Tempore)	Republican	District 12
McClendon, Jim	Republican	District 11
Melson, Tim	Republican	District 1
Orr, Arthur	Republican	District 3
Pittman, Lee "Trip"	Republican	District 32
Reed, Greg	Republican	District 5
Sanders, Hank	Democrat	District 23
Sanford, Paul	Republican	District 7
Scotfield, Clay	Republican	District 9

Members of the 2018 Alabama Senate

Senator's Name	Political Party	Senate District
Shelnut, Shay	Republican	District 17
Singleton, Boddy	Democrat	District 24
Smith, Harri Anne	Independent	District 29
Smitherman, Rodger	Democrat	District 18
Stutts, Larry	Republican	District 6
Waggoner, J. T. "Jabo"	Republican	District 16
Ward, Cam	Republican	District 14
Whatley, Tom	Republican	District 27
Williams, Phillip "Phil"	Republican	District 10

Appendix C

Alabama Legislature Approval of Research Project



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAC McCUTCHEON
Speaker of the House

11 SOUTH UNION STREET
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36130
334-242-7668

February 15, 2018

Mr. W. H. (Lee) Ammons III
3297 S. College St., E201
Auburn, AL 36830

Dear Mr. Ammons:

This letter is to inform you and the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at Auburn University that you have my permission to send the survey to the Alabama House of Representatives members for your research study titled *The Perceptions of the Alabama Legislature towards Higher Education*.

If you have any questions, please call me at 334-242-7668.

Serving you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mac McCutcheon".

Mac McCutcheon

MM/mh



ALABAMA STATE SENATE

ALABAMA STATE HOUSE
11 SOUTH UNION STREET
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36130

ALABAMA

PATRICK HARRIS
SECRETARY OF THE SENATE
SENATE OFFICE

February 16, 2018

(334) 242-7803
pat.harris@alssenat.gov

Mr. W. H. (Lee) Ammons III
3297 S. College Street
Unit E 201
Auburn, AL 36830

Dear Mr. Ammons:

This letter serves to inform you and the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at Auburn University that you have approval to submit your survey, for your research study, titled *The Perceptions of the Alabama Legislature towards Higher Education* to members of the Alabama Senate through the Secretary of the Senate's office.

If you have any further questions or if I can help in any further way, please contact my office at (334) 242-7803.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick Harris".

Patrick Harris
Secretary of the Senate

Appendix D

Auburn University Institutional Review Board Approval

Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and
Technology
4036 Haley Center, Auburn University, AL
36849

**(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL INFORMATION WITH
CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS DOCUMENT.)**

**INFORMATION
LETTER
for a Research Study
entitled
“Alabama Legislatures Perceptions Toward Higher Education
Issues”**

You are invited to participate in a research study to examine perceptions toward higher education by the Alabama Legislature. The study is being conducted by W. H. (Lee) Ammons III, PhD Candidate at Auburn University, under the direction of Dr. Jim Witte, Professor in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations Leadership and Technology. You are invited to participate because you are a member of the Alabama House or Member of the Alabama Senate and are age 19 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to give your opinions regarding issues in higher education including, duplication of programs, funding of public higher education, funding of private higher education, athletics, and admissions. Also you will be asked questions concerning your demographics. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no risks associated with participating in this study as the results are confidential. To minimize these risks, data will be de-identified and the data will be collected and protected through Qualtrics.com which offers security measures for collecting and storing participant data. IP address collection will be turned "off" on the survey collection site. Qualtrics.com uses SSL for secure collection and transmission of data.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to contribute to scholarly research on perceptions related to legislators in the State of Alabama. I cannot promise you that you will receive any or all of the benefits described.

Will you receive compensation for participating? No compensation will be provided. Are there any costs? If you decide to participate, there is no cost.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study by closing your browser. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will

not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Educational Foundations Leadership and Technology or Lee Ammons.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by electronic means. Information collected through your participation will be used to fulfill an educational requirement and may be published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please ask them now or contact Lee Ammons at ammonwh@auburn.edu or Dr. Jim Witte at witteje@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION ABOVE, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE CLICK ON THE LINK BELOW. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER TO KEEP.

Willard Ammons Jan 22, 2018

Investigator's signature Date

Willard Ammons Print Name

Co-Investigator Date

Printed Name

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from

03/19/2018 to ---. Protocol 18-114 EX 1803

[Link to Survey](#)

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from

03/19/2018 to ---

Protocol# 18-114 EX 1803

Add this approval information in sentence form to your electronic information letter!

Appendix E
Information Letter

EMAIL INVITATION FOR ON-LINE SURVEY

Dear Member of Alabama House of Representatives,

I am a Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology at Auburn University. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study to better understand the attitudes of Alabama legislators toward higher education. You may participate if you are currently 19 years of age and currently serving as a member of the Alabama legislature.

Participants will be asked to click the e-survey link below and follow the prompts to participate in the research; the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The following is the link to the questionnaire:

https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bw7jKCSoukKn3sF

By participating in this study, you will help community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities; as well as, the Alabama legislature gain better insights into the attitude of Alabama legislators toward higher education in Alabama which could be beneficial to you and other legislators. To minimize risks associated with confidentiality of data, no personal identifiers will be listed on the survey responses so as to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

If you would like to know more information about this study, an information letter can be obtained by sending me an email. If you decide to participate after reading the letter, you can access the survey from a link in the letter.

If you have questions, please contact me at (334) 321-1989 or email me at ammonwh@tigermail.auburn.edu or my advisor, Dr. Jim Witte at (334) 844-3054.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lee Ammons
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Auburn University
(334) 321-1989
ammonwh@tigermail.auburn.edu