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Abstract
Historically Black Colleges and University presidents and chancellors have been facing challenges similar to administrators at other institutions of higher learning. These demands center on accreditation, federal and state funding, and enrollment. COVID-19 has heightened each of these essential functions that administrators have as priorities. There has been a lot of research on the roles and responsibilities of HBCU administrators and how there has been a seemingly revolving door at these institutions, and how many have found them to be more autocratic than inclusive in governance. In addition, the coronavirus pandemic has added to the pressure and expectations administrators must endure ensuring HBCUs survive the pandemic's challenges of closing campuses for in-person classes and the resulting fiscal decisions related to the loss of income. Will dealing with the pandemic, fiscal shortages, enrollment, and staffing/furlough possibilities become factors in these administrators feeling the need to leave their positions? How will the current crisis affect the decisions they have made or feel they will need to make?

This study examined 22 HBCU administrators from large and small private and public institutions and their roles in the decisions that needed to be considered and made during the coronavirus pandemic. For example, how did they deal with shared governance, funding, and self-care? Which topics did they prioritize, and how do they see the future of their institution? Among some of the issues addressed by administrators were how worried are they about their institutions and themselves regarding the impact of coronavirus? How confident are they about their institution being able to return to full operations in the next five years? And how did they configure their institution COVID-19 response teams?

Introduction
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), like most Predominantly White Colleges (PWIs), have been facing myriad challenges in the past two decades. These challenges have ranged from federal funding to accreditation to falling enrollments. HBCUs have faced many of these challenges throughout their history. The new challenge – COVID-19. The pandemic has made HBCUs, already dealing with smaller endowments and threats to federal and state support, deeply consider moving beyond their original mission and establish more of a business model. The decision to make changes and face the challenges is part of the role of the administrators at these institutions.

The missions of the HBCUs are the key to how the administrators view the current challenges. American slaves were forbidden to learn to read. The process of keeping them and their descendants illiterate continued throughout America’s history. The common practice of authorizing literacy throughout the American South was accepted and had a purpose (Crawford, 2014).
The nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities are diverse. Although we discuss them as a category based on their historical racial make-up, these institutions are, in fact, quite different from one another. Nevertheless, according to the government's definition, black colleges are bound together because they were established before 1964 (the Civil Rights Act) to educate African Americans (Gasman et al., 2007).

While the education of Black Americans was one of the primary missions of HBCUs, other roles of importance include serving as economic and social anchors to the surrounding communities. Many HBCU's have begun to develop initiatives and institutes in health disparities research, bio-medicine health disparities, and biomanufacturing (Livingston, Porter, Bell-Hughes, & Brandon, 2018). This can be a crucial position during the COVID -19 pandemic.

Despite the accomplishments of HBCUs, they are the subjects of considerable criticism within the higher education community. Presidents of historically Black colleges and universities are often accused of being autocratic, and the mission of these institutions is said to compromise academic quality (Minor, 2004). Chancellors and presidents are charged to ensure the financial viability of their institutions. To be effective, this means they need a strong cabinet and a strong relationship and partnership in shared governance – including faculty and staff. HBCUs have served as the exclusive avenue of higher education for African Americans with their promotion policies and open-door admissions policy for all races and cultures. In addition, they have also provided avenues of student leadership potential and social development. In addition, many industries operating in the public interest look to Black college graduates to further support a diverse workforce.

HBCU administrators are the gatekeepers to making this happen. They champion their institutions in the halls of congress and business. They solicit endowment funds and federal grants, and other sources of funds. Yet often their terms are cut short by being overwhelmed or move on to another opportunity. The average time for those respondents to this study was four years. Could challenges, such as COVID-19, lead to more upheaval? How does their satisfaction affect how they responded to the pandemic and does the organizational structure affect their decisions and overall job satisfaction?

This study used online surveys, which were needed during the pandemic due to time, large geographic area, and limited travel; electronic video interviews were essential. A heuristic looks at how the individual administrators perceived their roles in the decision-making process regarding hybrid, in-person on campus, and online delivery of courses. The technology needed to allow institutions to continue classes was also helpful in the interviewing process. Consequently, phenomenological research requires multiple interviews, multiple re-readings of collected text, and multiple interactions with the text. The method of collecting, creating, and analyzing through these possible tools preserves the essence of the phenomenological approach. It allows the researcher to expend time and resources in learning about the lived experience of the participants (DeFelice & Janesick, 2015).

The pressures on HBCU administrators have always been significant in having them maintain the missions of their institutions while also looking toward the future. Presidents and chancellors at HBCUs have had shorter and shorter terms in the last decade. As the institutions' missions collide with new business models, these positions are now being held more and more by non-academics. HBCU boards and regents have reached out to the business world for leadership. The need for fundraisers and grant writers, as administrators, has increased, too. The need for most of their students to rely on Pell Grants and having lower economic family
Backgrounds makes it challenging for HBCUs to increase their tuitions and fees to compensate for the lack of federal and state funding. HBCUs have raised their tuitions in the last several years, but they fear that African American students may choose to attend PWIs or community colleges if they raise them too much. HBCUs, having lower outside funding, charging less than PWIs to attend, and having students from lower economic backgrounds have an enormous challenge of getting these same students to give back to their schools. For decades, alumni from these institutions were not even requested to help (Crawford, 2012). Will these pressures the HBCU dissatisfactions for these administrators? How will they react to the pandemic stressors and demands? How will their decisions dictate if they will stay in their positions? Studies have been conducted on administrators, HBCUs, and online courses; however, this study examined how these three critical topics have converged during the current pandemic.

**Literature Review**

An educational administrator is the head of the institution. The key educational leader and chief executive officer of a complex and heterogeneous community comprise prominent, devoted, dedicated professors and lecturers, students, parents, governing bodies, education departments, and universities (Malik & Kumari, 2013). According to Ogawa & Bossert (1997), the conceptualization of leadership as an organizational quality has implications for studying leadership in school organizations. They fall into three rough categories: general research strategies, focus on new dimensions, and promising developments in theory and research (p. 20). Educational leadership within a college or university unit makes them strong and, at times, vulnerable for failure if the leaders are not able to work within the institution's mission statement and culture yet be innovative enough to look forward to opportunities for institutional success. Researchers have posited that educational administrative heads have a significant role in the smooth and effective functioning of the institution. If an institution is not functioning well, in other words, either the faculty is dissatisfied or students not getting enrolled in the institution, to a great extent, it is because of the poor administration of an administrator (Bass 1981; Bums 1978; Owens 1991; Ramsden 1998). The authors all realized the importance of having a solid and transparent leader for the institution's success. They further declare that shared governance is equally important in how individual programs can prosper and grow with this leadership style.

Traditional leadership literature distinguishes between "top-down" and "bottom-up" leadership. The term top-down leadership refers to organizational change activities or efforts originating from organizational executives (for example, the president and their cabinet). In contrast, bottom-up leadership is another way of talking about grassroots leadership (Kezar & Lester, 2011, p. 227). The authors used this analogy in discussing how administrators can be successful, using the term "convergence," meaning a way to incorporate the two concepts. Their findings support the need for a robust shared governance model. The authors state that managing up must be done with great care, or it can result in those in positions of authority feel threatened and lashing out at the faculty or staff member. In the cases where people were successful, others perceived them as helpful and not threatening. This also requires an assessment by the grassroots leader of the self-confidence of those in positions of authority (Kezar & Lester, 2011, p. 231).

A recent article focusing on ethical framework and decisions made by HBCU administrators was timely in how they have had to look at more significant issues, other than day-to-day challenges. A robust set of principles must guide leadership at this level. Some of these principles involve always including the faculty in the decision-making process and involving
group discussion on issues, being open to using small groups to discuss ideas, and fact gathering to review as many facts as possible. They also suggest that the administrators build confidence by communicating regularly with the team (Anderson, Woods, & Walker, 2019).

HBCUs are facing challenges to their continued existence on several fronts (Crawford, 2012). The current and most pressing challenge is COVID-19. Administrators, facing a genuinely unknown variable, have had to make significant decisions in the short term, which may affect the long-term future of their institutions. One of the decisions to alleviate some of the financial burdens and help students stay on track for graduation was to add more summer courses. As a result, schools like Winston-Salem State University and Virginia State University have seen an increase in summer enrollment. In addition, Virginia State University's administrators made incoming freshmen courses more affordable and lowered tuition rates and fees for in-state students. Virginia State University's President, Dr. Makola Abdullah, said the school understands the challenges COVID-19 has had on students. "While there may be budget challenges for universities nationwide, we have decided that VSU will not pass that down to our students" (vsu.edu). The site says that upward of 90 percent of VSU students receive financial aid, and 70 percent are Pell Grant eligible.

The outbreak of the novel coronavirus disease COVID-19 began in the Wuhan region of China in December 2019. By February 2020, cases of COVID-19 had been detected on every continent. Governments are advising citizens to be prepared for an outbreak in their community. Today, we are globally experiencing closures in schools and universities, postponements or cancellations of conferences and other organized events, and social distancing (Vlachopoulos, 2020). This decision would have a cascading effect on the higher education system's learning and fiscal policies.

At this point, no one--not government officials, public health authorities, or health care professionals--can forecast how long this global pandemic and its countermeasures will last. By all accounts, COVID-19 is pervasively wreaking havoc on a social and institutional level. At my private HBCU, its impact has been substantial and far-reaching-it has been very disruptive to our students, faculty, and staff--in ways that are markedly different from more familiar natural disasters. All of us have found that there is no playbook for COVID-19. (Smothers, 2020, p. 28)

Current research demonstrated that technology does not guarantee a practical or pleasant-learning experience. This can only be achieved through systematic training initiatives that set out the teaching and learning institutions expect of their educators and students, respectively (Vlachopoulos, 2020). Institutions large and small, ranging from The Ohio State University, with nearly 70,000 students, to Antioch University's Seattle campus, with fewer than 700, are replacing in-person classes with an online learning format. They are holding meetings with software that otherwise would have just required a table and chairs, restricting travel, and nixing study abroad programs (Iupui, Tempel, & Iupui, 2020).

"What every college and university is facing is an immediate cash flow crisis," says Terry Hartle, senior vice president of the American Council on Education. "We're dealing with something completely unprecedented in modern history. There is just so much ambiguity about how this will continue to evolve" (Cohen & Clendenning, 2020).

Theoretical Framework
This research looked at institutional theory to examine how these administrators and institutions have navigated the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. "It is well known that the institutional theory can be applied to analyze phenomena in the social, policy, or economic realms. Since the scope of the institutional theory is vast, and its contents and streams are various" (Scott, 1987). Institutional theorists emphasize that organizational structures conform to institutionalized norms, especially those within a nation-state and other institutional environments (Scott, 1992). As a result, populations of organizations become more similar to one another or isomorphic over time (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). However, structural forms are not immutable and may be modified to conform to changes made in other organizations in their population (Pouder, 1996).

Institutional theory suggests that the expectations regarding appropriate organizational forms and behavior expressed in the broader social environment promote an organization's formal structure. This is important because the HBCU administrators will need to incorporate the decisions they have to make with the expectations and decisions made by others – such as the county, city, and national lawmakers. According to the contingency perspective, an organization focuses on its technical activities. It shapes its work processes to promote those activities while protecting them from disturbances in the external task environment (Gupta, Dirsmith, & Fogarty, 1994).

Understanding the culture of not just the industries and other stakeholders involved is easier when you look at institutions of higher learning as just that, institutions. During the construction of public higher education systems, the basic logic lies in the fact that the functions of all units need to be distinguished to increase the system's efficiency and improve the overall educational system (Ajdarpašić & Qorraj, 2019). Thus, institutional theory traces the emergence of distinctive forms, processes, strategies, outlooks, and competencies as they emerge from organizational interaction and adaptation patterns. Such patterns must be understood as responses to both internal and external environments (Selznick, 1996). This study moves forward by establishing each of the HBCUs as institutions, with a structure and a mission statement that dictates how the institution functions educationally.

HBCU administrators understand they were not making decisions in a vacuum. Many of them, working within statewide systems, were mandated by these governing agencies to make a decision, the administrators themselves may not have made if allowed to think only of their schools. Institutional theorists recognize a conflict between conformity to institutionalized standard operating procedures and efficiency criteria, especially in government and professional sectors, where the taken-for-granted form of organization is bureaucracy and survival is mainly a matter of legitimacy and only secondarily of actual performance (Gupta, Dirsmith, & Fogarty, 1994).

The data in this study showed that educational changes, like those required by the COVID-19 crisis, are often an organizational response to the need to adapt to the ever-changing environmental conditions. For example, the administrators in this study decided it was essential to have a platform for HBCUs to share their thoughts on funding, shared governance, and academic rigor qualifications – to be equal to all other institutions in academia. This allows the students at HBCUs to compete equally with students from institutions seen as the elite few in higher education.

Measurements
**Perceived Organizational Support**

To measure the organizational commitment of the administrators, Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa (1986) developed the perceived organizational support (POS) scale. Eisenberger et al. (1986) wanted to measure employee's dedication to their employers and the elements that influence dedication. The administrators at HBCUs exhibited a high range of allegiance to their institutions. The nine-question measurement is rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). This study modified this to a 1 to 5 scale.

**Work-Family Conflict**

HBCU administrators were asked about how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected their own personal and professional lives and how they felt it would/could affect them in the future. As part of the survey, administrators were asked, "How worried are you about the impact of coronavirus on your institution?" *Table 1* shows the results to be that 81% answered "very worried" on the five-point scale (1 = extremely worried; 5 = not worried at all). *Table 2* shows the results of the next question, which asked, "How worried are you about the impact of coronavirus on you?" Twenty-three percent answered, "extremely worried," 59% answered "very worried," and 18.1% answered "not worried at all." (1 = extremely worried; 5 = not worried at all).

In reviewing 190 work-family studies, Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, and Brinley (2005) reported that work-family conflict increases stress and reduces career satisfaction. Netemeyer, Boyles, and McMurrian (1996) developed a short, valid WFC instrument with that understanding. Netemeyer et al. (1996) defined WFC as "A form of inter-role conflict in which the general demands of time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities" (p. 401). The instrument has statements to be answered using a 5-point Likert-like scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

**Role Overload**

This survey asked, "How confident are you that the university will have the resources to return to full operations in the next (in years)." The options were 1 year; 2-3 years; 4-5 years; more than 5 years; and other/specify; with (1 = 1 year; 5 = other). The answers highlighted in *Table 3* were in two categories, 40% answered one year, and 60% answered 2-3 years. These answers were consistent with the open-ended questions asked in the survey.

The differentiating stressor of role overload and role conflict, Bacharach, Bamberger, and Conley (1990) remodeled the role overload measurement developed by Beehr, Walsh, and Table (1976). Beehr et al. (1976) defined role overload as "having too much work to do in the time available" (p. 42). Bacharach et al. defined role overload as "the professional's perception that he or she is unable to complete assigned tasks effectively due to time limitations (i.e., the conflict between time and organizational demands concerning the quantity of work to be done" (p. 202). The three-statement instrument is answered using a 4-point Likert-like scale (1 = definitely false; 4 = definitely true).

To examine how administrators worked with their cabinet and shared governance, the survey asked an open-ended question regarding how they configured their institutions’ COVID-19 response team/members. "How were they chosen, and why?" The answers all varied, but the central titles were – provost, vice provost of student affairs, IT staff, risk management director, faculty senate/representative, housing, registrar's office, staff council/representative, student council/representative, and campus health directors. Administrators found sharing the decision-
making role with many stakeholders allowed the institution to make seamless and meaningful
decisions.

For "How were they chosen and why?" two of the responses detailed how the institutions
had teams/committees already in place or concerted plans to handle emergencies. The first one
shows the existence of a crisis response model.

The university has an existing Emergency Response Team chaired by the Chief of
Police/Director of Public Safety (Emergency Management). However, we developed a
Crisis Team led by the president and included essential faculty, staff, and students (Crisis
Response Team). We will continue to operate with both. (Executive Provost response.
The second example, also from a provost, showed the importance of a shared governance model.
Response team members were chosen because of their role at the University. Additional
members were selected due to their respective leadership position through university
shared governance with key stakeholders consisting of faculty, students, and staff.
(Executive Provost response.)
Both responses were indicative of the overall answers given to this question. As could be
expected, the topic of overall funding was essential to the administrators. As a result, the CARES
Act: Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund was passed to help schools with funding.

Administrators were asked an open-ended question regarding federal funding assistance,
"Was the school provided funding from the CARES Act? If so, are you comfortable stating how
much was provided?" Again, the answers varied in the amounts provided to their institutions
and ranged from $1.2 million to $8.5 million. For example, one administrator wrote, "We
received $8.45 million from the CARES Act, and we holistically used the funding
- $3.3 million
for the Paycheck Protection Plan; $2.25 million for Emergency Relief; and $2.9 million through
Title III HBCU Aid."

However, when the administrators were asked, "Do you feel the federal funding was
adequate for your needs?", using a 4-point Likert-like scale (1 = Yes; 2 = No; 3 = Not sure, will
need to access later; 4 = Other/specify) 20% responded No, 60% responded Not sure, and 20%
responded Other (with the prevailing answer being "we appreciate the funding, however, there is
a significant need for additional funding."

Job Demand

Karasek’s (1979) seven-question job demand-control (JDC) measurement was designed
to assess the effects of job stress on the physical health of workers. The scale examines
explicitly job demand (workload in terms of time pressure and role conflict) and job control
(administrators' ability to control their work activities). Karasek wrote: "psychological strain
results not from a single aspect of the work environment, but the joint effects of the demands of a
work situation and the range of decision-making freedom (discretion) available to the work
facing those demands" (p. 287). Karasek suggests that high levels of control act as a buffer
against job dissatisfaction. The questions are answered on a 5-point Likert-like scale (1 = never;
5 = extremely often).

In examining the motivators and hygiene factors that determine job satisfaction among
HBCU presidents and chancellors, this unique study will build upon previous work. The
motivators include perceived organizational support (shared governance and their cabinet) and
management's commitment to fiscal and academic responsibility (working conditions), work-
family conflict (factors in personal life), and job demands (working conditions) will be the
hygiene factors.
This study will examine several phenomenological research questions and hypotheses, including:

RQ1: How will administrators' demographic characteristics correlate with overall job satisfaction, work-family conflict, role overload, social support, job demands, and perceived organizational support?

RQ2: How will administrators rate on the MOAQ’s job satisfaction scale?

H1: Herzberg’s motivators (perceived organizational support and stakeholder’s commitment to getting the institutions fiscally through the pandemic) will be significant predictors of overall job satisfaction among the administrators.

H2: How will Herzberg’s hygienes (role overload, work-family conflict, and job demand) will be significant predictors of overall job dissatisfaction (results of decisions) among administrators.

Methodology

As its primary method, the study incorporated a survey and several face-to-face and electronic video interviews. The questions, in each case, were the exact same and asked in precise order. The study explored the leadership styles, personal and professional goals during the pandemic and the level of shared governance used in decisions, and what possible variables involved in the process for their specific institution.

A secondary method used in the study was a heuristic investigation, relying on the lived experiences and observations of the surveyed administrators. This method was developed by Clark Moustakas, an American clinical psychologist with other renowned scholars, such as Carl R. Rogers and Abraham H. Maslow. In his development of heuristics, Moustakas suggested a format for reporting on a phenomenological study. This study examined the personal thoughts and feelings that HBCU administrators felt in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic. The design includes the following parts - an introduction and purpose statement with a topical outline, a conceptual framework and review of the literature, a description of the methodology, the presentation of data, and a summary with outcomes and implications.

The heuristic inquiry is a unique method in which the researcher's lived experience becomes the focus of the study. It is used as an instrument in understanding a given phenomenon. This method recognizes the importance of intuition and tacit knowledge as elements that enable comprehending a phenomenon and its meanings. The heuristic method can be understood as a reflexive version of descriptive phenomenology that engages self and participants in dialogue about the studied experience. Heuristic research offers a systematic, structured approach that integrates first-person and descriptive phenomenological approaches while encouraging creative exploration and presentations to deepen understanding further. However, the epistemological commitments underpinning the method remain fuzzy, caught between descriptive, hermeneutic, and first-person accounts, potentially compromising the depth that might be engaged (Finlay, 2011, p. 176).

Fifty schools were randomly selected – there are 89 four-year HBCUs, and of this total, 40 are public, and 49 are private; there are 14 two-year HBCUs, of which 11 are public, and three are private. Therefore, from a list of the 103, the researcher contacted those HBCUs that are currently still open, using the definition from the United States Department of Education as
Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The list was obtained on the website http://www.thehundred-seven.org/hbculist.html. In addition, emails were sent to administrators at each of the 50 schools to request their participation in the survey. The emails also included a consent form and the option for the administrator to be interviewed via electronic video conference or by telephone.

Permission to conduct the study was approved by the researchers' Institutional Review Board (IRB) and any individual university that preferred their own institution's IRB, as required by their procedure or request be used. All data for this study were handled with confidentiality, and each participant's privacy was protected unless they expressly agreed to have both their name and institution used as part of any publication.

**Results**

As a reminder, three weeks later, a third email was sent explaining the study's purpose to the administrators requesting their participation in the survey. The email also explained that the study was confidential, voluntary and respondents could refuse to answer any question. The email included a SurveyMonkey link for them to review and complete. The questionnaire was distributed three times during five weeks. Of the 50 administrators contacted, eight dead email accounts or a change of administrators listed on the schools' websites. An additional eight schools were randomly selected to bring the total back to 50. Of that number, 22 administrators or their representatives completed the survey for a response rate of 44% for this study. The response rate is similar and within accepted rates for online surveys. The data for this study is a result of their answers and comments.

In discussing the individual make-ups of their institutions and their personal lives and responsibilities, the administrators answered all the questions and provided the following information for the survey. They were asked how long they had been in an administrative role and how long had they been in their current positions. The administrators each had about 12 years of professional administrative experience, with an average current position of four years. The administrators were represented by more than 85% being Black or a person of color and male and 15% being Black or person of color and female. Ninety-five percent were married, and 52.7% had children living at home. The administrators in this study averaged working more than 52 hours a week inside and outside of the institution, and 77% held the title of either chancellor or president. In contrast, 23% were either provost or executive vice provost.

The individual school size (*Table 4* - determined by student size) was measured by the number of students enrolled. There was a total of 81.8% of the schools had 0-5000 students, while 13.6% had 5,001-10,000 students, and 4.5% had over 10,000 students.

Correlations were conducted to answer RQ1, asking how demographic characteristics relate to overall job satisfaction, work-family conflict, role overload, job demands, and perceived organizational support. Results indicate that job satisfaction had a small, positive and significant correlation to how the administrators handled the time invested in working during the COVID-19 pandemic, but a small, negative correlation to the institution's size. In addition, the work-family conflict had a small, negative and significant association with working with federal funding, and role overload had a moderate, positive, and significant correlation with working with shared governance. Additionally, organizational support (their cabinet and working with their boards or regents) had a moderate, significant association score.
RQ2 asked how administrators will rate the MOAQ overall job satisfaction scale developed by Camman et al. (1983). Unfortunately, the authors did not create a legend that determines high or low levels of job satisfaction based upon raw scores. However, in this study, administrators had a mean score of 17.5 out of a possible 21.

Multiple regression analysis was utilized to examine H1, which states that administrators who report high levels of motivators (perceived organizational support and boards'/regents’ commitment to fiscal responsibility) will report high levels of overall job satisfaction. When job satisfaction was the dependent variable, perceived organizational support and management’s commitment accounted for about 42% of the variance (adjusted r-square = .369), F(2,22) = 71.26, p < .001. Organizational support was a positive, significant predictor of job satisfaction \[B = .617, t(22) = 11.01, p < .001\], but management’s commitment to full decisions regarding some funding was not. Therefore, H1 was only partially supported.

H2 states that Herzberg’s hygienes (role overload, work-family conflict, and job demands) will significantly predict overall job dissatisfaction among administrators. In this model, role overload, work-family conflict and job demand accounted for about 8% of the variance (adjusted r-square = .077), F(3,22) = 7.79, p < .001. Work-family conflict was a negative, significant predictor of job satisfaction \[B = -.260, t(22) = -3.95, p < .001\], but role overload and job demands were not significant predictors. H2 was partially supported. The administrators had an average of 210 faculty, with a low of 120 and a high of 525.

**Conclusion**

Of course, there are limitations to this study. Surveying and interviewing only administrators who are deeply invested in the COVID-19 pandemic process might produce specific results. Also, the respondents were asked to identify themselves, which could encourage more favorable responses. However, the open-ended comments were direct and revealing. The 44% response rate does provide a reasonably representative accounting of the total HBCUs. While this is far from a monolithic grouping of colleges and universities, they all face similar stressors and challenges.

The purpose of this unique study was to examine the challenges faced by HBCU administrators that influence job demands, leadership, decision-making, organizational support, and HBCU missions. The results indicate that administrators find great satisfaction in their institution’s ability to adjust to the pandemic and the level of shared governance and desire to live to their institution’s original mission statement. They also all believed increased federal funding is necessary to assist them in operating at the same level as before the pandemic. Finally, the administrators all feel confident in their abilities to lead their institutions into the future, one which may include COVID-19 in some form in the next three years.

Additional research could also include further examinations as to the results of the decisions made by the administrations as part of a longitudinal study. Interviews with the administrators would undoubtedly assist in developing those answers. A more thorough examination of student and faculty technology/software needs and a general ascertainment of the possible digital divide for all involved stakeholders.

Regardless of the results, this study does have other limitations, particularly with the research method. Some consider online surveys to be unpredictable because of the unknown nature of the respondent. While that may be true, the SurveyMonkey link was sent to specific email addresses, ensuring some access restrictions. Also, because the emails were extracted...
from the institution's websites, another level of restriction was provided. Some institutions did not provide email addresses of their chancellors or presidents – the email went to "office of the president/chancellor." And finally, self-administered surveys have their problems concerning honesty and accuracy in answers.

From an institutional theory perspective, future research points to an institutional effect within state and local governments and related organizations, such as HBCUs. If we understand how these organizations function, we must expand our perspectives on them to include the institutional environment in which they operate (Gupta, Dirsmith, & Fogarty, 1994).
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Table 1  How worried are you about the impact of coronavirus on your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not worried at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so worried</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat worried</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely worried</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  How worried are you about the impact of coronavirus on you personally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not worried at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so worried</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat worried</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely worried</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3  How confident are you that the university will have the resources to return to full operations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 1 year</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2-3 years</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 4-5 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administrators believed their institutions would be able to handle the pandemic's current financial and enrollment challenges within the next three years. In addition, the majority of the administrators were confident the federal funding from the CARES Act and the move to online and hybrid course delivery would ensure they would not need to shutter programs.
Table 4 How many students enrolled at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5,000</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>