



6-1959

Behavioral Patterns of Selected Superintendents During the Process of Public School Desegregation

Sam Harris Ingram

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ingram, Sam Harris, "Behavioral Patterns of Selected Superintendents During the Process of Public School Desegregation. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 1959.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/2926

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Sam Harris Ingram entitled "Behavioral Patterns of Selected Superintendents During the Process of Public School Desegregation." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration.

Galen N. Downy, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Orin B. Graff, John W. Gilliland, Spencer Edgar, Cecil Lawrence

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

May 6, 1959

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Sam Harris Ingram entitled "Behavioral Patterns of Selected Superintendents During the Process of Public School Desegregation." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Robert H. Kucera
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

John B. Staff
John W. Gilliland
Ernest E. ...
Carl M. ...

Accepted for the Council:

Osie Wankling
Dean of the Graduate School

BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS OF SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS DURING
THE PROCESS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

A THESIS

Submitted to
The Graduate Council
of
The University of Tennessee
in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

by

Sam Harris Ingram

June 1959

33

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the problem	6
Sub-problems	6
Assumptions	7
Limitations	7
Definition of terms	7
Procedures	8
Related literature	17
Organization of the study	32
II. A BACKGROUND OF FORCES AFFECTING THE BEHAVIOR OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN KENTUCKY	33
History of white and Negro education in Kentucky	33
The legal framework within which the local superintendent operates	44
Kentucky and the Supreme Court decision	54
Chapter summary	60
III. IDENTIFYING THE BEHAVIOR OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS	62
System "A"	64
System "B"	69
System "C"	74

CHAPTER

PAGE

III. (continued)

System "D"	78
System "E"	83
System "F"	88
System "G"	93
System "H"	97
System "I"	100
System "J"	104
Chapter summary	109

IV. THE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS OF SUPERINTENDENTS . . 111

Superintendents who furnished initial leadership and made careful preparation for public school desegregation	113
Superintendents who initiated action without careful planning for desegregation	131
Superintendents who waited for the community or other outside agencies to initiate action and who then provided formal leadership in preparing for desegregation	137
Superintendents who waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and who made little formal preparation for desegregation	148
Chapter summary	151

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	154
Summary and conclusions	154
Recommendations	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY	165
APPENDIXES	168

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

At the time of the Supreme Court decision which proclaimed that segregation of the races in the public schools of the United States was no longer constitutional, the legal framework under which segregation was being maintained could be categorized as follows:

1. Eleven states had no specific legislation dealing with segregation. These states were: Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Maine, Nevada, Oregon, California, and Vermont.

2. Segregation was prohibited in sixteen states-- Washington, Idaho, Colorado, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

3. Segregation was permitted in varying degrees in four states--Kansas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

4. Segregation was required by law in the District of Columbia and seventeen states--Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North

Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas.¹

Robert A. Leflar had this to say concerning the decision directed toward the implementation of desegregation in the public schools handed down by Chief Justice Warren on May 31, 1955: "Five key terms in the opinion give its real meaning. These are 'good faith,' 'practical flexibility,' 'prompt and reasonable start,' 'deliberate speed,' and 'equitable principles.'"²

Not all of the seventeen states requiring public school segregation by law at the time of the Supreme Court decision have moved to comply with this decision. In those states which have chosen to resist desegregation in their public schools the legislative resistance has moved along the following lines:

1. Pupil placement laws in at least eight states have been enacted to control, if not to restrain desegregation.
2. Abolition of public schools has been authorized in six states as a last resort.
3. Financial aid to students who wish to attend segregated, private, non-sectarian schools in the event public

¹Harry S. Ashmore, The Negro and the Schools (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p. 2.

²Robert A. Leflar, "What the Court Really Said," Southern School News, June 8, 1955, p. 1.

schools are either closed or mixed has been provided in four states.

4. Curtailment of court attacks on segregation laws has been the aim of new laws in four states.

5. Miscellaneous statutes have been enacted affecting compulsory attendance, teacher tenure, transportation, and use of funds for desegregated education. Primarily these acts have been designed to adjust general education laws to the new legislation bearing directly on the segregation issue.

6. Resolutions of interposition, nullification or protest against the Supreme Court decisions have been adopted in all of the resisting states.³

The states of Missouri, Maryland, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Delaware met the Supreme Court decision without any legislative action. Oklahoma is the only state which has enacted new state laws designed to comply with, rather than delay, the desegregation process. These laws have eliminated the dual budget which had been necessary under a segregated school system and changed the school code so that the state board of education might execute policies favorable to desegregating school districts.⁴

³Don Shoemaker, With All Deliberate Speed (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 132.

⁴Ibid., p. 133.

Even though active resistance to desegregating school systems is occurring in many of the southern states, it is admitted privately by some of the officials of these states that litigation will eventually force them to comply with the Supreme Court decision. This means that the process of public school desegregation and the problems which may appear as the result of it must some day be faced by the people in most public school systems in the South.

As this process of public school desegregation moves slowly southward to comply with the historic Supreme Court decision of 1954 declaring public school segregation unconstitutional, the problems of compliance and adjustment to desegregation become increasingly more difficult. There are still many communities in the South where little attention is given to any decision which may have been made by the Courts concerning the public schools. Since the schools in these communities have traditionally been controlled and administered on the local level, there is little understanding of the authority of outside agencies and their effect upon the organization and operation of the public schools. Therefore, the people in these communities as well as those in communities where the authority from outside agencies may be understood but not accepted are looking to the local administrative officers of the school systems to resist any outside pressure.

This means that the local administrative officer of such school systems is often caught in a crossfire between the

wishes of the people who are responsible for his employment and the Courts whose responsibility is the implementation of public school desegregation. Many administrators find themselves in a no man's land with very little chance of pleasing both the Courts and the community.⁵

This is one of two companion studies done at the University of Tennessee in an attempt to show some relationship between the behavior of the administrative heads of local school systems and the desegregation of these public school systems. This study was an effort to identify and describe the behavioral patterns of selected public school superintendents and the companion study conducted by Harry S. Blanton was an attempt to relate these behavioral patterns to the desegregation process in the selected public school systems.⁶

It was believed that studies of this type might have certain implications for the administrative heads of public school systems in the South as well as other areas of the United States where desegregation has not occurred. Although no two school systems are exactly alike and each community is unique in many ways, any study or studies which will contribute

⁵Ibid., p. 183.

⁶Harry S. Blanton, "The Relationships of Behavioral Patterns of School Superintendents to the Desegregation Process in Selected Public School Systems" (Unpublished Ed. D. thesis, Department of Education, The University of Tennessee, June 1959).

in some way to a better understanding of the problems encountered during the desegregation process may be of value to administrators presently faced with what, at best, appears to be a delicate task in many areas of the South.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify and describe behavioral patterns of selected public school superintendents during the process of public school desegregation.

Sub-problems

1. To identify and describe the behavior of the selected superintendents toward their administrative staffs and/or principals during the process of public school desegregation.
2. To identify and describe the behavior of the selected superintendents toward their school boards during the process of public school desegregation.
3. To identify and describe the behavior of the selected superintendents toward their teachers during the process of public school desegregation.
4. To identify and describe the behavior of the selected superintendents toward the public during the process of public school desegregation.

5. To identify and describe the general behavioral patterns of the selected superintendents in the process of public school desegregation.

Assumptions

The assumptions of this study were: (1) that definite behavioral patterns of the selected superintendents existed during the process of public school desegregation, and (2) that these patterns could be identified and described.

Limitations

This study was limited to ten public school superintendents in Kentucky systems where public school desegregation in some form had been accomplished and where the superintendents and state department of education had indicated a willingness to cooperate in providing data for the study.

Definition of Terms

1. Superintendent will refer to the chief administrative officer in a school system charged with the direction of schools.
2. School system will refer to all the schools operated by a given board of education with a superintendent acting as administrative head and recognized by the state department of

education as being the local administrative unit of the state educational system.

3. Segregation will refer to the separation in the public schools of children who are considered to be "Negroes" from those who are considered to be "whites."

4. Desegregation will refer to removing the barriers in the public schools which may have separated children considered to be "Negroes" from those considered to be "whites."

5. Process of public school desegregation will refer to the transition period from public school segregation to public school desegregation.

6. Behavioral patterns will refer to actions which seem to be similar in nature that emerge from all the actions taken by the superintendents in this study.

7. Supreme Court decision will refer to the 1954 declaration of the Court saying that state-compelled racial segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional or the 1955 statement telling how the 1954 decision should be carried out.

Procedures

Once the decision had been made that companion studies which would identify and describe the behavior patterns of public school superintendents and relate these behavior patterns to the process of desegregation were needed, the next

step was that of finding the kind and number of public school systems which might be used. In addition to locating these systems permission had to be obtained for a Negro and white graduate student to collect the data needed in each of these systems. This involved the cooperation of the school officials within each of the systems.

It was believed that if the studies were to be of the most value to superintendents in the South who would be faced with the problems of public school desegregation, then systems should be chosen where opposition in some form had been present. At the same time it was realized that an atmosphere should prevail within the systems to be used which would be conducive to collecting the data needed for the studies. This meant that not only must the school officials be willing to cooperate but also that conditions within the community concerning desegregation be in such a stable condition that obtaining the data or news of the collection of the data would not create a disturbance.

In addition to the factor of opposition there was also the problem of obtaining a sufficient number of systems to justify companion studies of this type. It was originally believed that a minimum of twelve systems should be used. This would enable the investigators to observe a variety of behavior on the part of the superintendents under varying situations during the process of desegregation.

The number of Negro students within each system was another criterion which was felt essential in determining the systems to be used. The ratio of Negro and white students as well as the actual number of Negro students which had been included in the desegregation process was considered significant.

Another criterion which was believed should be included in the selection of the school systems to be used was that of leadership. It was believed advisable to include systems where the quality of leadership varied or where different patterns of leadership may have been exercised. Since the two studies were not only going to determine the behavior of the superintendents but also include what the superintendent felt about this behavior and its relationship to the whole process of public school desegregation, then it was believed that an important segment of the studies would be that dealing with the leadership exhibited by the superintendents.

Since the tenure of superintendents is usually uncertain, this was another factor which had to be considered. If the desired results were to be obtained, the superintendent who held office when desegregation occurred must still be in the school system or the person who was now serving as superintendent should be familiar with the actions taken by the former superintendent.

Feeling that the only states which had accomplished enough in the field of public school desegregation to provide

the number of systems needed as well as the additional criteria desirable for the studies were the border states, contact was made during the winter of 1958 with a member of the state department of West Virginia concerning the feasibility of conducting the studies in that state. Opposition was such that it was not deemed wise at that time for such studies to be undertaken in West Virginia.

The next choice of a border state which might come nearest to fulfilling the desirable criteria for the studies was Kentucky. Initial contact with the state department of education revealed their interest and willingness to cooperate in the proposed studies. They also indicated a willingness to contact the superintendents in systems which might be used in the studies.

After a preliminary meeting with a member of the Kentucky State Department of Education, several public school systems which might be used in the studies were selected by members of the Kentucky State Department of Education using as a guide the following criteria:

1. Had the systems completed or were they in the process of public school desegregation?
2. Were the systems willing to participate in the studies?
3. Were they systems where there had been varying degrees of opposition to public school desegregation?

4. Were they systems where there were rather large and rather small numbers of Negroes involved?

5. Were they systems where different patterns of leadership may have been exercised?

6. Were they systems where the same superintendent was still in office or remained in the same school system?

Each of the selected superintendents was then written a letter by a member of the Kentucky State Department of Education (see Appendix A) asking whether he was willing to cooperate and if his system could be included in the study. The ten systems finally chosen were those where the superintendent in the system had replied favorably to this letter. It should be pointed out that these ten systems were not all systems which fulfilled perfectly the desirable criteria for selection. Since the number of superintendents willing to cooperate was small, this had to be a major factor in the selection of a few of the systems. This also accounted for the decision to use only ten systems in the studies rather than twelve as had been previously planned.

Once the ten systems had been selected the writers of the two companion studies, accompanied by a member of the Kentucky State Department of Education, spent two days visiting some of these systems. The purpose of the studies was explained more fully than had been possible in the written communication and the methods to be used in obtaining the desired

information were also discussed. In some systems dates for future visits to obtain information were agreed upon. In those systems which were not visited during this two-day period with a representative of the state department, the two writers arranged a visit some time later.

These preliminary meetings were considered important by the members of the state department and others involved in conducting the studies. They served to clarify the purposes and possible values of the studies. They also helped to relieve the anxiety of some of the superintendents and paved the way for a more informal and comprehensive discussion of desegregation in their systems during later interviews. These early visits with the superintendents also meant that people could be contacted by the superintendent who might be able to give valuable information about desegregation in the system in the future visits of the writers to the system.

The behavior of the superintendents was actually determined in later visits to these systems by using the following methods:

1. A personal interview (see Appendix B) with each of the people then serving as superintendent.
2. A personal interview (see Appendix C) with a member of the superintendent's administrative staff when possible.
3. An examination of recommendations made by the superintendents to the school boards and actions taken by the local

school boards pertaining to desegregation as contained in the official school board minutes.

4. A personal interview (see Appendix C) with one or more community leaders who actively participated in planning for desegregation.

5. An examination of official documents distributed from the superintendents' offices concerning desegregation where these were available.

6. A study of the contents of informal talks, formal addresses or speeches of which there was an available record.

7. A review of news articles concerning actions of the superintendents and boards during the desegregation process.

Although an effort was made to use all of the above methods in each of the ten systems which were visited, this was not always possible. In the preliminary visits with the superintendents it was believed necessary to assure them that all of the methods used in obtaining data from their systems must be agreed upon by them. This meant that the people interviewed in each system must be approved by the superintendent in that system before an interview could be held. This limited the amount and kind of information which was obtained in some of the systems; however, it was believed that most of the superintendents not only were willing for the people who could contribute the most to be interviewed but also were anxious to assist in arranging these interviews and collecting

or making available the information which they believed would aid in the studies. A personal interview with each of the superintendents was conducted. An interview guide was used but the information obtained in these interviews was not limited to the points covered in the guide. Its use was primarily that of preventing the interviewers from failing to collect what was considered essential information to the studies. A member of the superintendent's staff or at least one principal in each system was interviewed. In every system where citizen's committees had been involved in the problems relating to public school desegregation, at least one of the members on such a committee was interviewed. The interview with these people was also conducted with the use of an interview guide to give direction to the information gained from each person rather than limit information received.

The interview with each of the selected subjects was conducted by the writers of the two companion studies. Notes were taken by each of the writers during the interview, and separate interview reports were written. The two writers then compared the two written reports of the interview to prevent omitting any information which was given and to clarify any points which might not have been understood.

The interview with each superintendent began with an informal conversation in which additional information concerning the studies was given and any questions from the

superintendents were answered. The superintendent was then asked to tell in his own words just how public school desegregation occurred in his system and the role he assumed as superintendent during the desegregation process. As he related this story and the role he assumed, specific questions were asked from time to time in order to obtain answers to all of the items included in the "Interview Guide for Superintendents." This method enabled each superintendent to present a detailed description of the desegregation process in his system and also assured the interviewers of obtaining comparable information from each system. In systems where a former superintendent had been in office during the desegregation process, the present superintendent was asked to present the same information concerning desegregation as it pertained to the former superintendent.

Interviews with other personnel in each of the ten systems were conducted in the same manner as those with the superintendents using the "Interview Guide for Other Personnel" as a guide.

Since the purpose of the study was to determine the behavior of superintendents during the desegregation process, it was believed that each superintendent would be more aware of his own behavior during this period than would anyone else in the system. In order to gain additional information which may have been overlooked and to validate the information which was

given by the superintendent, it was believed that other interviews in the system should be conducted with people who were also involved in or familiar with the desegregation process. It was believed, too, that information concerning the general behavior of each superintendent during public school desegregation should be agreed upon by a majority of the people interviewed in his system if it were to be regarded as reliable.

Once the behavior of each superintendent had been determined by interviewing the superintendent and other personnel in his system, a further effort was made to validate this behavior by examining the official school board minutes, official bulletins where these were available, and newspaper articles where they were said to have played more than a minor role during the desegregation period.

Related Literature

The Supreme Court decision of 1954 focused national attention upon the problems existing for education in a bi-racial society. Although some work in this field was already being done, the attention given to segregated schools and the process of desegregation in the United States by this Court decision has resulted in a mass of literature dealing in some way with this issue. Much of this literature has been written for the purpose of influencing the readers so that the author's viewpoints might prevail. Some of it has been based upon

facts and a great deal of it upon what might appeal to the human emotions.

No attempt will be made here to do a comprehensive survey of all the literature in this area. However, an effort will be made to look briefly at some of the important works in this field which have some relationship to this study. Some of these will not deal with the action of the administrative heads of school systems before or during the desegregation period but will present a background of conditions and problems which are basic to any study in this field. The literature reviewed here may be considered current in that it was done just prior to or after the Supreme Court decision of 1954. Nevertheless, it is believed that sufficient background is given in these works to acquaint the person who reads them with conditions which brought about our present crises in public school desegregation.

In 1953 James H. Tipton⁷ reported on a community which had eliminated segregation from its public schools. His study was based upon a series of experiences which stretched over a period in excess of two years. During this time the author and other consultants from the Bureau for Intercultural Education worked with school officials and community leaders in eliminating public school segregation. This work was done in

⁷James H. Tipton, Community in Crisis (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953).

the face of conflict within the community in the form of student strikes.

A background of the racial picture in America is presented in this work as well as the setting within which the conflict over public school desegregation in this midwestern town took place. A description of events and actions taken during the fifty days of crisis is given. This description includes a summary of events leading up to and during the student strike. Particular emphasis is placed upon the position taken by the school officials and white leaders who were opposed to school desegregation. The role of the students in this crisis as described by Tipton was a major one and is, thus, given a great deal of attention.

In presenting this study the author has quoted freely from newspaper articles and other reports which might help reveal the story of how this community solved its public school problem of desegregation. The school officials and community leaders cooperated with him in making needed information available. The city is identified only as a midwestern one and given a fictitious name.

The purpose of the study, according to the author, was to make available to interested citizens, school administrators, teachers, and other community officials information which might lead to a better understanding of similar problems. These people might gain some insights and guides which might

be adaptable to situations in which they might sometime become involved. It was also prepared so that interested citizens everywhere might gain a better understanding of the prejudice and fears which are to be found in every community.

Harry S. Ashmore's book,⁸ which was published in 1954 just prior to the Supreme Court decision, was an interpretation and summary of the work of more than forty people who had been involved in the "Ashmore Project." This project was the first comprehensive effort to make a thorough study of the structure of bi-racial education in the United States. The Fund for the Advancement of Education initiated the work in this area with the benefit of Ford Foundation money. The object of this project was to obtain objective data which people could use in their study of bi-racial education in the United States.

In making their decision to support the project which later became known as the "Ashmore Project," the Fund for the Advancement of Education adopted the following statement of principle:

1. The Fund will not undertake to argue the case for or against segregation in public education, and in no sense will it become involved as an advocate on either side of the issues now pending before the Supreme Court.

⁸Harry S. Ashmore, The Negro and the Schools (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954).

2. Aside from the possible consequences of this litigation, there is a need for an objective re-appraisal of the bi-racial aspects of our educational system. This should take into account the great shifting of population in recent years, the rapidly improving economic status of the region most affected, as well as any significant changes in prevailing attitudes and practices.

3. Since no single institution or agency is equipped to handle such a study within the time limitation involved, the Fund will bring together a temporary research staff consisting of persons who are specially qualified to examine the various aspects of the educational structure.

Part One of Ashmore's book gives a background of bi-racial education in the United States. It describes the effort which the South has made in the field of education during the last few years. Particular emphasis is placed upon the progress made by the South recently in raising the standards of Negro education toward that of the whites. Part Two of the book illustrates the facts and trends brought out in Part One through a series of tables. These tables tell the story of bi-racial education sometimes more vividly than can be told in narrative form. This story as told in tables is broken down to give an accurate state by state picture of the changes which have been going on in the South.

Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan's book⁹ was the second volume to emerge from the "Ashmore Project." It contained a series of case studies of communities which had changed from segregated to desegregated public schools in recent years. Although none of these communities was in the South, they lay all along the border of the South. They ran from New Jersey in the East through Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois to New Mexico and Arizona in the West. According to the authors the feelings in some of these communities during this period of transition closely resembles that found in many communities further south. Therefore, these studies are significant for the South today and may be for some time in the future.

The aim of these studies is not to present a formula for success during the transition period but rather to point to the need for careful planning and cooperation by both races. The need for effective leadership on the part of school and community officials is emphasized. An effort has been made to be objective in the study and reporting of the social change which occurred in these communities.

The book is organized into four parts. Part One deals with the background of desegregation. The nature of the

⁹Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan, Schools in Transition (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1954).

problem is described and attention is given to the place which law has in determining the patterns of separation of the races or their integration in the systems of public education in the United States. Part Two deals with communities which are located in states where the state law required them to desegregate their schools. The various patterns exhibited by these communities as they moved to comply with these state laws are described. Part Three describes the transition from segregated to desegregated schools in communities where the state law permitted either segregated or desegregated schools. The different patterns and variations exhibited by these communities are discussed.

Part Four summarizes the findings and presents some conclusions which might have future application. Some of these findings and conclusions are:

1. Desegregation is an uneven, shifting process, not a sudden massive change.
2. Each community has its own factors that work to produce or resist desegregation.
3. In communities where desegregation initially aroused opposition, there was usually observed a lack of communication between white and Negro leaders.
4. What happens in the school does not necessarily lead to important immediate changes outside the school.
5. The smoothness with which desegregation occurred

in most of the large and small communities surprised officials and teachers.

6. Segregation in the school system is powerfully supported by the larger patterns of segregation in the community.

7. Public school desegregation is only loosely correlated with the attitudes or prejudices of the population.

8. In communities where there was a tradition of activity in intergroup relations, and in which during the past decade such organizations as a mayor's friendly relations committee or human relations committee was active, the transition from segregation to desegregation seemed to have been made with relative ease.

9. A variety of procedures sometimes results in retarding or minimizing desegregation even when the public policy seems to favor it.

10. A clear policy of geographic districting, with a minimal allowance for "hardship" transfers, gives decisive force to the integration of schools.

11. The deciding factor in whether or not school administrators avoided publicity seemed to be the procedures customarily used in other aspects of school life.

12. Many Negro pupils feel highly motivated to prove their ability and good behavior in an integrated situation.

13. Pupil to pupil friction between whites and Negroes generally has been slight.

14. The use of Negro and white teachers with bi-racial classes in an integrated system tends to pose complex questions.

15. Where faculties have been integrated, professional standards soon take precedence over previous racial attitudes.

16. Where public school desegregation was made in communities in which residential segregation was prominent, immediate assignment of white and Negro teachers to schools or classes predominantly of the other race provided the initial step toward full integration by giving the students some experience in interracial communication and participation.

17. If there is no early discussion of the position or retention of the Negro staff under a proposed desegregation program, the Negro professional often fears for his job and promotion opportunities.

18. At the teacher-student level, the children become not so many Negroes and whites as children who are to be taught.

19. Teacher-student relations show in the main that Negro teachers who are professionally well-qualified tend to be accepted by white pupils.

20. There is an important difference between a change in actual behavior and the anticipation of a change.

21. Important social changes generally do not occur without some resistance and friction.

22. Where desegregation has been tried, the typical

outcome has been its eventual acceptance.

23. Desegregation and integration are not fixed or rigid conditions but moving and growing patterns.

Another book dealing with desegregation is the one by Pierce and others.¹⁰ Although it is not directly related to this study, it contains much information relative to an understanding of the bi-racial picture in the South which includes Kentucky. It is the culmination of several research studies analyzing bi-racial education in the South. These studies were also the result of the "Ashmore Project."

The purposes of this book as stated in the preface are:

To set forth, analyze, and interpret facts concerning the dual school systems of the South to the end that the findings may be useful in efforts to deal intelligently with the segregation issue and other problems in southern education during the years immediately ahead.¹¹

Part One attempts to analyze the American value patterns and relate these patterns to the bi-racial problem in the South. Bi-racial education is also placed in its historical context and the administration of education in the South is shown to reflect the attitudes of the whites toward the Negroes. Part Two presents the major facts of public education in the South as it exists in our bi-racial society.

¹⁰Truman M. Pierce, et al., White and Negro Schools in the South (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955).

¹¹Ibid., preface.

These facts presented include public school finance, school population, enrollments, attendance, and the curriculum. Part Three is composed of generalizations drawn from the studies and the discussion of a point of view for studying the issue of desegregation.

The states which were included in the investigations were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Don Shoemaker edited a book¹² which reported on the measures taken by southern and border states to comply with or counter the Supreme Court decision. It is a summary of the three years following the decision against segregation in the public schools. Chapter eleven of this book seems especially related to the present study since it describes the precarious position in which the administrative heads of school systems and principals find themselves in regard to school desegregation. Although the present study is primarily concerned with identifying and describing the behavior of superintendents rather than analyzing the causes, an understanding of the factors which influence it certainly contributes to an understanding of the behavior. A brief report on desegregation in

¹²Don Shoemaker, With All Deliberate Speed (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).

Kentucky is also given by Ashmore in the section which describes the border states.

Omer Carmichael and Weldon James wrote a book¹³ which was published in 1957 dealing with public school desegregation in one school system in Kentucky. This was the story of how the city of Louisville made the transition from segregated to desegregated public schools. The authors begin this story with conditions as they existed in the city before the Supreme Court decision. A detailed account is then given of all action taken and plans formulated during the period of transition. Reaction from the community to these plans and the action taken by the leaders is also discussed.

The purpose of the book was to present a study of the ways in which Louisville went about solving her problem of public school desegregation. The Fund for the Advancement of Education supported this study with the belief that other communities might profit from the experiences of Louisville.

A Phi Delta Kappa Commission Project resulted in a book¹⁴ by Herbert Wey and John Corey published in 1959. This book was designed to help school officials and community leaders during the transition period from segregated to

¹³Omer Carmichael and Weldon James, The Louisville Story (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957).

¹⁴Herbert Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1959).

desegregated schools. It was not designed to persuade communities to desegregate but rather to provide valuable information after this decision had been made. The Fund for the Advancement of Education gave financial support to this project also.

The study is based upon information secured from seventy school districts which had completed or were in the process of public school desegregation. Written reports were obtained from either the superintendent or his assistant in all seventy of these districts. Letters were also sent to teachers and principals in these districts asking specific questions about desegregation. These questionnaires resulted in personal responses from 215 teachers and eighty-seven principals. In addition to this information visits by the authors were made to representative school districts in Texas, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland. Personal interviews were held with superintendents, principals, teachers, and community leaders.

The first part of the book deals with determining the readiness of the school and the community for desegregation and developing attitudes of acceptance. In this part the importance of preparing for desegregation and the methods which may be used to determine readiness are discussed. Three chapters are also devoted to reporting the various methods used by school districts in preparing for desegregation.

Part Two discusses decision making and developing a plan for desegregation. The different approaches used in developing plans as well as the variety of plans used are reported. The Supreme Court decision and its relation to the different plans is also discussed.

The third part discusses the responsibilities of individuals and groups for carrying out a plan for desegregation as well as handling the news of it. The responsibility of the superintendent, principal, teacher, student, parent, and lay group is assessed in terms of the experiences which were a part of desegregation in the seventy school systems included in the study. The action of the press and other news agencies during desegregation is related.

Part Four is not related to the present study as closely as the first three parts, since it emphasizes the educational program as it has been affected by desegregation. Pupil personnel problems as well as student activities and social affairs are given attention in this last part.

Perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of desegregation in a periodical is that done by Glen Robinson in a series of six articles in The Nation's Schools. These articles run through the latter part of 1956 and January of 1957. They attempt to identify and explain some of the factors essential to understanding conditions which exist in the southern school desegregation issue.

The first article¹⁵ gives an overview of the conditions and problems involved in putting the Supreme Court decision into effect in the South. Such things as the conflict of ideals in the South, the value dilemma faced by southern whites, the new hope and means of southern Negroes, the range of opinion in all parts of the South, the southern counties having more than 50 per cent of their population composed of Negroes, the meaning of the Supreme Court decision, organized groups which bring pressure, the lack of communication, the position of the school administrator, and the socio-economic changes are discussed in this article.

The second article treats the patterns of resistance which have developed to public school desegregation. Just how far the South has moved in desegregating their schools and the methods used by the South in resisting the decision are given. The third article gives the forms of compliance to the Court decision. Leadership at the state level, state level discouragement, local approaches, plans of desegregation, and justified responsibility are the main topics discussed in this article. The fourth article treats the current scene of desegregation. Conditions as they existed at the time the article was written are given. The organized pressure groups for maintaining segregated schools in the South are discussed

¹⁵Glen Robinson, "The Shock Waves of Desegregation," The Nation's Schools, 58:39-43, August 1956.

in the fifth article. Finally, the last article deals with what the whole desegregation process in the South has meant for education. Both the good and bad effects of the Supreme Court ruling and subsequent events in education are presented.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters and is organized as follows:

Chapter I includes the statement of the problem, the sub-problems, the assumptions, the limitations, the definitions, the procedures, and related literature.

Chapter II gives a background of the forces affecting the behavior of superintendents toward desegregation in Kentucky.

Chapter III identifies the behavior of the superintendents during the process of public school desegregation.

Chapter IV gives a description of the behavioral patterns of the superintendents during the process of public school desegregation.

Chapter V gives the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

A BACKGROUND OF FORCES AFFECTING THE BEHAVIOR OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN KENTUCKY

So many factors affect the behavior of superintendents during the desegregation process that it would be an impossible task to treat all of them. It seems likely, however, that some knowledge of the conditions within which the superintendent must operate is essential if one is to understand his action. Many of the conditions or forces affecting the behavior of superintendents in Kentucky are similar to those which affect superintendents in other states. It was still believed that a discussion of some of the major factors affecting the action of superintendents in Kentucky during the desegregation process might provide the reader with a better understanding of this action. One of the things which was believed necessary in understanding the superintendents' actions was a brief history of white and Negro education in Kentucky. Another was the legal aspects of education on both the state and local level. Finally, it was believed that a discussion of Kentucky and its reaction to the Supreme Court decision would help to place the superintendents' actions in the proper perspective.

History of White and Negro Education in Kentucky

The early Kentucky settlers found both beauty and ugliness in the territory which was later to become their state.

To some the mountains were a thing of beauty while others cursed their heights as they trudged westward to the Bluegrass region which was covered with grass and flowers. Those who liked the mountains found shelter in their valleys and an abundance of wild game on their slopes. Others settled in the Bluegrass section and the great open region further west where they soon learned its agricultural wealth.¹

One of the earlier travelers in the territory which later became Kentucky had this to say about parts of it:

There are some strips of rich land upon the Little Kanhaway, but farther up the river the country is broken and sterile, producing scarcely any other timber than the fir-tree or pine, and knotty black oaks, which are generally deemed symptoms of a bad soil. .

. . . After passing the Blue Lick, the soil, if possible, increases in richness. From thence to Danville is about fifty miles, Lexington lies about midway, and is nearly central of the finest and most luxuriant country, perhaps, on earth. From Lexington to Leesburg is about twenty miles: to Boonsburg is about twenty: to the Upper Blue Lick nearly thirty. This square which is nearly fifty miles, comprehends entirely what is called first rate land²

Although the first local government was instituted by the settlers in 1775, a year later Virginia laid claim to the district and the region which had been named Transylvania became known as Kentucky County. During the Revolution British

¹F. Garvin Davenport, Ante-Bellum Kentucky (Oxford: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943), p. 1.

²Thomas D. Clark, A Description of Kentucky (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1945), p. 75.

and Indians from beyond the Ohio conducted raids against the sparsely settled people of this area. It was only after a long contest with Virginia that in 1792 Kentucky became a state. In the constitutional convention there was some opposition to slavery. The opposition was fostered by anti-slavery societies and religious groups but was not strong enough to influence the state government at that time. However, attempts made in 1861 in the Kentucky legislature to pass an ordinance of secession did not succeed even though state laws sanctioned slavery at that time.

Moses Edward Ligon, in his history of public education in Kentucky, gives the following reasons why public education was not mentioned in the first state constitution of Kentucky:

1. The settlers were familiar with the constitution of Virginia and the United States neither of which mentioned education.

2. During the period of the colonization of Virginia, education in England was provided for the common people through the apprenticeship system and schools provided by the church or private organizations. It was only natural to follow this practice.

3. The plantation holders and their conception of class society made them hold to the theory that education was no concern of the state. These landed gentry of the new state were in control of public affairs.

4. A great majority of the population of the region was made up of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists who felt that a liberal education was not necessary to the salvation of a sinner.³

Prior to becoming a state the territory known as Kentucky County had practically no public schools. There were a few municipal systems which were making feeble attempts at some form of public education. However, most of the work being done in the field of education was in the form of various private schools which sprang up here and there. These schools as they were advertised in the newspapers sometimes read as follows: ". . . classical, high, grammar, Hebrew, select, writing, law, mathematical, boarding, music, dancing, literary, military, parochial, male, and female."⁴

One of the first forms of public education in Kentucky to receive support from the state was that of the county academy. In supporting these academies Kentucky was following the example of her mother state, Virginia. It was the General Assembly of Virginia which had authorized the establishment of Transylvania Seminary and had granted eight thousand acres of land to that institution. This was done in 1783, and

³Moses Edward Ligon, A History of Public Education in Kentucky (Lexington: Bureau of School Service, 1942), p. 14.

⁴F. Garvin Davenport, op. cit., p. 60.

Transylvania was the first seminary to be established in Kentucky.⁵

It was only in 1838 that the machinery was actually set in motion for a state system of public education in Kentucky. The first state Superintendent of Public Instruction took office about February 20, 1838, and submitted his first annual report approximately one year later. There was a State Board of Education and five people from each county were appointed commissioners where sufficient interest in public education was found. The first year these commissioners were appointed in seventy-eight of the eighty-eight counties in the state.⁶

As county systems of education in Kentucky grew and people became more interested in their schools, those who lived in some of the towns began to become dissatisfied with existing conditions. These people wanted better facilities and a better instructional program for their children. This led to the development of independent graded and consolidated schools in Kentucky. As interest continued high schools became more common and public education in Kentucky began to come into its own. However, it was not until 1908 that the legislature enacted the County School Administration Law. Prior to this time public high schools in Kentucky had been

⁵Moses Edward Ligon, op. cit., p. 17.

⁶Ibid., p. 80.

organized under the graded common school law. The County School Administration Law provided that:

Within two years after the passage and approval of this act, there shall be established by the county board of education of each county one or more county high schools: Provided, there is not already existing in the county a high school of the first class; if such high school already exists, and if the county board may be able to make such an arrangement with the trustees or board of education of said high school as will furnish to the pupils completing the rural school course free tuition in said high school, then said high school may be considered as meeting the purpose of this law without the establishment by the board of another high school. The county board of education in the various counties shall have full power and authority to unite with the governing authorities of any city or town in their respective counties for the purpose of establishing a high school for the joint use of the city or town and such county.⁷

In discussing the possible reasons why education in Kentucky progressed so slowly during the early years of its history the Kentucky Educational Commission in 1921 had this to say:

Not the niggardliness of nature, but the mischance of history holds the state back. Peopled in the first instance by emigrants from Virginia, the state inherited the slave-holding system. Social organization was distinctly aristocratic. Manual toil was stigmatized. Kentuckians were generally engaged in activities that needed little capital and gave little employment or outlook to white labor. The coal and iron lay untouched below the soil, and emigration passed Kentucky by. Even today the conservatism of the state discourages well-trained, progressive, and adventurous youth. The handicaps under which Kentucky suffers and has suffered are man-made and can

⁷Ibid., pp. 219-220.

be removed by men.

Poor education is the inevitable result of the conditions described. The political leaders of antebellum Kentucky were not thinking of a whole state peopled by a vigorous and industrious race armed with the power that knowledge gives. An excellent Anglo-Saxon stock thus largely lost, as far as public education is concerned, the first century of its history. Public schools got but a feeble start;. . . .⁸

Although public educational opportunities for the white children in Kentucky were somewhat slow to develop, they were even slower in developing for the Negroes. It was not until 1866 that the General Assembly passed a law which provided:

That all the taxes hereafter collected from negroes and mulattoes in the Commonwealth shall be set apart and constitute a separate fund for their use and benefit, one-half, if necessary, to go to the support of their paupers, and the remainder to the education of their children.⁹

This was the first effort on the part of the state to provide any assistance for public education for the Negro. Even though all of the money collected from the Negro in Kentucky at this time was to be spent for the education of his children and the care of the indigent, very little was collected. This was due in part to the economic condition of the Negro and in part to the lack of enforcement of the Negro tax laws by the trustees.

⁸Kentucky Educational Commission, Public Education in Kentucky, Vol. I (New York: General Education Board, 1921), pp. 4-5.

⁹Ligon, op. cit., p. 245.

In 1867 another law was enacted by the state legislature for the benefit of the Negro in Kentucky. Part of this act reads as follows:

The trustees of each common school district in the county may cause a school to be taught in their district for the education of negro and mulatto children in said district; and shall report to the county school commissioner the number of children in attendance at said school during the year, for not less than three months; and the county school commissioner shall report to the annual court of claims all the negro schools thus taught in the county; and said court shall allow, out of the fund aforesaid, two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) for each scholar who has attended school three months, or a longer period.¹⁰

Since this law only provided assistance to those school districts which wanted to provide some education for the Negro children, few schools were established as a result of its passage. The following year the legislature amended this Act making it impossible to obtain this money for education unless the Negro and mulatto paupers had first been taken care of. It seemed that the legislature at that time was more interested in caring for the indigent among the Negro population than in providing their children with the opportunity for an education. As a result very little was done in the field of Negro education in Kentucky until 1874. In this year the Negro children were given a uniform system of schools. The outstanding features of the law¹¹ passed by the legislature were:

¹⁰Ibid., p. 246.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 248-249.

1. The fund for Negro education consisted of a property tax of forty-five cents on each one hundred dollars of taxable property owned by Negroes; a capitulation tax of one dollar on each male Negro above twenty-one years of age; all taxes levied and collected on dogs owned or kept by Negroes; all state taxes on deeds, suits, or licenses collected by state agencies from Negroes; all sums arising from donations and gifts; and all sums of money collected from the distribution of public lands or the sale of these lands.

2. The pro rata share to each Negro child attending school could not exceed in any one year the apportionment to each white student.

3. The school ages of Negro children were fixed between six and sixteen.

4. The commissioner was to lay off the counties into suitable districts.

5. Three trustees were to be appointed by the commissioner at the beginning of each school year.

6. Negro teachers were to hold certificates.

7. A Negro child could not attend a school for white children.

8. The State Board of Education was to prescribe the course of study and textbooks and adopt rules for the government of the Negro schools.

9. The State Auditor was authorized to keep the Negro

school fund separate from the funds for white schools.

With the passage of this law Kentucky had two systems of public schools. One of these was for white students and the other for Negroes. Both were regulated by the State Board of Education and the local county commissioner or superintendent.

As the number of Negro schools increased, their operation under the law of 1874 became more and more difficult. In 1882 the Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that the per capita difference existing by law in the educational expense of white and Negro children be abolished. The General Assembly of 1882 passed an act¹² whose main provisions were:

1. There should be one common school fund, to be distributed to white and colored children in the same proportion.

2. The school ages of colored children were fixed between six and twenty years, the same as for whites.

3. Separate schools were to be maintained for white and Negro children.

4. The act was to be ratified by a majority of the voters at the regular election in August, 1882.

A great stride in accomplishing a uniform system of public education for both Negroes and whites was taken when the people of Kentucky ratified this act. It was to remain in

¹²Ibid., p. 252.

effect until 1894 when the part relating to the certification of teachers was amended. This amendment provided the same requirements for both Negro and white teachers. Thus, Kentucky entered an era of separate but equal legal educational opportunities for all of her children.

There are many ways in which local boards of education and school administrators may take advantage of minority groups in the administration of a system of public education. There can be little doubt that the result of prejudice in many systems has been inferior equipment in the Negro schools, poorly trained teachers, and the lack of adequate buildings. It must also be remembered that many school systems in Kentucky contained only a small number of Negro students. It was not feasible to expend for such a few students the funds necessary to provide the same facilities as those provided for white students. Since the law prevented Negroes from attending white schools, at least one factor to be considered in addition to prejudice was this small number of Negroes in some school systems.

Moses Edward Ligon had this to say about the improvement in educational opportunities for the Negroes of Kentucky:

The state has adopted a policy of equal educational opportunity for the white and colored races. By and large the state has been attempting to pursue this policy. Race prejudice resulting from conditions existing in ante-bellum days has been a mighty force to overcome in the execution of educational plans on a basis of equality. City and county school boards are composed wholly of people of the white

race. On the whole these people are men and women of broad sympathies who, in the execution of their plans, have the social welfare of both races in mind. Little by little race prejudice is disappearing, and better and better educational opportunities are being provided for the colored population.¹³

The above statement seemed to indicate the efforts of the people of Kentucky to eliminate prejudice and improve the status of Negro education from the period beginning in 1882 and continuing until the Supreme Court ruling of May 17, 1954.

The Legal Framework Within Which the Local Superintendent Operates

There are certain laws which every person who is officially connected with the public schools in Kentucky must comply with. These laws not only specify certain duties that are to be performed by school officials but also specify the organization of public education in the state. The legal framework within which each superintendent in Kentucky must operate is composed of two areas. These two areas are the state level and the local level.

State Level

As is true in each of the other states, education in Kentucky is a state function. The highest state educational office in Kentucky is Superintendent of Public Instruction.

¹³Ibid., p. 263.

This is a state constitutional office and is filled by a vote of the qualified voters of the state. The election takes place every four years at the same time as the election of the governor. The Superintendent of Public Instruction cannot succeed himself at the end of his term. To be eligible for this office a person must be at least thirty years of age and a resident of the state for at least two years prior to election.

The Kentucky State Superintendent of Public Instruction is the executive officer of the State Board of Education. His duties include the responsibility for the administration of the Department of Education. He must execute the policies passed by the State Board of Education and direct the work of all who are engaged in the administration of the public schools of the state. He may delegate to his assistants full power of attorney to act for him in the inspection, supervision, and administration of all public schools over which the Department of Education has control.¹⁴

Among the things which must be prepared and submitted to the State Board of Education by the Superintendent of Public Instruction are the following:

1. The biennial state school budget.
2. Minimum courses of study for the different grades and kinds of common schools, and regulations governing

¹⁴Kentucky Department of Education, Kentucky Common School Laws, Vol. XXVI (Frankfort: Department of Education, 1958), p. 474.

educational equipment of the schools.

3. Rules and regulations for grading, classifying and accrediting all common schools, and for determining the scope of instruction that may be offered in the different classes of schools, and the minimum requirements for graduation from the courses offered.

4. Rules and regulations for taking and keeping a school census, and the forms and blanks to be used in taking and keeping the census and in compiling the required reports thereof.

5. Regulations for the sanitary and protective construction of public school buildings, toilets, physical equipment of school grounds, school buildings and classrooms.

6. Regulations governing medical inspection, physical education and recreation, and other rules and regulations deemed necessary or advisable for the protection of the physical welfare and safety of the public school children.

7. Rules and regulations concerning the transportation of children to and from school.

8. Rules and regulations for approving private and parochial schools of elementary or high school grade, and commercial schools.

9. Rules and regulations fixing the holidays on which schools may be closed and special days to be observed, and the pay of teachers during absence because of sickness or quarantine

or when the schools are closed because of quarantine.

10. Rules and regulations governing the preparation of budgets and salary schedules for the several school districts under the management and control of the State Board of Education.

11. A uniform series of forms and blanks, educational and financial, including forms of contract, for use in the several school districts.¹⁵

The state agency whose responsibility is the management and control of the public schools in Kentucky is the State Board of Education. This board is composed of eight members including the Superintendent of Public Instruction who serves as chairman. The other seven members must possess all of the qualifications of local school board members. They must be at least thirty years of age and not engaged as a professional educator in addition to the qualifications required of local board members. Other than this, their place of residence in the state, political affiliation, occupation, and the like are not supposed to be considered in their appointment. Their appointment is made by the governor for a term of four years.

The general powers and responsibility of the State Board of Education are the management and control of the common schools, public vocational education and vocational

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 475-476.

rehabilitation, West Kentucky Vocational School, and the Kentucky School for the Blind. The State Board of Education may, on the recommendation and with the advice of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, prescribe, print, publish, and distribute at public expense such rules, regulations, courses of study, curriculums, bulletins, programs, outlines, reports and placards as it deems necessary for the efficient management, control and operation of the schools under its jurisdiction. All rules and regulations of the State Board must be published before they may be enforced. In its capacity as a board of control for the West Kentucky School, the board may receive by any legal mode of conveyance, and hold and enjoy, property of any description.¹⁶

Local Level

The local units of Kentucky's public school system are made up of the County School District and the Independent School District. Part of the school law in defining these two systems reads as follows:

Each county in the state constitutes a county school district, except that in counties in which there are independent school districts the county school district consists of the remainder of the county outside of the boundaries of the independent school districts.

All school districts embracing cities of the first five classes together with the territory within their limits, including any territory that has been added for

¹⁶Ibid., p. 471.

school purposes outside of the city limits, and all independent graded common school districts having a school census enumeration of two hundred or more white children, constitute independent school districts, except such of them as have merged with a county school district since June 14, 1934. No independent district other than a city of the first five classes shall continue to operate when its school census enumeration of white children falls below two hundred pupils unless it appears to the State Board of Education that the district can maintain a more efficient program of school service by operating as an independent district.¹⁷

Each of these local school districts is governed by a local board of education. This local board is composed of five members and considered a body politic and corporate with perpetual succession. School board members in the independent districts are elected from the district at large and in the county districts from divisions within the county. The term of office is four years.

Before a person may serve on any local board of education in Kentucky, he must meet certain qualifications. One of these is that he must have reached the age of twenty-four. He must have been a citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding his election and a voter of the district for which he is elected. He must have completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools as shown by the records of the school in which the eighth grade was completed or by affidavits of the teacher or teachers under whom the work was completed,

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 537-538.

or he may have the equivalent of an eighth grade education as determined by an examination held under rules and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education. He must not hold or discharge the duties of any civil or political office, deputyship or agency under the city or county of his residence. He must not be directly or indirectly interested in the sale of equipment or supplies for which school funds are expended. He must not have been removed from membership on any board of education for cause.¹⁸

Each local board of education must meet regularly at least once each month. Special meetings may be called by the chairman of the board as often as he deems it necessary. Special meetings may also be called at the request of any three members of the board. A majority of the board members is considered a quorum and may conduct business.

Some of the general powers and responsibilities of local boards of education are:

(1) Each board of education shall have general control and management of the public schools in its district and may establish such schools and provide for such courses and other services as it deems necessary for the promotion of education and the general health and welfare of pupils, consistent with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education. Each board shall have control and management of all school funds and all public school property of its district and may use such funds and property to promote public education in such ways as it deems necessary and proper. Each board shall exercise generally all powers in the administration of its public school system, appoint such officers, agents and employees as

¹⁸Ibid., p. 545.

it deems necessary and proper, prescribe their duties, and fix their compensation and terms of office.

(2) Each board shall make and adopt, and may amend or repeal rules, regulations and bylaws for its meetings and proceedings for the government, regulation and management of the public schools and school property of the district, for the transaction of its business, and for the qualification and employment of teachers and the conduct of pupils. The rules, regulations, and bylaws heretofore made by any governing body of a school district, or hereafter made by a board of education, shall be consistent with the general school laws of the state and shall be binding on the board of education and parties dealing with it until amended or repealed by an affirmative vote of three members of the board. The rules, regulations and bylaws shall be spread on the minutes of the board and be open to the public.¹⁹

One of the most important appointments the local boards of education make in the exercise of their duties is that of Superintendent of Education. He serves as the executive agent of the board that appoints him and meets with them except when his salary, tenure, or the administration of his office is under consideration. He advises the local school board on all school matters and has general supervision of the conduct of the schools, the management of teachers, the discipline of pupils, the course of instruction, and the management of the school business affairs. All of these are subject to the control of the school board, however.

Each local Superintendent of Education must possess a letter signed by the state Superintendent of Public Instruction

¹⁹Ibid., p. 553.

saying that he has been issued a certificate of administration and supervision in accordance with the provisions of the law and that he is qualified to hold the position of superintendent. This letter must be presented to the board which hired him before he may assume his duties as superintendent. The board of education may set the term of the superintendent for one, two, three, or four years. Any superintendent may be removed from office for cause by a vote of four of the five members on the board. When this is done, the charges for such dismissal must be written in the minutes of the board and the superintendent given fifteen days notice.²⁰

Although the school laws of Kentucky spell out certain functions and specific tasks for which the local superintendent is responsible, it is generally agreed that it is no easy task for the superintendent to know precisely where his responsibility begins and where it ends. In exercising leadership, for example, the superintendent in one system may exceed by far the amount done by the superintendent in the adjoining system and both be fulfilling their duties as required by law. One of the superintendents in a large county system in Kentucky gave the following responsibilities which he believed belonged to him as superintendent of schools:

²⁰Ibid., pp. 558-559.

General Responsibility - The superintendent shall have the general responsibility of supervising the total school program.

Specific Responsibility - In addition to the general responsibility the superintendent shall have the specific responsibilities which follow:

1. Provide for wide community participation in determining, planning, and evaluating school services and programs.
2. Provide for the development of a comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of school plant facilities.
3. Provide for the determination of resources available for the support of public education in the district and the resources which can be marshalled to meet the educational needs of the district.
4. Establish working relationships with local, state, and federal agencies to provide services needed by the school system.
5. Work with the Board of Education in the formulation of public school policy and plans.
6. Designate appropriate operational units within the school system.
7. Develop an over-all staff organization.
8. Prepare the school budget.
9. Work with staff members in developing and

implementing new procedures and techniques.

10. Work with staff members on recurring problems which affect the total school system or on individual problems.

Kentucky and the Supreme Court Decision

Almost ten years before the Supreme Court decision of 1954 the Kentucky Commission on Negro Affairs had this to say concerning the Negro population in Kentucky:

Fifty years from now there will be no Negroes in Kentucky, if the present rate of decline in the population ratio continues. Kentucky, once a "slave state," in 1890 had a Negro population which was 50 per cent greater than that of Missouri, Illinois, and Ohio combined. The number in any one of these states now far exceeds that of Kentucky. It has decreased from 14.4 per cent of the state total in 1890 to 7.5 per cent as shown by the 1940 United States Census.²¹

A comparison of Kentucky with other border states in the number of Negroes in each state based upon the 1950 census is as follows:

Delaware	14 per cent
Maryland	17 per cent
West Virginia	6 per cent
Kentucky	7 per cent
Missouri	8 per cent

²¹The Kentucky Commission on Negro Affairs, The Report of the Commission on Negro Affairs (Frankfort: State Department of Education, 1945), p. 5.

Oklahoma	7 per cent
Texas	13 per cent ²²

From the above comparison it seems obvious that the problems encountered in desegregating the public schools of Kentucky will not be as great state-wide as in some of the other border states and other southern states. Although the number of Negro students is only one facet of the desegregation issue, it seems to be agreed that school systems which contain only a few Negro students find less resistance generally than those with large numbers. It should be pointed out, also, that the Negro population of Kentucky was not evenly distributed throughout the state at the time of the Court decision. This meant that in certain areas of the state the per cent of the population which was Negro might be higher than in some of the southern states.

Table I, page 56, shows the comparison in the public elementary and secondary school enrollment for whites and Negroes from the 1930-31 school year until the year of the Supreme Court decision. Although the white enrollment for this period shows an increase of approximately twelve thousand, the Negro enrollment shows a decrease of approximately nine thousand.

As has already been stated in Chapter I, Kentucky was

²²Don Shoemaker, With All Deliberate Speed (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 60.

TABLE I

WHITE AND NEGRO ENROLLMENT IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY
AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY FROM
1930-1931 THROUGH 1954-55^a

Year	White Schools	Negro Schools
1930-31	540,818	47,536
1932-33	565,135	47,984
1934-35	559,527	50,157
1936-37	580,814	47,287
1938-39	572,689	45,629
1940-41	560,193	43,871
1942-43	534,149	40,958
1944-45	488,278	37,166
1946-47	490,256	36,205
1948-49	509,458	36,619
1950-51	525,759	37,124
1952-53	532,226	36,404
1954-55	553,051	38,517

^aSource: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1934-1957).

one of five states which met the Court decision without any legislative action. Governor Wetherby publicly stated that his state would do whatever was necessary to comply with the decision and the Kentucky Attorney General said that he regarded the state segregation laws as being dead. All of the state's congressmen and senators announced their support of the decision. Interviews with the superintendents included in this study revealed that shortly after the Supreme Court's decisions the State Board of Education called upon each local board in the state to announce publicly their acceptance of the ruling and to begin active planning for desegregating their school system.

In his report on the desegregation problem in Sturgis, Kentucky, Dr. Roscoe Griffin had this to say concerning the position of the state authorities: "There is considerable evidence to conclude that state authorities from the Governor on down are committed to bringing about compliance with the Supreme Court decision. . . ."23

His report also touched upon the feelings of the public school teachers in the state when it stated:

The public school teachers of Kentucky, in general, have already indicated their desire and willingness

²³Roscoe Griffin, "A Tentative Description and Analysis of the School Desegregation Crisis in Sturgis, Kentucky" (Unpublished report, Department of Sociology, Berea College, September 1956), p. 5.

to accept desegregation by such acts as the various moves involved in merging the Kentucky Education Association with the Kentucky Teachers Association, the Negro organization of teachers. Many of these teachers have attended summer classes at the University of Kentucky which has had many Negro teachers registered during the last five years or so.²⁴

In addition to what seems to have been a willingness on the part of the state officials and school people generally in Kentucky to accept the Supreme Court decision, there were several human relations agencies serving the state during the period just prior to and shortly after the Court ruling. These organizations were: American Friends Service Committees, Inc., American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Conference of Jewish Organizations, Kentucky Council on Human Relations, The Lincoln Foundation, Inc., Louisville Urban League, and National Conference of Christians and Jews.²⁵

Each of the above organizations has promoted better relationships among various groups in Kentucky, and although their primary interest may be recognized from many of their titles, all have contributed a great deal in improving human relations in Kentucky. The Kentucky Council on Human Relations is one of these which was set up originally as a part of the

²⁴Ibid., p. 6.

²⁵"Human Relations Agencies Servicing Kentucky, Prepared by Officials of Human Relations Agencies in Kentucky." (Mimeographed)

Southern Regional Council. This Council stemmed from the Supreme Court decision, and its objectives have been to "smooth" the transition from segregated to desegregated schools in states where there appears considerable opposition.

The purpose of this Council in Kentucky has been that of offering encouragement and consultation to school districts which were planning desegregation. Where there has been violence or the threat of violence, the Council has attempted to obtain statements from public officials which would discourage it. The status of Negro teachers who have lost their jobs as a result of desegregation and the finding of employment for them elsewhere has also been part of the Council's work.

During the past several years a great many Negroes in Kentucky have migrated to other states, and they now make up only approximately 7 per cent of the state's population. Thus, there has been a decline in the number of school children in the Negro population. This has been one factor which made the transition in Kentucky less painful than might be expected in some of the border states and states further south. The local school administrator in Kentucky also had firm commitments from the state officials pledging their support for desegregation. There were a number of active human relations agencies which were ready and willing to serve the state during this social crisis. The education association of the state was either generally favorable toward desegregation or took no

active part in opposing it. The State Board called upon the local systems to begin planning for a desegregated school system. The State Department of Education was active in supporting and encouraging desegregation throughout the state (see Appendix D).

It was in this atmosphere and with these conditions prevailing that the systems included in this study began the desegregation process. It was a change which few people throughout the state actively favored and one which was to require unique leadership if goodwill were to remain after the period of transition.

Chapter Summary

The history of white and Negro education in Kentucky was an important factor in affecting the behavior of superintendents during the desegregation process. Many of the beliefs and attitudes existing during the period of public school desegregation and just prior to this period were the result of tradition as revealed by the history of white and Negro education in Kentucky. Although education for whites in Kentucky developed somewhat more slowly than education for whites in many other states, it was only in 1882 that a uniform system of public education for both whites and Negroes was established. Progress continued to be made in Negro education in Kentucky. However, at the time of the Supreme Court

decision in 1954 it was still not adequate when compared to education for the whites.

Another important factor affecting the behavior of superintendents during desegregation was the legal framework within which each superintendent operated. This legal framework was composed of the legal structure of education on both the state and local level in Kentucky. The legal educational agencies on the state level were the state legislature, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the State Board of Education. The most powerful legal agency on the local level was the local board of education. The responsibilities which the local superintendents felt and their behavior during the desegregation process were influenced by the policies of these agencies.

The reaction of the Kentucky state officials to the Supreme Court decision also affected the behavior of the superintendents during public school desegregation. Kentucky was one of five states which met the decision without any legislative action. Evidence gathered during the study indicated that state authorities from the governor on down were committed to a policy of complying with the Supreme Court decision. The teachers across the state were believed to be generally sympathetic with the decision. A number of human relations agencies also existed in Kentucky and they were ready to help with the change from segregated to desegregated schools.

CHAPTER III

IDENTIFYING THE BEHAVIOR OF THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Chapter three is an attempt to identify the action of the superintendents in each of the ten systems studied as this action related to the total picture of public school desegregation in each of these systems. It should be considered, at best, as a brief outline of the conditions existing in each system immediately prior to and during the process of desegregation and the action taken by each superintendent in this period of time. It should also be remembered that these conditions and actions were those pointed out by people in these systems who were interviewed. Therefore, it is important that the conditions existing in each system and the actions taken by the superintendents in each system as described in this chapter are largely those perceived by the people interviewed in these systems.

It was believed that the reader should be presented with a brief analysis of the events leading up to desegregation, the setting within which the superintendent operated, and the actions taken by the superintendent in each system before a description of the behavioral patterns was given. This description of the patterns of behavior of the superintendents which is an interpretation of the data obtained in the study will be given in chapter four.

In the brief outline of events and actions in each system presented in this chapter, an attempt was made to present only those things which were considered most important in the desegregation process and which would contribute most to understanding the behavior of the superintendent. One factor which prevented a more complete description of some of the systems and the actions of the superintendent was the limitations which sometimes restricted the number of people interviewed. Since one of the agreements made with each superintendent prior to the study was that only those people recommended or approved by him would be interviewed in his system, in a few instances it was believed additional interviews would have yielded valuable information. This was especially true in systems where the superintendent preferred that board members not be interviewed.

The school systems included in the study where needed information was not obtained were in the minority. It was believed that enough evidence in each of them was obtained to be of value in the study and to give some evidence as to what was done by each superintendent and possibly why he felt it should have been done.

The reader should not consider this chapter as being an effort to present a comprehensive study of the behavior of any individual superintendent included in the ten systems visited or of the superintendency as it exists in the state of

Kentucky. Such a study dealing with any one superintendent would be a challenge for several doctoral studies. Among other things such studies would have to include such things as community power structure, the operational beliefs of the superintendent and many other factors. It is admitted that all of these things would certainly have added value to the present study. However, it is obvious that time as well as the circumstances under which the present study was carried out prevented any such thorough treatment of any of the systems which were used. With these things in mind it was believed that a review of the outstanding action pertaining to desegregation taken by the superintendents in several systems might be more valuable than a somewhat more comprehensive treatment of any single system. This was thought desirable since the companion study done by Harry S. Blanton was an effort to relate the general behavior of each superintendent in each school system to the actual process of desegregation in these systems.

System "A"

System "A" was a small independent school district within a large county unit. The man who was superintendent was serving his second year and felt that the schools in his district were "better" than the county schools. Enrollment in System "A" was limited to students who resided there. More than 80 per cent of the high school graduates went on to college.

The superintendent pointed out that this fact alone indicated the type of parents who lived in the district.

There were only a few Negro families living within the boundaries of System "A". Prior to desegregation their children were transported to the Negro school operated by the county. This was expensive to System "A" since it paid the county that part of the total amount needed for the operation of the Negro school which equaled the proportion of their students to the total number attending the school. Not only were their Negro students being deprived of equal educational facilities and an adequate instructional program but it was also costing them much more per child to educate the Negro children than the white.

The former superintendent of schools in System "A" initiated the movement toward public school desegregation in his system. According to the present superintendent, the former superintendent was an excellent leader and took the initiative in the whole desegregation process for his district. After the Supreme Court decision of 1954 he talked to members of the faculty in the white school to determine how they felt about desegregation and the possibility of the Negro students in their district coming to the white school. The former superintendent also had computed the amount which might be saved by desegregating his school system. Conversations had been carried on with individual board members concerning desegregation and the problems involved.

During the month of July, 1955, the board formally discussed the question of desegregation as it pertained to their system. The expressed consensus was that System "A" should move toward desegregation at an early date. It was also agreed that a committee to study the problem should be appointed by the chairman of the board and the superintendent.

The superintendent of System "A" was careful to obtain people on the committee who were community leaders and had influence upon people in the community rather than those who were favorable toward desegregation. One of these people chosen by the superintendent reported that she specifically asked whether her feelings about desegregation should have anything to do with her attending the meetings with other members of the committee. She stated that the superintendent was quick to point out that he was not interested in having only those people who favored or opposed desegregation. The committee was composed of four ministers in town, three other representatives from the community, and four members from the school staff.

The committee met with the superintendent and the school board in August, 1955, to discuss the question. The superintendent pointed out the Court decisions concerning desegregation, the financial burden to the small district in maintaining segregation, and the things which could be done for all students of the district with the savings brought about by

desegregating the schools. He then asked that each member of the committee present briefly his own feelings about the question. After a lengthy discussion the meeting ended with a decision by the committee to ask the school board to desegregate the schools.

The press had not been invited to attend the committee meeting, and it was agreed that members present would discuss the decision informally only with community leaders. It was also decided that no mass meetings should be held. The superintendent also asked the committee members to talk informally with Negro leaders to determine their feelings since there were no Negroes on this first committee.

The superintendent and board then decided it should meet with the Negro leaders in the community since they had had no representation on the first committee. It was also felt that if desegregation were to be successful the Negro citizens must be satisfied with any decisions made. One of the Negro leaders had this to say about the meeting with the superintendent and the board:

I hadn't really thought about desegregation in our school system but after being on the committee and talking to the board and the superintendent I felt better about my child going to the white school. The general attitude of the superintendent and the board was such that I was no longer uneasy as to the outcome. I felt that they had already made up their minds to desegregate but wanted the Negro's opinion before going ahead.

This Negro committee was composed of five leaders in the community. It ended with the recommendation that the school board desegregate the schools in System "A".

After this meeting with the Negro committee the board voted to desegregate the public schools of System "A". The vote was unanimous.

The superintendent had already discussed the question of desegregation with the faculty before the board officially desegregated the schools. However, at the pre-school meetings they were officially notified and measures were discussed which would prevent any incidents which might occur as a result of the desegregation order. One of the teachers in the white school said that the main theme of the superintendent during these meeting was simply that the Negro students were to be treated exactly as all other students.

When the newspapers called the superintendent and asked to come to make pictures the first day of school, they were told that any pictures would have to be made off of the school ground. As a result there were no pictures and very little publicity.

All five people interviewed in System "A" including the present superintendent and a former teacher in the system gave the former superintendent credit for initiating and carrying out successfully desegregation in his system. His work with the school board, the teachers in his system, and the leaders

in the community indicated that System "A" made the transition from a segregated school system to a desegregated school system with a minimum of conflict.

The superintendent's action in System "A" was that of direct compliance with the Supreme Court decision. He made a complete study of all aspects involved in the desegregation process and used these data to gain support from the school board and the community. He involved key people of both races to determine what action the board should take. Even though the committee of white citizens had already decided the schools should be desegregated no official action was taken by the school board until the Negro leaders were brought in and agreed with these plans. The general public was not involved in solving the problem since the superintendent seemed to feel that the community leaders were most important. Indications were that at least part of the public knew little about the plan for desegregation until it was an accomplished fact.

System "B"

System "B" was an independent school district whose boundaries corresponded with that of one of the cities within the county. The city making up this system contained a college which dominated the community to some extent. The superintendent stated that it was a progressive town. Many of the leaders in the system had attended the college at some time or

had been associated with it in some capacity. One of the board members interviewed recalled that some twenty-five years ago large tent revival meetings in this system had been attended by mixed crowds. He related that both colored and white preachers at these meetings had preached. The editor of the local paper said that race relations had always been good in this system.

The few Negro elementary students living in System "B" were attending the small elementary school operated by the county which was within walking distance of the town. Both the high school Negro students in this system and the county were being transported to a Negro high school in a nearby town.

Although the superintendent reported that he and the board had been discussing the question of public school desegregation since the Supreme Court decision of 1954, they had taken no positive action at the time he was called upon to attend a meeting of citizens in town. At this meeting were some ten or twelve white and Negro people in the community. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the question of desegregation. The superintendent seemed to believe that the meeting was initiated by one of the local ministers. The press as well as community leaders had been invited.

The superintendent stated that he felt the purpose of the meeting was an effort to speed up desegregation. The members asked the superintendent what he and the board had planned

concerning desegregation and a proposal was actually put forth for complete desegregation of the schools in System "B." However, this proposal was voted down since it was believed that more time might be needed.

The Negro principal of the county elementary school which the Negro elementary students in System "B" attended said that the superintendent was invited to the citizen's meeting as the representative of the school board. This Negro principal was a member of the committee and stated that its main purpose was to discuss ways and means of desegregating the schools in System "B."

Although the superintendent and the board had discussed the question of desegregation before, it was shortly after the citizen's meeting to which the superintendent was invited that the decision was made to desegregate the high school in System "B." The superintendent gave the following possible reasons why he and the board decided to desegregate the upper grades only the first year: (1) both the Negroes and whites might not be ready for complete desegregation the first year; (2) the Negro high school students were being transported to another city; (3) the lack of adequate facilities for complete desegregation until the new building program was completed.

After the decision of the board to desegregate the high school in System "B," it was the unanimous opinion of the superintendent and the board that this decision not be placed

in the minutes of the board. The reason for this as told by the superintendent was to prevent any publicity which might be given to any official public action taken by the board and recorded in the minutes. Rather than give a public statement to the press the superintendent personally called or visited each prospective Negro student's parents and told them of the board's decision to desegregate the high school in System "B." In addition to this action by the superintendent the editor of the local paper told of a meeting in which both he and the superintendent had decided that any publicity would be bad and that as a result there was none.

The principal of the high school in System "B" emphasized that desegregation was a natural occurrence and that it was done quietly simply because outsiders could cause trouble and stress. She pointed out that the faculty was ready for desegregation and that most of them actually favored it.

The action of the superintendent in preparing the facul- for the opening of desegregated classrooms was thus one of alerting them to any situation which might cause trouble. It was not unusual for the superintendent in System "B" to work closely with the faculty, since he carried on most of the functions of the typical high school principal. The principal of the one high school in the system taught full time and would not have had time for many of the activities carried on by the superintendent.

An incident which caused the superintendent to take action occurred the first year of desegregation. One Negro boy's class elected him as one of their representatives to run for king. Had he won this it would have meant that he would have competed with the winners of the other grades for king of the Harvest Festival and thus been assured a place opposite a white girl on the platform the night of the public festival. The superintendent called the Negro boy in and talked frankly with him about the situation. He said that the boy understood and very quietly withdrew. The white girl who had been selected at the same time also withdrew and other representatives were chosen.

Neither the school board, the superintendent, nor the school itself had made any rules concerning the social functions of the school. However, the superintendent seemed keenly aware of any possible source of trouble and quietly prevented any function or activity on the part of the school or any of the students which might have caused any unpleasant experiences due to desegregation. The superintendent also communicated freely with one of the Negro leaders in the community about any problems concerning the Negro students in his school.

The impressions received by interviewing the superintendent of System "B," two board members, the principal of the high school, the editor of the local paper, and a Negro leader were

that the board and the superintendent shared in the leadership of the schools. The community rather than the board or superintendent furnished the initial leadership in the desegregation movement. All of the people interviewed were satisfied with the way desegregation had come about in System "B." All of them felt that the superintendent had done a good job and that desegregation was working smoothly in their system. The actions of the superintendent seemed to have been directed toward cautiously following the leadership exhibited by the community leaders.

System "C"

System "C" was an independent school district within a county unit and included a rather large town. The Negro principal of the elementary school, formerly both elementary and high, classified the town as being a liberal one although a cross had been burned on the Negro school grounds shortly after the beginning of the first year of desegregation. Most of the Negro families in System "C" lived in one section of town where the Negro elementary school was located. However, a few of these families lived across town and were much closer to a white elementary school than the Negro elementary school.

The present superintendent took office just prior to the opening of schools for the second year of desegregation and seemed to know little about the action of the former

superintendent during the first year or previous to the first year of desegregation. He did state that the superintendent and board tended to run the schools in this system without any outside pressure from the community. The indications were that this belief was based upon his experience since assuming office rather than what might have occurred before that time.

Additional interviews in System "C" revealed that the former superintendent took action in the winter of 1953 which eventually led to the desegregation of the high schools in his system. This action was the decision by the superintendent and board to appoint a citizen's group composed of white and Negro community leaders whose purpose was to make a study of the school program and school facilities in order to meet certain minimum requirements of the state foundation program. The superintendent consulted the board and his staff in selecting the white community leaders. The Negro principal, in addition to the board and the superintendent's staff, was used in selecting the Negro leaders for this committee. It was called the Committee for School Improvement.

It was pointed out that it was only a natural occurrence for this committee to become concerned with desegregation after the Supreme Court ruling in the spring of 1954, since it was directly related to their original problem. The superintendent furnished much of the leadership and co-ordinated these meetings until desegregation had been accomplished in

his system. He placed particular importance upon larger meetings where representatives from the committee met with interested citizens and civic groups to discuss what was happening and the decisions which were being reached.

One of the Negro participants in the committee meetings had this to say about the early meetings of this group, "We didn't want very much publicity because we were in the pioneering stages. When explosions did come they came in the committee meetings rather than in public."

During the time this committee was working the superintendent brought in consultants from the University of Kentucky as well as those from the State Department of Education. The work of these consultants was that of furnishing technical advice and information rather than that of directing the group toward a particular decision or decisions. The superintendent seemed to want the community informed as to the actual conditions which existed and the ways in which these conditions might be improved.

The committee finally decided that if the Negro high school students from outside their system who paid tuition were to withdraw there would not be enough students to maintain the Negro high school. Before the board took any official action, however, the Parent Teacher Associations as well as other Civic groups were called in and the decision was discussed. The board then voted to desegregate grades nine, ten,

eleven, and twelve. This was some two years after the appointment of the Committee for School Improvement.

After the decision by the board to desegregate the high school in System "C," the faculty began preparing for desegregation. There were discussions in faculty meetings and the faculty began preparing the students for it. One of the people interviewed stated that the superintendent personally talked to some of the teachers who were particularly against desegregation. Most of these teachers were convinced that it was necessary that desegregation occur and were willing to cooperate. However, one or two simply resigned without giving their reasons and it was believed that this was due to desegregation.

According to the present superintendent who had since desegregated part of the elementary grades, the former superintendent did an excellent job of desegregating the high school in his system and there had been little opposition from the community. According to others interviewed in System "C" the former superintendent was not only eager that the citizens in the community understand the problems which existed in his school system but also was willing for them to assume some of the responsibility in helping solve these problems. He was willing and ready to make whatever effort seemed necessary to obtain resource people to serve as consultants during the committee meetings. Although no general public or mass meetings

were held, an honest effort seems to have been made to see that all of the people in the community knew about the plans of the school board concerning desegregation and the reasons behind these plans. The official action of the board to desegregate the high school was taken some six months before it was to be placed into effect and there was no attempt to keep this information from the public. The superintendent had time to work with his staff and the faculty in planning for desegregation in the high school. These plans included the students who would be affected in both the Negro and white schools. Any teachers who felt that they were not able to accept desegregation were given time to look for other employment.

System "D"

System "D" was an independent school system located in a city with a population of approximately ten thousand. This city contained one white school, grades one through twelve, and one Negro school, grades one through twelve prior to desegregation. The city was called conservative by at least one of the people interviewed. Many of the large property owners were not public school minded people and as a result the school system had been slow in obtaining the proper facilities. The fact that there was a college located in the city appeared to have had little if any effect upon the thinking of the town. It was as though the city had left the college to

itself and the college had had little to do with the city according to the remarks of one person interviewed.

Relations between the races in System "D" appeared to have been good although this seemed to have been the result of the willingness of both the Negroes and whites to accept the status quo. However, for some years the Junior League Negro football team in town had played the white teams without any apparent conflict. These teams were in no way connected with the school but the children involved in these sports contests were of school age. Thus, their parents in System "D" were not opposed to this form of association with members of the opposite race.

An interview with the former principal of the Negro high school revealed that the man who initiated desegregation in this system was the former superintendent. This principal said that his school was seldom visited by this man but on the day following the Supreme Court decision of 1954 the superintendent did visit his school to talk to him concerning this decision. The superintendent gave the Negro principal no indication of what action, if any, he planned to take but asked that he be thinking about the matter. In the meantime the Negro principal attended a course in human relations being offered by one of the colleges. On one occasion the superintendent was invited and attended one of these meetings in which desegregation in the public schools was discussed.

The former superintendent was also preparing his board for the decision to desegregate. One of the arguments used by him as revealed by one of his board members was that it was much better to act immediately rather than wait until pressure was applied. Another argument was that due to the small number of Negro high school students, System "D" would not be able to continue their Negro high school. The idea of desegregating the schools was constantly being placed before the board. The efforts of the superintendent seemed to be directed solely toward the members of the school board individually and as a group rather than toward the community.

The Negro principal stated that some six weeks after the superintendent visited the meeting in the human relations class in which desegregation was discussed, the superintendent again visited his school. He discussed desegregation with him and asked him how he felt that it should begin in System "D." The Negro principal related that he suggested he had two or three high school boys who were interested in shop and that these facilities were not available to the Negro students. After the superintendent convinced the board that this would be one of the better ways to begin desegregation the Negro principal selected some thirteen boys to take shop. These boys were selected on the basis of whether the Negro principal believed they would be able to adjust to a bi-racial class.

After the successful experience of desegregating the shop class, the superintendent discussed the possibility of

desegregating only the twelfth grade with the board and the Negro principal. The Negro principal stated that he suggested that the upper three grades be desegregated rather than only the twelfth, since the Negro school could not compete with other schools in athletics without their seniors. At the request of the superintendent he appeared before the school board and gave the same reason to them.

In addition to the lack of adequate facilities at the Negro high school, there was also the possibility of the number of Negro high school students becoming so small that the Negro high school would have to be discontinued. The athletic program of the Negro school would be handicapped by desegregating only the twelfth grade. Another reason given by the superintendent for desegregating the upper three grades rather than only the twelfth was that some of the Negro high school teachers were about to go on tenure. This would have meant that the superintendent and board would have been faced with the problem of finding employment for these teachers. The board decided to desegregate the upper three grades of the high school in the fall of 1956.

There were no committee meetings to discuss the problems involved in desegregating the schools in System "D." The superintendent had conferred with some community leaders and the board. There was little publicity given the decision by the board to desegregate. An announcement was simply placed

in the paper stating that the high school's upper three grades would be desegregated.

The evidence gathered through the interviews in System "D" revealed that although some community leaders were informed of the plans to desegregate the schools these plans had not been accepted by the community. For example on the night the school board met and voted to desegregate the upper three grades a large group of Negro parents met with the board protesting this decision and asking that they be allowed to continue their own Negro high school. At least part of this sentiment seemed to be the result of the board's refusal to rehire some of the Negro high school teachers. The board did not alter its decision.

One of the people interviewed in System "D" seemed to believe that the former superintendent was determined to desegregate the schools. The board was thought to be dominated to some extent by the former superintendent and therefore action could be taken by him without the proper preparation which would make such action a complete success. This was given as one reason why most of the Negro parents were not completely satisfied with the desegregating of the high school. Before the board's decision to desegregate, the superintendent had made contact with other superintendents in the immediate area to try to obtain an agreement that all would desegregate at the same time. One of the reasons given why the superintendent was eager to desegregate was that he might have been

pleased at the prospect of improving the team at the white high school since he was interested in athletics.

It was pointed out that one of the main arguments given to the community for desegregating the schools was that the State Department of Education would not approve the Negro high school, but this might not necessarily have been the case. Although there were no racial conflicts in the desegregated school and the students appeared to have adjusted well, the Negroes and whites in the community do not seem to have the mutual respect for each other found in some other systems. The Negro parents still seemed divided in their opinions concerning the action taken by the former superintendent and school board. Some of them were presently demanding complete desegregation of all grades and others were feeling that the present board and superintendent were acting in good faith. The demands made by some Negro parents in the system had resulted in threatened economic reprisals against their leaders as well as some talk of reviving the Ku Klux Klan.

System "E"

System "E" was a large county system surrounding an independent system composed of one of the largest cities in the state. Although the county system included part of the old slave-holding farm land of Kentucky, it was said to hold a metropolitan outlook because of its location. The system was

growing rapidly and its problems of teacher personnel and facilities were greater than most county systems in Kentucky.

Unlike many of the small independent school districts the Negro students in System "E" were distributed over the entire county rather than in only a small section. This meant that many of them were being transported to and from school each day as were many of the white students. To do this meant operating an extensive transportation system. Facilities for the Negro schools in System "E" were not as adequate as those for the white schools. This was due in part to the fact that small schools in any system do not usually possess the same school instructional program or school facilities which are found in the larger ones.

Shortly after the Supreme Court decision of 1954 the superintendent talked to his school board about the decision and the many problems which were facing the system. He informed the board that he felt a committee was needed to help solve some of the problems which were facing them. He thought it time to begin laying the groundwork for desegregation and felt that some outstanding people should be on the committee. In February, 1955, the committee was appointed. It was composed of twelve white people and three Negroes.

One person interviewed said, "The superintendent and school board worked hard to obtain the services of people on committee who were responsible, thinking people, rather than

those who had pre-conceived notions." Various leaders throughout the system were asked about people who might be chosen for this committee. Since the problems involved were educational in nature, the superintendent selected an outstanding educational leader to serve as chairman of the committee. The purpose of the committee was to make a complete study of public school desegregation, school buildings, and transportation in System "E."

Since the board and superintendent believed that the groundwork should be laid carefully before the schools were desegregated, no stone was left unturned in the study by the committee. Its work took some nine months to complete and, according to one of its members, the committee attempted to look at the actual conditions in the county and tried to keep emotions out of their deliberations. As the committee progressed in its work different representatives from organized groups throughout the system were invited to attend and discuss the problems. They were to keep their organizations informed of the work of the committee. Individual members of the committee also attended meetings throughout the system to clarify the work and function of the committee.

During the period when the special advisory committee appointed by the board was making its study of the problems of desegregation, buildings, and transportation, the superintendent and board did not interfere with this study in any way.

When the committee was appointed it was made clear that the board would depend upon it to complete the study and would act only upon the recommendations which might come out of it. This did not mean that the superintendent and board were not extremely interested and willing to assist in any way the committee should think necessary. The superintendent followed the work of the committee closely and from time to time asked the chairman to give progress reports to the board. However, the work of the committee was not directed by the office of the superintendent, and the recommendations made to the school board were solely the result of the enormous amount of work and study done by the committee.

The recommendations made to the school board concerning desegregation were accepted unanimously several months before the schools of System "E" were to open on a desegregated basis. During this time the superintendent worked with the principals and faculty members preparing them for this event. It was pointed out by one of the people interviewed in the system that some of the white teachers had stated they would resign rather than teach Negro children. In reply to a question concerning the work of the superintendent in preparing his staff for desegregation, one of the board members in this system said that he met with every faculty and principal group many times to discuss the problems involved before the schools were actually desegregated. One of the Negro principals in the

county system told about being on a panel in one of the meetings of the teachers and of being informed by several of the white teachers how effective she was. Although it may be assumed that some of the white teachers were not in favor of public school desegregation in this system, not one of them resigned as a result of it according to the people interviewed. The superintendent asked that a consultant continue to work with one faculty which was dissatisfied about desegregation.

Little publicity was given to the movement to desegregate the schools in System "E," although news of the progress of the committee was carried. The chairman of the school board advisory committee assured us that there was no effort to suppress the news. He said that the committee did agree not to seek publicity, however. It was also agreed that all publicity on the work of the committee should come through the school board. When the newspapers asked the first Negro student who attended the white summer school whether they might take her picture, the principal of the Negro school in the community advised her not to permit it.

An examination of the board minutes, materials produced during the work of the advisory committee, interviews with the chairman of this advisory committee, the present superintendent, the chairman of the school board, and a Negro principal who was a community leader and also a member of the advisory committee left the impression that the former

superintendent initiated the movement for desegregation in his system. He was also willing that the community share in the responsibility for solving the problems brought about by the Supreme Court decision. He knew how to involve the leadership in his system in this problem solving. He believed that the decision by the board to desegregate the schools in his system should be made soon enough for adequate preparation before the opening of desegregated schools, and the time available was used by him in preparing his school personnel for desegregated classrooms. He felt that the board could not effectively move any faster in his system than the community. He knew how to use resource people in helping the community work out their own solutions to the problems confronting them.

Although minor problems remain in System "E" as a result of the transition to desegregated schools, the change has been without any major incidents, and those people interviewed look upon it as being an example of what any community with the proper leadership and determination can do to solve their own problems in their own way.

System "F"

System "F" was an independent school district in a relatively small city. The number of Negro students in this system was approximately 15 per cent of the total enrollment. This was somewhat higher than in many of the other systems

included in this study. The feelings of the people in System "F" were described as conservative by most of the people interviewed.

During the early stage of desegregation there were only two schools located in System "F." One was the white and the other the Negro school, both containing grades one through twelve. The Negro school was operated by the system, but depended upon students drawn from the county to have a sufficient number to justify its existence.

It seemed that desegregation in System "F" was initiated by the Negroes. The superintendent pointed out that the Negroes were dissatisfied with their buildings. A Negro teacher in the system said, "I think we started it. The Negro parents were dissatisfied and had several meetings and a lawyer from the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People." A Negro citizen who was a member of the citizen's committee told about the efforts of the Negroes in his city to get the city and county to add a gymnasium and two classrooms to their school some two or three years before the Supreme Court decision. He said that this was never done, and he believed the board in his system knew they would have to desegregate once the Supreme Court had rendered its decision.

The superintendent of System "F" stated frankly that, although he realized his system had to face the problems of

desegregation, he was concerned about having Negro teachers on tenure. ✓ He talked to the Negro parents early in 1955 about the possibility of transporting their children to a larger school in another system where facilities were better. The Negro parents were unhappy with this. Shortly afterwards the superintendent and board decided to transfer the operation of the upper four grades of the Negro school in their system to the county. ✓ In March, 1955, letters were sent to the five high school teachers in the Negro school stating that their services would not be needed the following year. ✓ The board minutes listed as the reason for this transfer that the county was furnishing approximately three times as many students as System "F."

The board minutes reveal that in April, 1955, the contract was approved for the operation of the Negro high school by the county. A few days later members of the Parent Teacher Association from the Negro school, with an attorney representing the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, met with the school board and asked for equal facilities and an equal curriculum for the Negro school.

The board minutes of August, 1955, contain a statement of policy which said that it was the intention of the school board that Negro high school students in System "F" attend the Negro high school being operated by the county. It stated that a committee was being appointed by the board to study all

educational facilities and the recommendations of this committee would be accepted, that all laws would be obeyed, and that there was a possibility that a new Negro elementary school would be built.

The superintendent said this committee was composed of some eight white citizens and three Negro citizens. The minutes of the board show that it was appointed in September, 1955. In October, 1955, the minutes note that the report from this committee was received and that the committee recommended grades nine through twelve be desegregated in the fall of 1956. The board followed this recommendation. The remaining grades were to be desegregated as room in the white school became available. The minutes reveal that grades seven and eight were desegregated in the fall of 1957 and the remaining grades in the fall of 1958.

It appears that the superintendent in System "F" not only did not initiate the desegregation movement but also that he acted only after it appeared certain that legal pressure might be brought to bear upon him and the school board. Once this pressure did seem certain the superintendent and board appointed a citizen's committee to study the problem. This committee was appointed after the transfer of the operation of the Negro high school to the county system. It was also after the Negro parents had been approached by the superintendent to transport their children to a school in another system

and after the school board meeting in which Negro parents with an attorney asked for facilities and an instructional program equal to those at the white high school.

The work of the citizen's advisory committee was completed in a period of one month from the time it was officially appointed. The chairman of the school board said that this committee worked together very well and that the board accepted their recommendations. The superintendent stated that he felt the work of the committee prevented a suit from being brought by the Negro parents. The committee members were community leaders who had been chosen by the chairman of the board and the superintendent.

The action of the school board in desegregating the school to become effective some months later gave the superintendent time to work with his faculty to prepare for desegregation. He said he met and discussed coming desegregation with the teachers but that most of them were ready since they had previously been in workshops which were desegregated. Official announcements concerning desegregation were placed in the local paper, but there was little other publicity. The superintendent did not talk to the local editor concerning any agreement to limit publicity but said he had made a trip to another city to ask the newspaper to play down a story of the hiring of a Negro teacher in his system. ✓

Even though pressure was brought by the Negro parents upon the superintendent and the school board, this pressure did not result in any court action. Neither did it seem to interfere with the peaceful desegregation of the schools. The people interviewed indicated that relations between the two races were not changed as a result of the indirect pressure to desegregate the schools.

The action of the superintendent seemed to be that of delaying as long as possible what he believed might be a painful experience for his system. Once he felt this experience could no longer be delayed he served as the co-ordinator during the transition period. He involved the leaders in the community in working out a solution to the problems facing his system. This included communicating effectively with the Negro parents to prevent their bringing suit against him and the school board while at the same time convincing the white parents that desegregation must come.

System "G"

System "G" was a county system which operated a few small Negro elementary schools prior to public school desegregation but sent all of their Negro high school students to a Negro high school located in an independent school system nearby. Negro students made up approximately 10 per cent of the school population in the system and were located throughout

the county.

The present superintendent was serving his second year and had taken office soon after a school building and school consolidation program had been completed. He pointed out that when he assumed office the system was under a court order to completely desegregate its schools. He said he knew little about the action taken by the former superintendent and the board concerning desegregation but that the court order for complete desegregation had posed a hardship upon the schools the first year of his tenure, since temporary classrooms had to be moved in to take care of the additional students at the white schools.

An interview with the pupil personnel director in System "G" revealed little of what actions the former superintendent took during the desegregation process. It was reported that high school desegregation seemed to have been worked out in the school board. A committee had also been appointed, but it reportedly met only once or twice and did not seem to function. An interview with a white principal yielded the same information concerning the citizen's committee. This principal said the committee which had been selected did little but agree to go along with desegregation in the high school.

A Negro teacher interviewed reported that desegregation in System "G" began when a group of the Negro teachers decided to ask the superintendent what he had been thinking about the

Supreme Court decision. His reply was that he had not been thinking anything about it. The teachers then went to the Human Relations Council in Kentucky and an attorney. This teacher said the superintendent and school board did nothing until the teachers asked.

Other interviews in the system brought out the fact that the superintendent and school board had recorded no official plans in the board minutes for complying with the Supreme Court decision. This was given as being one of the major reasons System "G" was ordered to desegregate its schools. It was not clear whether the citizen's committee met as a result of the court order to desegregate the high school or to study the complete desegregation picture. A report of the one citizen's committee meeting stated that it was composed of representatives selected by the various Parent Teacher Associations in the county. The committee contained seventeen whites and one Negro. The report said that after much discussion by the committee, it was recommended that the Negro high school students be permitted to attend the consolidated white county high school and that the elementary program be studied by the board and plans be made to desegregate the elementary schools as soon as the board felt it was feasible. The school board went on record by unanimous vote some three months later to desegregate grades nine through twelve beginning in the fall of 1956.

All of the information needed to give a complete picture of desegregation in System "G" was not obtained. Therefore, it was difficult to determine the exact role of the superintendent during the desegregation process. One of the reasons for the difficulty in obtaining a better picture of desegregation was the lack of statements in the school board minutes. Another contributing factor was the present superintendent's failure to give his permission for members of the school board to be interviewed.

From the four people interviewed in System "G" and an examination of the minutes and the report of the citizen's committee appointed to advise the school board, it appeared that the superintendent was either unwilling or was prevented by the board of education from furnishing the leadership needed during this period of transition. This lack of leadership and positive action by the superintendent seemed to have resulted in a court order to desegregate the schools in the system before adequate physical facilities were available thus causing some hardship upon the students of both races. There was an indication that at least some bitterness also resulted from this court order. In spite of the method of desegregation all those interviewed believed the transition period was less painful than had been expected and at least one person stated that the superintendent and board had deliberately waited for the suit to relieve them of any pressure from the white community leaders.

System "H"

System "H" was a county system with a large independent city district located within its boundaries. This county's problems concerning desegregation were not as great as many of the systems in Kentucky, since fewer than one hundred Negro students in their system attended school. Prior to desegregation these students went to Negro schools operated by another system. It was suggested that the adult level of education of System "H" was higher than in most other counties because of the kind of employment available and the strict enforcement of the attendance law for the past several years.

Although the superintendent and board had discussed the issue of public school desegregation, they appeared to have taken no positive action until some of the Negro parents in the county asked that their children be allowed to attend one of the white high schools. The principal of this high school stated that the school board was informed by the superintendent of these requests and the superintendent had asked him to discuss them with the board. He told the board he favored letting these students enter his school and that he didn't feel there would be any trouble as a result.

The superintendent and board worked with the city school system in that they conferred with each other and both adopted policies before school opened in the fall of 1956 giving Negro students in their systems a choice of continuing to attend

their present school or of transferring to a white school in their district. System "H" was not eager, it appeared, to have their Negro students transfer to the white schools this first year of desegregation. The city was still operating the Negro high school that year and one of the Negro parents interviewed said that she talked to the superintendent in April, 1956, and asked that her child be allowed in the fall to attend the white high school which would be convenient to her residence. According to her the superintendent did not give her an answer but asked her to call him again before school began. She stated that she did not call again but talked to some other parents and together they decided to send their children to the white school anyway. On the day of registration when their children were accepted it came as a surprise to them she said. She also said that she felt sure that most of the Negro parents were unaware of the board's action which came only a few days before school opened. She noted that one Negro parent had taken his son to another city to attend school after conferring with the superintendent shortly before school opened and being told that the Negro children would not be accepted in the white school.

One of the members of the superintendent's staff said that the superintendent's position was that of trying to carry out desegregation as smoothly and quietly as possible. He talked to the white high school faculty where the Negro parents

had asked that their children be allowed to attend and asked them how they felt about desegregation. The high school faculty voted unanimously in favor of permitting the Negro students to attend.

The superintendent stated that there was little publicity during desegregation. He asked the newspapers to try to be favorable to the board rather than disturb the people and felt that they cooperated. He believed that the success of desegregation in his system was due to this lack of publicity as well as the way the leadership in the community felt about the issue. He thought the leaders in the system were firm in their desire to uphold the law concerning desegregation. He thus indicated that there was an understanding among the community leaders regarding the action of the school board before this action was officially taken. Another person interviewed said that it was not felt that a committee was needed in System "H."

All of the people interviewed believed that desegregation in the system had been a success. Other than the few minor incidents involving students the only outward expression which might be attributed to the community was a cross-burning which occurred at the white desegregated high school during the first month. The Negro parents seemed satisfied in System "H." Although all grades were officially desegregated, none of the Negro elementary students had chosen to attend a white elementary school. They seemed to be well satisfied with the

Negro elementary school being operated by another agency and felt that its school facilities and school program were adequate.

The action of the superintendent in System "H" during the desegregation process seemed to be that of cautious compliance to the Supreme Court order. Although he realized that the high schools in his system would have to desegregate when the city system where his Negro high school students were attending was discontinued, he did not initiate the desegregation movement. He seemed to have informed his school board and the community leaders that desegregation was coming and, when action was asked by Negro parents, the faculty and principal of the white high school were consulted before any action was taken. Indications were that the community leaders knew and approved of this action before it was taken. The fact that there were so few Negroes involved may have prevented the superintendent from feeling that it was necessary or desirable to work more closely with them.

System "I"

System "I" was a county system with Negro students making up less than 2 per cent of its total number of students. The few Negro families residing in the county were mostly farmers who were well known by most of the whites and respected throughout the county. Many of them would "swap" work with

their white neighbors during the harvest season with apparently very little discrimination being shown against them. This does not mean that opposition to desegregation of the public schools was not present. The superintendent pointed out that here as in most other places this opposition was centered in the low socio-economic group of people in the system.

Before desegregation occurred in System "I" all of its Negro students were going to the Negro school being operated by an independent city school district within the county. This was due to the fact that there was an insufficient number of Negro students in the county to maintain their own school.

Neither the superintendent nor the Negro parents initiated the movement to desegregate the county schools. It was begun as a result of the city school system's refusal to accept the county's Negro students. However, in 1955, a motion was passed by the school board stating that a committee would be appointed to make a study of the problem of desegregation. This was done shortly after the State Board of Education had asked that each local board comply with the Supreme Court decision. It seemed that this action by the local board was taken to fulfill the request of the state board rather than any real desire on the part of the superintendent, the school board, or the leaders of the county to make a study of the problems involved in desegregating the schools in System "I." Interviews revealed that a committee was never officially

appointed by the school board and thus did not meet to study the problem.

In March, 1956, the superintendent of the county was notified by the city which had been operating the Negro school that the city was desegregating their schools in the fall of 1956 and would not accept county students. The superintendent of System "I" stated that he immediately notified his school board and tried to get them to make plans for desegregating the schools in his system, also. He indicated that the board refused to make any definite plans, but that he kept reminding them at each meeting thereafter that something must be done. In August when the board still had not made a decision the superintendent told them that they must act. In the meantime he had talked to the Negro parents assuring them that their children would be taken care of and to the principals and teachers in his system preparing them for desegregation. This was done because the superintendent believed everyone realized that the board would have to desegregate the county schools.

The official school board minutes in System "I" reveal that on the Friday before schools were to open the following Tuesday the board officially opened all schools in the system to all children residing in the county system. The superintendent also said that in this meeting the school board passed a resolution asking the Negro parents to have their children ready and waiting for the school buses on the opening day of

school. A meeting of all school bus drivers was called immediately and the action was explained to them. They were asked to pick up the Negro children on the opening day of school. Thus, public school desegregation in System "I" was completed only four days after official action had been taken by the school board.

The superintendent had this to say concerning desegregation in his school system:

I had talked to parents since the Supreme Court decision and told them that we would have to desegregate. There was no organized campaign for or against it. Most people realized that after the city desegregated their schools we would have to, also.

A member of the superintendent's staff said that the superintendent was the "kind" of man who discussed these things with community leaders long before they happened. He said that this was done in an informal way, that the superintendent had been in the system for a number of years, and that the people knew him and respected his judgment.

Although the superintendent did not think it was necessary that a committee of citizens be appointed to study the problem of desegregation, it appeared that the community leaders were kept informed of the possible action which was to be taken by the school board. This included the Negro leaders as well as the white. The failure of the school board to take official action earlier than a few days before the opening of school did not appear to be part of the planning done by the

superintendent but rather the reluctance of the board to act. This may have been an effort to let any resistance to desegregation build up against the city which was located within the county and which was desegregating the schools in its independent school district. The superintendent seemed to have been aware that desegregation in his system would present fewer problems than in some others. This was due in part to the very small number of Negro students in his system. Another reason given for desegregating was that his system had little choice except to desegregate when the city independent school system desegregated and refused to accept the Negro students from his system.

All of the people interviewed in System "I" believed that the desegregation had been brought about with a minimum of conflict and that the superintendent acted wisely throughout the desegregation process.

System "J"

System "J" was an independent school district located in one of the larger cities in the state. Interviews revealed that the kind of employment available demanded many people with a high level of education. The fact that most of the leaders in this community were people who were well educated and progressive was also brought out. One of the things mentioned as

evidence of this was the opening of the newly completed municipal swimming pool to everyone without regard to race.

An interview with the principal of a white high school brought out the fact that the year before the Supreme Court decision a Negro boy who was coaching basketball in a nearby Negro school had volunteered to help the coach at the white school with football. Since this Negro had been an excellent college football player, his services were accepted. Although he worked without pay the football players insisted that he attend the football banquet, and he was presented with a nice gift as a token of the team's appreciation. Thus, it seemed that System "J" had gone through a period of becoming "ready" for desegregation.

It was pointed out by the superintendent, however, that he felt they key to desegregation in his system was the year or more of preparation which was made. He said that at no time was there any doubt that his system would desegregate their schools. The only questions which remained to be answered by the board was the "when" and "how." In a board meeting very soon after the Supreme Court ruling a discussion of desegregation took place. At this time the board requested that the superintendent meet with a group of Negro representatives and discuss a plan to desegregate the schools. As recorded in the school board minutes, the board also requested that throughout the year the superintendent hold a series of meetings with

members of the board and representatives of both races to work out an acceptable plan.

Soon after the school board officially asked the superintendent to make a study of desegregation in his system with representatives from the community, the first in a series of three meetings was held. The superintendent, with the help of the high school principals in his system, decided who should be invited. As reported by one of the members of this first committee only the school officials and the "strong" community leaders were invited. In addition to discussing possible ways of desegregating the schools in System "J" one of the functions of this group was that of determining other community leaders who should be invited to attend the next and subsequent meetings dealing with desegregation.

A short time after this first meeting of the citizen's committee with the school officials, and approximately one year before the opening of desegregated schools in System "J," the school board in a statement of policy said that the schools would be desegregated in the fall of 1956. As contained in the school board minutes this statement of policy, among other things, said that the responsibility for action was placed upon the board of education but that the board felt that this was such a problem that all citizens should assume responsibility for its solution. It continued by saying that the superintendent of System "J" had been asked by the board to counsel with

the people of both races through a series of meetings, seeking their advice and opinions through discussions in an atmosphere of calm, intelligent deliberation. This statement of policy was given to the press for publication.

The second meeting of the citizen's committee with the school officials, as related by one of the participants, included the people present at the first meeting and those recommended by them to attend the second. These included such people as civic leaders, lawyers, and Parent Teacher Association supporters. After the discussion of the problems involved in desegregating the schools each member of this committee was asked to invite other people in the community to a third and final meeting. In the meantime the shop teacher at the Negro high school operated by the system resigned, and it appeared certain that a replacement for him could not be found. The superintendent stated that he and the board thought this was an excellent time to try desegregation on a small scale, so the Negro shop class was permitted to continue its shop work at the white school.

The third committee meeting with the school officials was described by one of its members as being almost a mass meeting which was not considered as successful as either of the first two. The main reason given for this lack of success was that there were so many people present, the expression of personal viewpoints by the members was prevented.

The superintendent of System "J" gave the following reasons for these meetings with community leaders and citizens in his system: (1) to get everyone to understand the problems involved in the desegregation of the schools in his system, (2) to find the best way of going about desegregating the schools in his system, and (3) to have the leaders of both races prepared to help with any problem which might come up when the schools did desegregate.

In March, 1956, the school board officially desegregated grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve in System "J" to become effective with the opening of school the following fall. During the period in which the three meetings with the citizen's committee were being held, and until desegregation occurred the following fall, the superintendent was working with the principals and faculties preparing for desegregated classes. People in the system interviewed stated that this preparation consisted of meeting with the principals and the faculties and discussing things which needed to be done before desegregated classes began. There were some assembly programs devoted to the problems which would face the white students, and some of the school clubs were encouraged to build some of their programs around the problems which might arise. Students in the Negro school who planned to attend the white school were informed of the policies of the white school and how they should conduct themselves.

The people interviewed felt that the superintendent had initiated the move to desegregate the schools in System "J," although it was believed that most of the board members were ready to assume their share of leadership also. Even though it appeared that the community leaders in this system were more willing to accept desegregation than those in some of the systems studied, the superintendent seemed anxious that they be given an opportunity to help with the planning for this transition. The Negro as well as the white leaders in the system were given ample opportunity to contribute in this planning. This seemed to have resulted in a mutual feeling of respect between the whites and Negroes as far as their schools were concerned. The superintendent was also quick to seize upon the opportunity of the gradual approach by permitting the Negro shop class to meet at the white high school before the high school was completely desegregated. He seemed to have prepared his staff and faculties as well as the community for desegregation.

Chapter Summary

Chapter three has been an attempt to present a brief description of the conditions existing in each of the ten systems prior to and during the desegregation process. It has also been an attempt to identify and describe the behavior of each of the ten superintendents as he operated within his own

system and within the setting which was peculiar to his system. It was not a comprehensive study of the behavior of each superintendent but rather an effort to place his general action in a setting where the reader might better understand its significance.

The behavior of the superintendents was found to vary from system to system as did the situations within which they operated. A description of this behavior as it existed in each school system permits a closer look at the action of each superintendent. It also points to definite patterns of behavior which seems to emerge from all of the behavior of all the superintendents.

CHAPTER IV

THE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS OF SUPERINTENDENTS

As has been previously pointed out in this study, each school system is different in many ways. The power structure in each community usually has unique features. Attitudes vary as do the economic, social, physical, and political structures of each school district. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the action of a superintendent in one school system with the action of a superintendent in another. Many of the people interviewed in the ten school systems included in this study stated that their feelings concerning the action taken by the superintendent were determined by conditions as they existed in their own school system. They quickly pointed out that what might have been advisable in their system might not have been successful in another.

Another factor which must be remembered when studying the behavior of different superintendents is that they may possess different competencies in the various methods utilized by them in performing the functions of the superintendency. In many instances the superintendent himself may be more aware of these strengths and weaknesses than his associates. If this is true, then it would seem more likely that he would meet any critical issue by employing the method or methods with which he seemed most secure. This probably means that

the superintendent who has worked with and has proven ability in the area of community citizen's committees will do a much more creditable job of solving the problems involved in desegregating his school system by using this method than the superintendent who may be less skilled in this method.

Although it is realized that each school system has its unique features and that the administrative heads of each school system do not all possess the same skills in their operational methods, there seems to be some value in a general classification of the behavior of superintendents during the process of desegregation. In some instances these behavioral patterns reflect more than an attempt on the part of the superintendent to adapt his operational methods to the peculiarities of his own school system. They may reflect the different perceptions of the functions of the superintendent as seen by various superintendents included in the study. At any rate general behavior during desegregation can be evaluated only as it is identified. This general identification of behavioral patterns during desegregation permits some form of evaluation to occur not only in terms of the kinds of actions which more people indicate are best suited to the transition from segregated to desegregated schools in a community but also in terms of the kinds of behavioral skills most needed by the superintendents during this or similar periods.

The behavior of the ten superintendents included in this study fall into the following four categories:

1. Superintendents who furnished initial leadership and made careful preparation for public school desegregation.

2. Superintendents who initiated action without careful planning for desegregation.

3. Superintendents who waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and then provided formal leadership in preparing for desegregation.

4. Superintendents who waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and made little formal preparation for desegregation.

Superintendents Who Furnished Initial Leadership and Made Careful Preparation for Public School Desegregation

Only those superintendents who were responsible for beginning the process of desegregation and who made very careful plans for carrying out the Supreme Court order in their systems were included in this pattern of behavior. They were the superintendents who seemed to anticipate any problems in their school systems and to be ready with a plan of action when they were faced with these problems. They were also people who followed through with their plans until a successful solution was reached. The superintendents placed in this category are the ones in System "A," System "C," System "E," and System "J."

Initial Leadership

In System "A" the superintendent talked to faculty members to determine their feelings about desegregation immediately after the Supreme Court decision. He also asked individual board members their opinions in informal conversations. A careful study of facts which pointed up the savings that might be realized by desegregating the schools was begun. Soon after the decision by the Court in 1955 desegregation was formally discussed with the school board and it was decided that a committee should be appointed to study the question. The people who were selected to serve on this committee were notified by the superintendent and a meeting date was set.

In System "C" the superintendent was already working with a citizen's committee composed of both Negroes and whites at the time of the Court decision. The original purpose of this committee was to make a study of the school system and recommend improvements needed. This study of the school system was directly related to the dual educational system and it was natural that the committee should turn its attention to the question of public school desegregation. However, it was under the leadership of the superintendent that the committee became primarily involved with the problems of desegregation. Thus, the superintendent was not only aware of the need for action to be initiated in his system, but he was also ready to use an existing organization to initiate this action. He

was also informing his school board of these plans so that they would be ready to cooperate in placing into effect whatever recommendations might emerge from the work of this committee.

The superintendent in System "E" began to initiate plans for making a study of the problems which might face his system as a result of desegregation after the Court decision in 1954. These plans included obtaining a consultant who was an educational leader in the state to serve as chairman of a citizen's committee which was to study the question of desegregation and to make recommendations to the board of education. The superintendent discussed the issue of desegregation with his board soon after the Court decision. In this meeting he told the board that he believed a committee was necessary to help solve some of the problems which faced them. It was after this meeting that the committee was appointed and asked to make a complete study of desegregation and its implications for the system.

In System "J" the superintendent had discussed the issue of desegregation with his school board and the principals after the Court decision in 1954 and immediately after the second Court decision in 1955 the superintendent and school board formally discussed the matter again. At this meeting the board asked that the superintendent meet with a group of Negro representatives and discuss possible plans which might be used

to desegregate the schools in the system. It was also decided at this meeting that a series of meetings should be held throughout the year with school board members and representatives of both races present so that an acceptable plan could be worked out. A few weeks later the school board published a statement of policy saying that the Supreme Court decision would be obeyed and asking that the citizens cooperate with the superintendent in working out an acceptable solution to the problems of public school desegregation in the system. The superintendent called a meeting of the school principals in his system, and with their help the people who were to serve on the first citizen's committee meeting were selected.

Preparation

The preparation done by the superintendents in these four systems varied somewhat. In general, however, it centered around the action of the superintendent in preparing his administrative staff, the school faculties, the students, and the public for public school desegregation. Since small school systems sometimes have as few as one person other than the superintendent working in the central office, high school principals are included in the administrative staffs.

Each of the four superintendents worked closely with his administrative staff in preparing for desegregation in the school systems. Some of this work involved clarifying the problems involving desegregation in order that the central

office might agree upon a united plan of action. Much of this work was done between the Court decision of 1954 and the decision of 1955. During this time informal discussions were held with the central office staff as well as with high school principals in each of the systems.

After the second Court decision most of the work done by the superintendents with the administrative staffs was that of attempting to anticipate possible trouble spots as a result of the decision and to plan actively for ways of eliminating them. Sometimes this resulted in the administrative staff being asked to choose members of the community who would serve best on a citizen's committee to plan for desegregation. This was especially true in System "J." In the other three systems also the administrative staff was consulted. Perhaps the most important work of the superintendents and their administrative staffs was that of determining what kinds of preparation should be made with individual school faculties and student bodies prior to opening desegregated schools. Each of the superintendents seemed to be aware of the importance of working closely with his administrative staff in these two areas.

The work of preparing the teachers for desegregated schools in each of the four systems was directed by the superintendents. This direction was in the form of working cooperatively with the administrative staff and officials of teachers' organizations in deciding the kind of preparation

which might be most effective in each system. In some systems this meant panel discussions dealing with desegregation, consultants from institutions of higher learning, and many meetings of the superintendent with individual faculty groups. In other systems it meant only a minimum of personal visits by the superintendent and faculty discussions led by individual principals.

System "J" was a system where most of the faculty members seemed ready to accept desegregation. Since the high school was the only school to experience desegregation the first year, most of the work done with the faculty prior to that time was left to the principal. The meetings which were held centered around the preparation needed before opening as a desegregated school.

The work of the superintendent in System "A" began before the Court decision of 1954. This was a small school system and the superintendent attended all faculty meetings. By the time of the Court decision all of the teachers in this system were aware of the excessive cost of educating the few Negro children located in their school district. One of the discussions had also centered around the unfairness of their having to be transported to a school some distance away where facilities were inadequate and where the instructional program was poor. One of the teachers interviewed in System "A" stated that all of the faculty members were quite willing for

the schools to be desegregated. Almost all of the time devoted to preparing for desegregation in this system was spent in a cooperative effort on the part of the superintendent and faculty to make desegregation as pleasant as possible for students of both races.

System "C" is the only one of the four where it appeared that there may have been one or more teachers who resigned as a result of desegregation. This was not verified since only one of the people interviewed stated that he had heard this was true. He was a Negro teacher in the system. The former superintendent was not interviewed since he had moved to another state. Although he did not formally discuss desegregation with his faculty prior to the decision of the school board to desegregate, some of them had been involved in a discussion of the issue in meetings including Parent Teacher Association representatives and the school board. After the decision by the board to desegregate the schools, the superintendent formally discussed this decision with his faculty where the Negro students would attend. Interviews also revealed that he talked with several of them individually concerning their views on the matter. This was some six months prior to the opening of desegregated schools, and any teacher who desired other employment had ample time to obtain it. If any of the teachers actually resigned as a result of desegregation, there was no indication that the relationships between

the superintendent and these teachers were anything except good.

Perhaps the most thorough job done by any of the four superintendents was in System "E." Not only were plans worked out cooperatively with the administrative staff and the education organization in the system but the superintendent also spent many hours working with faculty members in individual schools in his system. A consultant from the University of Kentucky was asked to continue working with one faculty after its school had been desegregated. Programs of the education organizations in the system were centered around desegregation. In some instances Negro representatives were asked to present their views. An indication of the effectiveness of the superintendent's action in working with the teachers in his system is a statement made by one of the Negro principals. She said, "Some of the white teachers had said they would resign rather than teach Negro children but as far as I know not one resigned as a result of desegregation."

The work of the four superintendents included in this category of behavior was limited to working with their administrative staffs in deciding what, if any, preparation should be made by the students for school desegregation. In System "A" there was no preparation, since the school board's decision to desegregate came while school was closed during the summer. The school faculty worked informally with the students in

System "C" getting ready for desegregation after the decision was made by the school board in February to desegregate. The faculty at the Negro school was also included in this process of preparing their students for the changes of the following year. In System "J" the principal of the white high school visited the Negro high school and talked to the Negro students the year before desegregation. Information concerning the operation of the white school was given and prospective Negro students were told that the white high school was preparing to receive them. During the time between the decision to desegregate and the closing of the current school, student groups in the white high school included the topic of desegregation among those to be discussed.

Although little formal preparation was planned for students in any of these four systems, it may be argued that students in every classroom in any system are being conditioned for or against any social change. This is particularly true of any issue which is currently being considered by a large segment of the population. It may also be argued that the most effective plan to prepare children for desegregation is the plan which prepares their parents for this change.

The superintendents in Systems "A," "C," "E," and "J" all worked with the community in some way to prepare the general public for school desegregation. At least some of the community leaders in each of these systems were asked to share

the responsibility for formulating acceptable plans to desegregate the schools. This responsibility also included some means of informing others in the community and enlisting their support. Each of the superintendents included members of both races in some capacity during this period. In each system there were excellent lines of communication between leaders of both races. At the time of the interviews these systems were experiencing their second or third year of desegregation and these lines of communication still seemed to be open. The Negroes who were interviewed stated that they believed the school officials in their systems had acted in good faith. The white people interviewed were generous in their comments concerning the cooperation which had been given by the Negro leaders during the whole process of desegregation.

The techniques used by the different superintendents to inform the general public varied somewhat as did their ideas of just how many people or the kinds of people in the community who should be informed. The amount of responsibility which the school board and the superintendent were willing to delegate to community leaders was not the same in each system.

System "A" was the only one of the four systems where an attempt was made to deliberately avoid all publicity dealing with the decision to desegregate the schools. It was a very small independent school district, and it was pointed out by one of the people interviewed that this fear of publicity was

at least partly due to the fact that the superintendent believed there might be outside interference. Since this system was one of the early ones in the state to desegregate, this seems logical. At any rate only key community leaders were placed on the citizen's committee which met to discuss the issue of desegregation. The superintendent assumed the leadership of this committee meeting. One of the decisions to come out of this first and only meeting held by the white group after they decided to ask the board to desegregate the schools was that there would be no publicity given to this decision. It was agreed that they would discuss it only with other community leaders. The same agreement came out of the single meeting held with the citizen's group composed of the Negro community leaders.

As a result of the lack of publicity not all of the people in the community knew about the decision to desegregate the schools until it was already accomplished. This was especially true of those people who might have caused trouble. A member of the white citizen's committee which was composed of key people appointed by the superintendent and chairman of the board gave this information.

Even though the superintendent was against publicity for the masses in System "A," he made no effort to obtain people on the citizen's committee who agreed with his views on desegregation. He seemed sincere in his desire to find a plan

which would be approved by the community leaders and confident that any such plan approved by them would be successful. Once the community leaders asked the school board to desegregate the schools, they acted immediately. The opening of schools was only a few weeks after the board action. Newspapermen were prevented from taking pictures at school, and there was little publicity even after schools had begun.

It was reported that the superintendent knew most of the leaders in his school district and that he had also held informal discussions with them prior to the board's action and between their action and the opening of schools. This meant that the plans to desegregate the schools were generally known and understood throughout the community.

The superintendent in System "E" made excellent use of a citizen's committee which included resource people from the University of Kentucky. He also spent a great deal of time personally attending various meetings throughout his system informing the people of the problems faced during the process of desegregation. Although publicity in the newspapers was not avoided, an effort was made to publicize only information which pointed out the progress being made toward desegregating the schools. The citizen's committee decided that all publicity concerning its work should come through the school board rather than the committee or its individual members.

As was stated in chapter three the purpose of the citizen's committee in System "E" was to carefully lay the

groundwork for desegregation. Laying the groundwork, in the opinion of the superintendent, included more than the work of a few citizens in sharing the responsibility of finding the best solution to the problems of desegregation. It meant that the people in the system must be informed and must understand the problems facing them and the methods being used in an attempt to solve them. For this reason various members of the citizen's committee met with local organizations from time to time to explain the work of the committee and the progress which was being made. During these meetings there was time set aside for a discussion of the work of the committee and the issue of desegregation. These discussions contributed much in the way of a better understanding of the work of the committee and the problems involving desegregation.

In addition to individual members of the citizen's committee meeting with local organizations to discuss desegregation, the committee invited representatives from these groups to meet with it on different occasions to help work out difficult problems and to report back to their groups the progress which was being made. All of this was being done so that everyone would be ready before the school board adopted the plans of the committee.

During the time the citizen's committee was at work and before the school board took any official action to desegregate the schools, the superintendent was also meeting with Parent

Teacher Association groups and others building up support for desegregation in his system. These were not public meetings as such being held on desegregation but rather meetings at which different groups with the superintendent met to discuss the problem. At these meetings the people were reminded of their responsibilities in the matter and they were free to discuss their fears or anxieties. The superintendent brought out different facts about the school system and their relationship to the problem of desegregation in these discussions.

It is interesting to observe that in System "E," unlike the other three systems in this group, the superintendent and school board delegated the responsibility of designing a plan for desegregating the schools to a citizen's committee without the superintendent or members of the board being a part of it or assuming any responsibility toward its direction. This seems to indicate that the superintendent and school board had no preconceived notions as to the best way desegregation in their system should occur. It also seems to indicate the amount of confidence which they placed in the chairman and individual members of the committee selected by them to perform this task. This unique fact may have had certain implications concerning the willingness of the public to cooperate in whatever decisions resulted from the committee's work.

Even though the work of informing and preparing the public in System "E" involved the general dissemination of

information related to the work being done on desegregation, this was done by involving leaders in the community through existing organizations. This information passed from the leaders and officials of these organizations to their members and from the members to the general public. To supplement this, official announcements were released from the school board and printed in the newspapers. There was no attempt on the part of the superintendent or the board to hold mass public meetings to discuss desegregation. Although both the white and Negro citizens in System "E" seemed to have been well informed and prepared to accept public school desegregation, this preparation was done through existing organizations.

System "C" began work on desegregation as a "community thing" according to a Negro principal in the system. A committee composed of both Negroes and whites was already working on school problems in the system at the time of the Supreme Court decision. This committee moved immediately into the problem of desegregation. Although consultants were invited from the University of Kentucky and the State Department of Education to help the committee find solutions to their problems, the superintendent served as the leader of the committee.

There was little publicity during the time this committee was studying the issue. However, System "C" was a small independent school district and it seemed likely that most of the people learned informally of the work which was being done.

The superintendent also discussed desegregation with many people in the system during the two years prior to the decision to desegregate schools. One of the people interviewed said that the reason a committee was originally appointed by the superintendent to study school problems was because he believed the community should be informed as to the conditions which actually existed in the system and that the school board should consider the wishes of the people before acting.

After the committee had completed its study of desegregation in System "C" the school board did not take any action upon the recommendations which came from it until a series of meetings had been held to inform the public. Particular emphasis was placed upon there being a complete understanding among the Negroes of the system concerning the proposed plan for desegregating the schools. Negro ministers, the Negro Parent Teacher Association, and other Negro organizations were called upon to study these recommendations and decide whether they were in agreement with them before they were adopted by the school board.

White civic groups and organizations were also given an opportunity to study the plan and become familiar with it before the board acted. Thus the superintendent in System "C" worked through the existing structure in his community to inform and prepare the public for public school desegregation. As in System "E" there was an official announcement of the

plans decided upon by the committee but little publicity otherwise. No mass or general public meetings were held to discuss the issue of desegregation. The school board also acted some months before desegregated schools were to open thereby giving plenty of time for this action to become known throughout the system.

Interviews in System "J" revealed that the public was, perhaps, more "ready" for school desegregation in this system than the other three. However, the superintendent and school board spent approximately one year in preparing for it. Much of this preparation was directed toward the general public. One of the first steps taken by the superintendent and school board was a meeting between Negro representatives in the community and the superintendent. At this meeting these representatives were assured that the school board intended to comply with the Court decision and that a citizen's committee was being appointed to make a study of the problem.

The first meeting of this committee was held soon after the decision of 1955. The people present included only the key leaders in the community and school officials. This meeting was described by some of the participants as a good meeting and the decision to desegregate the high school classes the following year seems to have come out of it. It was soon after this first citizen's committee meeting that the school board published a statement of policy which said it was the

board's intention of beginning desegregation in the fall of 1956. The public statement also said that the superintendent had been asked to counsel with the people of both races through a series of meetings. It said the purpose of these meetings was to seek the people's advice and opinions concerning desegregation.

The second and third meetings of the citizen's committee were much larger than the first, and their purpose seemed to be that of gaining support for desegregation in the system as well as informing the public of the problems with which they were faced. The second meeting was composed of members present at the first meeting and those invited by them to attend the second. Some of those invited to attend this second meeting were supporters of the Parent-Teacher Association, lawyers, ministers, and others who could be counted upon to support the educational program in the system.

The third and final meeting was described as "almost a mass meeting" by one of the people present. It was designed to further inform and prepare the public for school desegregation. During the period in which these three meetings were taking place the superintendent and board decided to test the reaction of the public to limited desegregation. The Negro shop teacher had resigned and it appeared that a replacement could not be obtained. The Negro shop class was permitted to come to the white high school to continue their course. After

this preparation the board officially desegregated grades nine through twelve in March, 1956, to become effective in the fall of 1956.

Superintendents Who Initiated Action Without Careful Planning for Desegregation

This category of behavior treats the superintendents who initiated the movement to desegregate the schools in their systems but did not follow through after this decision. Some work may or may not have been done to prepare the system for desegregation. However, too little had been done for desegregation to be as successful as it might have been. The result of this inadequate preparation might be a lack of communication between whites and Negroes in the system or between Negro or white groups within the system. It might also be reflected in the lack of confidence which the Negroes have in the whites. The feeling on the part of both Negroes and whites that the other group was trying to go too slow or too fast in desegregating the schools might also be the result of an insufficient amount of preparation in a system. System "D" is the only one of the ten in which this pattern of behavior characterized the superintendent.

Initial Action

The superintendent in System "D" initiated action to desegregate the schools. A school board member in this system

said, "The superintendent kept putting the idea before the board to integrate." Two of the reasons the superintendent gave the board for wanting them to take action were: (1) it was much better to act upon the desegregation issue before pressure was applied, and (2) the number of high school students in the Negro high school might drop below the number required by the State Department of Education to maintain a senior high school.

Although the superintendent did talk with the principal of the Negro high school and asked him to appear before the school board to present his reasons for wanting the upper three grades desegregated rather than only the twelfth, all of his activities seemed to be directed toward getting action from the board. There was little evidence gained from interviews to indicate that he was active in initiating a study of the problem by members of either the white or Negro group in the community.

The impression was gained from the interviews in the system that the superintendent was personally in favor of public school desegregation and that the Supreme Court decision was already the law of the land. Therefore, the responsibility of the superintendent was in a large measure simply that of convincing the school board that they should comply with this decision as soon as possible in whatever way that might appear reasonable. Since the school board was the policy making body

of the local school district, he felt that whatever decision they might make would be accepted by the citizens of the community.

Lack of Planning

The superintendent in System "D" did little to prepare for desegregation in his community. This seemed especially true as far as the general public was concerned. Conditions at the white school were such that it was operating a double shift in order to accommodate all of the white students already attending prior to desegregation. Interviews brought out the fact that many parents were unhappy with this arrangement and, perhaps, did not understand why something was not done immediately to correct it. In spite of these crowded conditions which already existed at the white school, the number of students was increased when the school board desegregated the upper three grades of the high school.

There seemed to be little understanding or agreement of the action of the school board in desegregating the upper three grades among the Negro leaders in the community. This action meant that the Negro school would contain only grades one through nine and that some of the teachers in the Negro school would not be rehired the following year. Although the Negro principal and the superintendent had discussed this plan of desegregation for the system and apparently agreed upon it, many of the Negro parents did not favor it. This may have been

due to the fact that they were not informed or consulted before the decision was made. At any rate when news that the board was going to meet to consider this action became known, a large number of these Negro parents attended the board meeting and asked that the Negro high school be continued. These parents preferred their own high school rather than desegregation as had been planned by the superintendent and school board.

The superintendent and board decided to desegregate the schools as planned over the protests of this group of Negro parents. After this decision to desegregate by the board there were no further meetings with these Negro citizens to explain or clarify the reasons for this action. At least no attempt to do this was brought out in any of the interviews with people in the system. It is assumed then that many of the Negro parents continued to be unhappy with the school board's method of desegregating the schools.

There were no white citizen's committees or groups which were called upon to help plan for desegregation in System "D." Interviews did not reveal anything to indicate that the superintendent called upon any of the existing organizations within his system to study the issue before the school board acted. Neither were these organizations used to inform the public of the board's decision or to gain support for their decision. The only publicity the board gave its decision

was an announcement in the newspaper stating that the high school would be desegregated the following year. This does not imply that most of the people in System "D" did not know about the plans of the board to desegregate. It does imply that, perhaps more people in the system would have been more sympathetic toward the board's plans had they been involved to some extent in formulating them. This may have been especially true of the leaders in the community or the people who usually gave their support to education.

The fact that many of the Negro parents were not satisfied with desegregation and were somewhat divided among themselves became known again some two years after initial desegregation in the system. At this time officers were elected at the Negro school for the Parent-Teacher Association. Immediately after this election the new officers brought up the issue of desegregation and a resolution was passed demanding that the present superintendent and school board completely desegregate the schools at once. The resolution mentioned the fact that the board had originally desegregated the high schools without the Negro's approval and that now they preferred immediate and complete desegregation.

The Negro principal of the school said that he was unaware of what was about to happen at the meeting until it was too late to stop it. The present superintendent and school board prepared a new statement of policy dealing with

desegregation and by working with Negro leaders appeared to have satisfied most of them that they were working in good faith. However, many of the white leaders in the community had become disturbed by the new demands made by the Negroes and had threatened economic reprisals against some of their leaders. It appeared that the superintendent had consulted and worked with only the Negro status leaders and as a result the public was not properly prepared for desegregation.

It should be pointed out that even though interviews indicated that insufficient planning for desegregation may have occurred in System "D," there was nothing revealed in these interviews which left the impression that the superintendent in this system was any less sincere or concerned about the success of desegregation in his system than superintendents in other systems visited. It should also be pointed out that the superintendent was eager that desegregation be tried on a small scale so that the people in his system might be more "ready" for further desegregation. This was given as his reason for desegregating the shop class the year before desegregating other high school classes. The faculty and students had accepted desegregation very well and the superintendent seemed to have done a better job of preparing them for this social change than he had the public.

Superintendents Who Waited for the Community or Other
Outside Agencies to Initiate Action and Who Then
Provided Formal Leadership in Preparing
for Desegregation

The superintendents placed in this category are those in systems "B," "F," and "H." These are the ones who for one reason or another did not furnish initial leadership for desegregation in their systems. This lack of initial action on the part of the superintendents may have been the result of several factors. One reason may have been the belief of these superintendents that people in their systems should have some time to consider the full significance of the Supreme Court decision before being faced with the threat of immediate action by the school officials. Another reason may have been the fear on the part of some superintendents of becoming involved in a critical issue immediately when it was known that other systems were pushing ahead and their mistakes might be observed before taking action. The problem may have appeared so great that some superintendents felt unsure of their ability to find a satisfactory solution to it. There is also the possibility that some of them may not have personally favored the decision or that they felt initiating action pertaining to public school desegregation might jeopardize their position. Other reasons may have caused this lack of initial action also.

Once action had been initiated in these three systems,

the superintendents took the initiative in preparing their systems for desegregation. Each of them was interested in promoting the kind of activities which he believed was most desirable in his system for making desegregation acceptable. This included working with citizen's committees, local organizations, faculty groups, and students in preparing for desegregation.

Agencies Which Initiated Action

In System "B" leaders in the community initiated action which began the movement to desegregate the schools. This leadership took the form of a citizen's meeting which was called by people in the community who were interested in the issue of desegregation. The superintendent stated that although he had discussed desegregation with his school board, they had made no plans for immediate action concerning it when he was invited to attend this citizen's meeting. A Negro who attended the meeting reported that it was composed of a group of citizens in the community who were interested in desegregation. The superintendent said that he believed the purpose of the meeting was to speed up action by the school board to desegregate the schools.

A representative from the local newspaper was present at this meeting but absolutely no publicity was given to it. During the discussion which took place at the meeting a proposal was set forth for desegregating the school system. The

proposal was voted down by a majority of those present as being too fast and those interviewed who attended the meeting indicated that no recommendation on how the board should begin desegregation was actually made. However, it was only a short time after this initial action of citizens in the community that the superintendent and school board announced their plans for desegregating the high school the following year.

The Negro parents initiated the action to desegregate the schools in System "F." When interviewed, a Negro teacher in the system had this to say, "The parents of the Negro children were dissatisfied. They had several meetings and a lawyer from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People." A Negro leader in the community said, "They gave us the run-around at first."

The superintendent of System "F," while discussing the way desegregation had come about in his system, reported that conditions in the Negro school were poor and that the Negro parents were not satisfied with them. He and the board realized that something would have to be done. However, they were concerned about their system having Negro teachers on tenure. They felt that action on desegregation might be avoided for some time by providing transportation to another school district where school facilities were better for their Negro students. With this in mind the superintendent said he talked to the parents of these students. They were unhappy with

such an arrangement, and the board did not follow through with it.

✓ The school board in System "F" then transferred the operation of the Negro high school to another school district whose students were also attending the school. The board also notified the Negro teachers in the high school that its operation had been transferred and that their services would not be needed the following year. These same teachers were employed by the other system, however, and continued to teach in the same school. This meant that although the same teachers were teaching in the same school as the year before and the same students attending classes, the teachers were no longer on tenure since another system was operating the school.

It was during this period that a suit was filed against the school board in a nearby system asking that the schools in that system be desegregated. The Negro parents in System "F" were having their meetings with a lawyer during this time. Therefore, the superintendent and school board in System "F" decided that action should be taken to desegregate the schools. A committee composed of both Negro and white leaders were asked to study desegregation and to make recommendations for beginning it in their system.

It appeared from the statements of the people interviewed in System "H" that the Negro parents initiated action to desegregate the schools. The principal of the former high

school which had been the first to desegregate in the system reported that the superintendent had some requests to enter the white school from Negro parents before any action had been taken by the board. This principal said the superintendent had taken these requests to the school board.

As reported in the previous chapter, one of the Negro parents who asked the superintendent to desegregate the schools said she had made this request in April, 1956. She reported that he was unable to give her a definite answer. In July when she called the superintendent was still unsure of the action the board might take and asked that she call again just before school was scheduled to open in September.

It seemed that the superintendent and school board were not eager to initiate action to desegregate the schools in System "H." Although desegregation had been discussed on several occasions, no official action was taken until there had been some requests from Negro parents for their children to attend a white school in the system. This action was taken only a short time before schools were to open and little publicity was given it. In fact a Negro parent who sent her child to the white school to register on the first day of school said that none of the Negro parents sending their children on this first day were certain that they would be admitted.

Preparation for Desegregation

Although each of the three superintendents made some formal preparation, it was not always the careful, thorough preparation that was made by the four superintendents listed in the first pattern of behavior. The formal preparation of these three superintendents involved the administrative staffs, faculties, students, and the public in the systems to some degree. However, not all of the superintendents made what might be considered formal preparation for each of these.

The superintendents in Systems "B," "F," and "H" all worked with their administrative staffs in preparing for desegregation. System "B" was a small system and an interview with the only high school principal in the system revealed that she had been personally in favor of desegregation. Therefore, the work of the superintendent in preparing his administrative staff for desegregation seems to have been mainly that of discussing the best possible ways of accomplishing the policy of the school board without major incidents occurring.

In System "F" the superintendent had discussed desegregation with his administrative staff many times prior to action of the board asking that a citizen's committee be appointed to recommend the best possible way for desegregation to occur in their system. During the period of time this committee was meeting and prior to the opening of desegregated schools, the superintendent held conferences with his

administrative staff in which many aspects of desegregation were discussed and plans were made for preparing both faculty and students for desegregation.

The superintendent of System "H" worked with his supervisor and pupil personnel director as well as his principals in preparing for desegregation. The principals were sometimes called to the board meetings to discuss the matter and give their views. The principal of the high school which was first to desegregate told of attending a board meeting in which the superintendent had invited him to present his views. Ways and means to prevent any incidents at the school when desegregation was begun were also discussed by the central office personnel and this principal.

Of the three superintendents placed in this pattern of behavior, the superintendent in System "H" seemed to have done less than the other two in preparing his faculty for desegregation. One of the reasons may have been the fact that there was only a small number of Negro students in the system. He had also worked with the principal of the school, and it is assumed that both he and the principal felt the faculty was prepared for desegregation without formal meetings of the faculty and superintendent to deal with the issue. There was also less time to prepare the faculty for desegregation after the board acted than there was in the other two systems.

In System "B" the superintendent had been holding regular faculty meetings for some time to discuss school problems. When the issue of desegregation became prominent in his system, much of the time in these meetings was devoted to it. Since most of his faculty were in favor of desegregation, these discussions centered around ways of preventing incidents between Negro and white students when desegregation was realized.

The teachers in System "F" had attended desegregated workshops and were, generally, ready for public school desegregation according to the superintendent. He said that the work of the citizen's committee and their recommendations in October, 1955, that the upper four grades of the high school be desegregated in the fall of 1956 gave him plenty of time to work with his faculty. In a formal meeting with them the issue of desegregation was discussed and most of them seemed to accept it. The principal and faculty also held other meetings in which plans were formulated for the first days of school. Informal discussions with individual faculty members were also carried on by the superintendent.

As far as could be determined by the interviews in these three systems, the superintendents played very little, if any, part in the preparation of students for desegregation. The work which was done in this area was that of planning with the administrative staff or faculty. The superintendent in System "B" took no direct action with students in his system

until after mixed classes had begun in his school. This action was taken to prevent any situations which might lead to interracial incidents. The superintendents in Systems "F" and "H" took no direct action to prepare students for desegregation. Work which was done with students in these three systems was planned and carried out by the principals and school faculties. However, the superintendents were aware of anything being done to prepare students for desegregation.

Each of the three superintendents was involved in some way in preparing the general public for public school desegregation. The superintendent in System "B" did little more than carry on informal conversations with leaders in the community. In his work with Negro parents in the community this was especially true. He personally contacted those parents whose children were eligible to attend the white school and explained the action of the board. These parents were told that they might enter their children the first day of the coming school year. The lack of action on the part of the superintendent in preparing the public for desegregation in his system was explained in part by the action of the citizen's committee. This committee had initiated action to desegregate the schools in System "B." Therefore, it was known by the superintendent that several leaders in the community were actively working for desegregation. The effort to avoid any incidents from citizens opposed to desegregation was given by the superintendent as

the major reason for keeping publicity out of the newspapers. Both the superintendent and school board as well as interested citizens in the community seemed to have done a great deal to inform the public of the board's action. The reason given for the success in informing the people in the system was its small size.

Rather than avoid any publicity concerning desegregation, the superintendent in System "F" was responsible for a citizen's committee being appointed to make a study of the best way to desegregate the schools. Although this action was taken only after pressure had been brought by Negro parents, the superintendent stated that he believed the work of this committee was very successful and may even have prevented a suit from being filed against the board by Negro parents. Community leaders of both races made up the committee, and announcements of its work were publicized in the local papers. The superintendent and members of the board also informed citizens in the system with whom they came in contact of the board's action and the reasons for this action. All of the people in System "F" seemed to have been aware of the plans of the school board to desegregate the schools. However, interviews did not reveal any series of meetings with local organizations in which the superintendent actively participated in preparing the members for desegregation or discussing the problems involved in desegregating the schools.

The superintendent of System "H" took little formal action in preparing the public in his system for desegregation. No public announcements were placed in the papers before schools opened stating that they would open on a desegregated basis. A Negro parent in the system insisted that she and others were not consulted or informed of the board's decision to desegregate the schools. She said this was true even though she had contacted the superintendent on two occasions asking that her child be permitted to attend the white school. However, the independent school system within the county was desegregating their schools and most of the public was aware of their intentions. Also, a community council in the city independent school system contained parents of the county school system also. This council had discussed the fact that they had no Negro representatives on it shortly after the Supreme Court decision and had voted to include Negroes in its membership and recommended that the schools accept desegregation. The superintendent and board kept the white leaders informed of the plans to desegregate the schools in System "H" although this does not seem to have been true of the Negro leaders.

Superintendents Who Waited for the Community or Other
Agencies to Initiate Action and Who Made Little
Formal Preparation for Desegregation

The superintendents placed in this pattern of behavior are those in Systems "G" and "I." These two systems are the ones where action was initiated to desegregate the schools from something or someone other than the superintendent and school board. The superintendents made little formal preparation in these two school systems for public school desegregation after this action had been initiated by agencies other than school officials. At least they made less formal preparation than was reported by the other superintendents included in the study. Interviews in these and the other systems seemed to agree with this conclusion.

Agencies Which Initiated Action

Initial action pertaining to public school desegregation in System "G" was taken when a group of Negro teachers in the system went to the superintendent soon after the Supreme Court decision and asked him what his feelings were about the decision. His reply, as reported by one of these teachers, was that he had not been considering the decision or thinking about it. The teachers then went to one of the human relations agencies in the state to seek advice and obtained an attorney.

The limited number of interviews in System "G" failed to clarify the exact sequence of events. However, a suit was

brought against the school board demanding complete desegregation of the schools in the system. It was not determined whether this suit was the result of the board's failure to set forth any plan of desegregation or dissatisfaction on the part of the Negroes in the community with a plan which was proposed. The impression was given in at least one interview that it was due to the school board's failure to produce a plan. The board minutes revealed no plan prior to the date of the Court's order for the system to completely desegregate its schools. At any rate it seemed clear that the Negroes in the system initiated action to desegregate the schools in System "G."

In System "I" the action of the school board in a nearby system initiated the movement to desegregate the schools. The board in this nearby system refused to accept Negro students from other systems any longer. Since System "I" did not have a Negro school of its own to send its students, it was forced to make other arrangements. This fact plus the expected reluctance on the part of the Negro parents to permit their children to be transported some distance to another system which might accept them had to be considered. Although the superintendent did not have this reluctance expressed to him by these parents and it could not be considered as direct pressure, he was aware of it and it probably affected the action of the school board.

System "I" was placed in this group even though a motion had been passed by the school board in 1955 stating that a

committee would be appointed to make a study of the problem of desegregation. This committee was not appointed and, therefore, this motion of the board was not considered as the initiating action which was responsible for public school desegregation in the system.

Lack of Formal Preparation

The superintendents in both System "G" and "I" did very little in the way of formal preparation for school desegregation in their systems. This does not mean that the superintendents of these two systems did not make some kind of preparation for desegregation or that they failed to do anything which they believed to be in the best interest of their school system. In at least one of these systems desegregation seemed to have occurred with a minimum of conflict and to have been as successful as in most of the systems included in the study.

Both of the superintendents worked with their administrative staffs during the period of transition. This work seemed to have been in informal discussions of the issue rather than meetings called for the purpose of discussing only desegregation. The pupil personnel director in System "G" was called upon to survey public opinion to help determine what action suited the Negro parents in the system.

Neither the superintendent in System "G" or System "I" did any work with formal faculty groups as such. It is assumed that they talked with individual teachers about desegregation.

The principals worked with the faculties in the two systems and in one system this work seemed to be very excellent.

There was no time to prepare the students in System "I" for desegregation since the final decision was made by the school board only a few days before school opened. Any preparation which was done in System "G" for students was done by the principal and teachers. Interviews did not reveal this preparation, however.

The only formal preparation which involved the public that was done by the superintendents in these systems was a public meeting of the superintendent in System "I" with the bus drivers explaining the plan to transport the Negro students and the attempt of the superintendent in System "G" to make a citizen's committee function in working out the problems of desegregation. Both of the superintendents in these two systems seemed to have done a great deal of work in preparing the public for desegregation in an informal way. This took the form of visiting community leaders throughout the system and talking to them about the problem as well as discussing the issue with the people they came in contact with from day to day in the performance of their duties.

Chapter Summary

Chapter four has been an identification and analysis of the behavioral patterns of the ten superintendents included

in the present study. Four general behavioral patterns within which the action of the ten superintendents could be categorized were identified and described.

The first of these patterns of behavior was the one where superintendents furnished initial leadership and made careful preparation for public school desegregation. These were the superintendents who anticipated the magnitude of the desegregation problem and were eager that work begin on it. Once this work was begun, they were anxious that their administrative staffs, faculties, students, and the general public be ready before the transition from segregated to desegregated schools occurred.

The second behavioral pattern included superintendents who had initiated action without careful planning for desegregation. The superintendent placed in this category initiated action to desegregate the schools in his system, but it was believed that he failed to make the careful preparation needed for this social change.

The third behavioral pattern was the one in which the superintendents waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and then provided formal leadership in preparing for desegregation. For one reason or another the superintendents placed in this behavioral pattern did not choose to initiate action to desegregate the public schools in their systems. Once this action had been taken though, these

superintendents made formal preparation for desegregation. This preparation included work with their administrative staffs, faculties, students, and the general public.

The fourth behavioral pattern was the pattern where the superintendents waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and made little formal preparation for public school desegregation. Not only did the superintendents in this pattern fail to initiate action to desegregate their schools but they also failed to make formal preparation for desegregation after this initial action had been taken.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of the present study was that of identifying and describing behavioral patterns of selected public school superintendents during the process of desegregation. The study was limited to ten superintendencies in Kentucky where some degree of desegregation had been accomplished. After the decision had been made to conduct a study dealing with the behavior of superintendents during public school desegregation, the next task was that of obtaining a sufficient number who would cooperate in such a study. Once this number had been obtained with the help of the Kentucky State Department of Education, data were collected by interviewing school officials and lay citizens in each system, examining school board minutes, and reading other available printed material pertaining to desegregation. Interviews with people in each system were limited to those approved by the superintendent. An interview guide was used in all interviews to insure specific kinds of information being obtained which were believed essential to the study. 155

Summary and Conclusions

During the period of collecting and analyzing data for the present study, it was found that the significance of the behavior of the administrative heads of local public school

systems could be understood only by becoming familiar with some of the general forces which affected this behavior. These general forces were those which were believed responsible for providing the broad framework within which the action of the superintendents might be categorized while dealing with the major issue of public school desegregation.

It should be remembered that the description of the action of the superintendents and the conditions affecting this action were those perceived by the superintendents and other people interviewed in the systems as well as the printed materials which were examined. Since it was believed that those people who were most directly concerned with desegregation were in a better position to determine the major forces affecting it, no effort was made to identify all of the conditions existing in each system which might be considered a factor in the superintendents' actions. However, other forces were observed than those directly mentioned by the people interviewed. Where they were observed frequently, they were included in the forces which had some relationship to the superintendents' actions during public school desegregation.

An examination of data gathered during this study indicated that the behavior of public school superintendents during the process of desegregation was the result of many forces. Although it is believed that the action of the superintendent during desegregation was influenced by many of the

same forces which affected his general behavior, evidence obtained seemed to point to certain things which had some general relationship to the issue of desegregation. These forces did not affect each superintendent in the same way or to the same degree. They did seem to be considered by each superintendent during desegregation, however.

Tradition

Tradition seemed to be one of the factors which had some effect upon the action of the superintendents during desegregation. Most of the superintendents were anxious that the change from segregated to desegregated schools in their system not be too rapid. This was true even of most superintendents who initiated action to desegregate the schools in their systems. The methods used by them indicated that they believed that both the white and Negro people in the community should get used to the idea of mixing the races in the classrooms before schools opened on a desegregated basis. Much of this tradition was revealed in the history of white and Negro education in Kentucky. Some of the attitudes and beliefs concerning Negro education have existed down through the years and were still maintained by the general public. Even though inequalities were still present in Kentucky at the time of the Supreme Court decision of 1954, great strides had been taken toward equalizing education for both races.

Legal Structure

Another force which directly affected the action of superintendents in Kentucky during desegregation was the school law within which they operated. These rules and regulations exercised some control over the action of the superintendents. These laws may have been the result of action of the local school board which is the governing body of the individual school systems or they may have been the result of the state board of education which is the state agency charged with maintaining a state system of public education. The Kentucky Constitution as well as the state legislature also required that certain conditions be met by the educational officials of the state. Many of the state laws pertaining to education have been a result of all of these agencies.

The legal framework within which the local superintendents operated also meant that there was a relationship between the action which the superintendent took during desegregation and the attitude of the local school board toward the Supreme Court ruling and the issue of desegregation. If the local school board did not wish to begin desegregation in their system, this did not mean that the superintendent always changed his own objectives in the matter. It did usually mean that the superintendent changed or modified his approach in reaching his objectives. The length of time a superintendent had been in the system sometimes reflected his success or lack of

success in reaching his objectives during the period of desegregation.

State Officials

The favorable reaction of the state officials to the Supreme Court decision was an important force in affecting the behavior of the selected superintendents in Kentucky during the process of public school desegregation. The information obtained during this study indicated that most of the important state officials of Kentucky had anticipated the Supreme Court decision and were ready with a positive statement saying that their state would comply with the decision. These officials included the governor, the attorney general, and the congressional senators and representatives.

Human Relations Agencies

The human relations agencies which were operating in Kentucky during the period of public school desegregation were also considered a force in affecting the behavior of the superintendents during the process of desegregation. These agencies were ready to act as pressure groups in systems which did not seem inclined to act in good faith. They were also ready to give guidance and direction as well as assistance in systems which asked for their help in solving their problems.

State Department of Education

The positive attitude of the Kentucky State Department

of Education was an important force which affected the action of the superintendents during public school desegregation. Some superintendents called upon members of the State Department of Education to serve as consultants in their systems during desegregation. Some of them said that their action was based in part upon the procedures suggested by these consultants. Even though it appeared that the State Department of Education was called upon to work more with systems where there already existed a strong relationship before the period of desegregation began, their work with these systems in helping to solve the problems of desegregation and the attitude of the State Superintendent of Education affected the action of other superintendents as well. The State Board of Education also asked each local board to issue statements declaring their intention to comply with the law of the land.

Negro Population

The decrease in the Negro population of Kentucky as well as the small number of Negro students in some of the local systems was considered significant in affecting the behavior of superintendents during public school desegregation. Where Negro students made up only 2 or 3 per cent of the total student body in a school system, the action of the superintendent appeared to be influenced by this factor.

Superintendent's Position

The security or lack of security felt by the superintendent in his position also seemed to affect his action during public school desegregation. An insecure superintendent had to be more concerned with the opinion of the school board and public than was sometimes necessary to aid desegregation. He was sometimes less able to receive approval for policies which he believed were needed in an effective change from segregated to desegregated schools. Although little evidence obtained during the present study indicated this factor was an important one in the action of the ten superintendents, it did appear that some superintendents considered it.

Skills of Superintendents

The skills possessed in affecting change in his system helped determine the action taken by each of the superintendents. Although this factor was not mentioned specifically by any of the people interviewed, it became apparent during the study that certain actions by some of the superintendents were at least partly the result of the skills possessed by him. During a crisis situation it appeared that each superintendent preferred to use methods and actions with which he was most familiar and felt most at ease. This has certain implications in any attempt to evaluate the behavior of any superintendent during the process of desegregation. The patterns of action

used by different superintendents may be considered successful and yet be quite different.

Pressure

The amount of pressure placed upon each superintendent on the local level by individuals, groups, and organizations during the transition period was also instrumental in determining the behavior of the superintendents. In many cases these pressures were at least partly responsible for the methods used by each superintendent in affecting the social change within his system. One of the reasons given as to why some of the superintendents moved more slowly than others in desegregating their schools was because of more intense opposition and pressure at the local level.

Status of Negro Education

The conditions of the physical facilities and instructional program in the Negro schools at the time of the Supreme Court decision affected the action of some of the superintendents. Even though this factor may be considered one facet of the total picture which intensified or relieved local pressure on the superintendent during desegregation, it appeared often enough to be considered worthy of noting. Where the facilities and instructional program in the Negro schools were comparable to those in the white schools, there appeared to be less pressure from the Negro citizens to desegregate the schools.

Where the facilities and instructional program in the Negro schools were inferior to those in the white schools, the Negro parents seemed more anxious that desegregation begin immediately. In addition to the effect the conditions in the Negro schools had upon the Negro people, the superintendent and sometimes local citizens appeared more willing to press for action in systems where it was obvious that the Negro was being discriminated against in the educational opportunities being afforded their children.

The data in this study revealed four general behavioral patterns of superintendents which could be characterized as follows:

1. Superintendents who furnished initial leadership and made careful preparation for public school desegregation.
2. Superintendents who initiated action without careful planning for desegregation.
3. Superintendents who waited for the community or other outside agencies to initiate action and who then provided formal leadership in preparing for desegregation.
4. Superintendents who waited for the community or other agencies to initiate action and who made little formal preparation for desegregation.

Although there was not always sufficient evidence to indicate that all of the action of each superintendent fell precisely within the category in which he was placed,

interviews as well as other sources of information tended to reveal that his general behavior justified placing him in the selected pattern. The placing of each superintendent's action into one of the four behavioral patterns should not be considered an effort to evaluate this action. Even though information gathered in each school system tended to place some value upon the different behavioral patterns observed, the present study was concerned with identifying and describing the behavior rather than evaluating it.

Recommendations

The general conclusions of this study suggest that a great deal more attention should be given to the effect the actions of public school superintendents have upon the success or lack of success of desegregation. It is also believed that more research should be directed toward the factors which seem to have a definite effect upon the superintendent's action during the process of public school desegregation. Perhaps more intensive research in a single school system, where this is possible, would shed additional light upon the action of the superintendent and the causes of this action. The behavioral patterns which emerged from action taken by all ten superintendents were evaluated to some extent in the companion study. However, it seems probable that a series of studies which involved many people in each system would make the

patterns of action more meaningful. This would appear especially true if these patterns were the result of intensive research in each system as suggested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashmore, Harry S. The Negro and the Schools. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.
- Blanton, Harry S. "The Relationships of Behavioral Patterns of School Superintendents to the Desegregation Process in Selected Public School Systems." Unpublished Ed. D. thesis, Department of Education, The University of Tennessee, June 1959.
- Carmichael, Omer and James Weldon. The Louisville Story. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
- Clarke, Thomas D. A Description of Kentucky. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1945.
- Davenport, F. Garvin. Ante-Bellum Kentucky. Oxford: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943.
- Griffin, Roscoe. "A Tentative Description and Analysis of the School Desegregation Crisis in Sturgis, Kentucky." Unpublished report, Department of Sociology, Berea College, September 1956.
- "Human Relations Agencies Servicing Kentucky, Prepared by Officials of Human Relations Agencies in Kentucky." (Mimeographed)
- Kentucky Commission on Negro Affairs. The Report of the Commission on Negro Affairs. Frankfort: Department of Education, 1945.
- Kentucky Department of Education. Kentucky Common School Laws, Vol. XXVI. Frankfort: Department of Education, 1958.
- Kentucky Educational Commission. Public Education in Kentucky, Vol. I. New York: General Education Board, 1921.
- Leflar, Robert A. "What the Court Really Said," Southern School News, 6 (June 1955), 1.
- Ligon, Moses Edward. A History of Public Education in Kentucky. Lexington: Bureau of School Service, 1942.
- Pierce, Truman M., et al. White and Negro Schools in the South. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Robinson, Glen. "The Shock Waves of Desegregation," The Nation's Schools, 58 (August 1956), 39-43.

Shoemaker, Don. With All Deliberate Speed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Tipton, James H. Community in Crisis. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

Wey, Herbert and John Corey. Action Patterns in School Desegregation. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1959.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan. Schools in Transition. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Letter to Selected Superintendents from
Kentucky State Department of Education

Commonwealth of Kentucky

Department of Education

Frankfort

July 17, 1958

The Southern Education Foundation (Atlanta) is now sponsoring a Research Fellowship Program on the Post Masters degree level centered in Five State Universities of the South including the Universities of Arkansas, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Texas. Briefly the plan of this program is the selection of highly qualified and outstanding young men to study as teams in each of the centers on the production of research important to public Education. The teams have a bi-racial membership.

The team from the University of Tennessee, consisting of two fellows, has selected as its problem the study of local school administration and its behavioral patterns, as an influencing factor in the integration process. Since Tennessee has hardly begun with integration, the fellows working through their sponsor, Dr. Galen N. Drewry, Associate Professor of Education, University of Tennessee, wishes to select Kentucky for their study.

It has been requested of me that I recommend ten or twelve local school systems in our state with successful programs of integration where this research might be conducted. In giving this assistance which I am pleased to do feeling that such information can be of great help to some fellow school-man in the future, I am recommending the school districts and the superintendents listed on the separate sheet enclosed. You will notice that I have included you and your district which I trust will meet with your approval.

Procedures in the conduct of this study may include a few visits to your school district by the fellows and possibly a visit to the school centers with an integration program. The purpose of the first visit requested for some time during the latter part of August or first part of September will be for a conference with you. At this time an overview including the type of information being sought will be given for your evaluation. Also at this time a tentative plan can be made for the remainder of the study.

I should like to have your permission to suggest the including of your district in this study providing it meets your convenience.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Sam B. Taylor, Supervisor
Secondary Schools

SBT:sls

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

Interview Guide for Superintendents

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

- I. Who initiated the movement toward public school desegregation in your system?
 - A. State Department
 - B. Local groups or organizations
 - C. Individuals
 - D. Others

- II. As superintendent of schools what specific action did you take with each of these individuals, agencies or groups who were interested in public school desegregation?
 - A. Individual conferences
 - B. Public meetings
 - C. Other

- III. Exactly how was public school desegregation accomplished in your system?
 - A. Court order
 - B. Directive from State Department
 - C. Decision of local board
 - D. Other

- IV. Prior to the decision which was made to desegregate public schools in your system - what specific action, if any, did you take concerning desegregation with the following:
 - A. Your administrative staff
 - B. Your school board
 - C. Your teachers
 - D. The public

- V. After the decision was made to desegregate the public schools in your system, what specific action, if any, did you take concerning desegregation with the following:
 - A. Your administrative staff
 - B. Your school board
 - C. Your teachers
 - D. The public

VI. Since public school desegregation has begun in your system, what specific action, if any, did you take concerning desegregation with the following:

- A. Your administrative staff
- B. Your school board
- C. Your teachers
- D. The public

APPENDIX C

Interview Guide for Other Personnel

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR OTHER PERSONNEL

- I. Who initiated the movement toward public school desegregation in your system?
 - A. State Department
 - B. Local groups or organizations
 - C. Individuals
 - D. Others

- II. What specific action did the superintendent take with each of these individuals, agencies or groups who were interested in public school desegregation?
 - A. Individual conferences
 - B. Public meetings
 - C. Other

- III. Exactly what part did the superintendent play in desegregating the public schools in your system?
 - A. Strongly encouraged
 - B. Encouraged
 - C. Discouraged
 - D. Strongly discouraged

- IV. Prior to the decision which was made to desegregate public schools in your system - what specific action, if any, did the superintendent take concerning desegregation with the following:
 - A. His administrative staff
 - B. His school board
 - C. His teachers
 - D. The public

- V. After the decision was made to desegregate the public schools in your system - what specific action, if any, did the superintendent take concerning desegregation with the following:
 - A. His administrative staff
 - B. His school board
 - C. His teachers
 - D. The public

VI. After desegregation had begun in your system - what specific action, if any, did the superintendent take concerning desegregation with the following:

- A. His administrative staff
- B. His school board
- C. His teachers
- D. The public

APPENDIX D

State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky

Report on Integration

School Year 1958-59

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau of Instruction-Division of Instructional Services
Frankfort, Kentucky

* * * * *

Report on Integration⁽¹⁾
School Year 1958-59

Each year since the school year of 1955-56, a brief report has been issued relating to the results of public school integration. This is the fourth report which is being distributed for the purpose of giving factual information concerning the program.

Beginning on page four there is found a list of school districts throughout the state with an integration program. Also, shown in this section of the report are the schools with mixed student bodies together with the bi-racial enrollments and the number and classification of the teachers. The districts which have had integration programs at any time during the four-year period from the beginning in 1954-58, are shown even though there are no such enrollments this school term. It will be observed that growth continues in most all areas of integration although there are evidences of trends toward a leveling off in the rate of progress.

(1) Prepared by Sam B. Taylor, Division of Instructional Services, Bureau of Instruction.

The extent of the integration program in Kentucky at the beginning of the school term 1958-59 can best be shown by comparing the results to the total situation. The total pupil membership in the public schools of the state at the close of the school year June 30, 1958, was 586,149 pupils. Approximately 6.8 per cent of these or 39,708 are Negro pupils. At the present time there are 215 local school districts of which 175 have a Negro population. Forty (40) districts, 20 counties and 20 independents have no colored pupils. The total number of professional staff members employed in the schools last year was 23,432 teachers, supervisors and administrators.

Reports from local school districts show that since the start of integration three years ago, 105 districts have put into operation the integration of their pupil personnel by actually enrolling pupils of both races in non-segregated schools.

In all schools of the integrated districts there is an open policy. That is, Negro pupils who desire to enroll are admitted to any school within the district provided they live within the attendance area of the school. In addition to these 105 districts, there are 18 others which have an open policy. Districts with an open policy and no mixed enrollment this year are: Barren, Boyle, Edmonson, Graves, Harlan, Laurel, McCracken, Webster counties and Glasgow, Paris, Cattlettsburg, Harlan, East Bernstadt, Standford, Mr. Sterling,

Central City and Providence independent districts.

These 123 districts representing 70 per cent of the districts with a mixed population contain over 80 per cent of the Negro group.

Six districts which had mixed enrollments in former years have no such enrollments this year. These districts are: Calloway, Johnson, Owsley and Wolfe counties and Lebanon and Murray independent districts.

Six new districts were added this year. These are: Owen County and Bardstown, Cloverport, Fulton, Hopkinsville and Liberty independent districts.

In the integrated districts there are 321 separate schools with mixed student bodies. These schools have a total enrollment of 160,889 pupils; or approximately 27 per cent of the total enrollment in the state. Of the enrollment in the integrated schools, 11,496 are Negro pupils which is 29 per cent of the Negro pupil personnel. A total of 6,053 teachers are employed in the 321 integrated schools. In this number there are 138 Negro teachers. The number of Negro teachers has been decreased by 34 from 172 teachers in 1957-58.

The growth of integration since the beginning of the school year 1955-56 is shown in the following table:

TABLE I

INTEGRATION SINCE 1955-56 IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, IN SCHOOLS,
PUPIL PERSONNEL AND TEACHING PERSONNEL

Integration	School Year			
	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59
In School Districts:				
Total number districts				
in state	224	221	216	215
Districts with Negro population	184	177	170	175
Districts integrated	30	91	94	123
Per cent of districts integrated	16.0	50.8	55.3	70.3
In Schools:				
Total schools in integrated district	826	1,742	1,736	1,730
Schools integrated	41	233	262	331
Percent integrated	5.0	13.3	15.4	19.1
In Pupil Personnel:				
Enrolled in integrated districts	97,903	325,478	362,269	402,000
Enrolled in integrated schools	16,981	128,324	144,079	160,889
White pupils enrolled	16,688	120,307	133,182	149,392
Negro pupils enrolled	313	8,017	10,897	11,492
In Teaching Personnel:				
Number teachers in integrated districts	3,496	11,889	13,384	13,400
Number teachers in integrated schools	641	4,821	5,647	6,053
White teachers	639	4,708	5,475	5,915
Negro teachers	2	113	172	138