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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is an historic, ethnographical case study of Dunbar School, a segregated elementary and junior high school in Tucson, Arizona, established in 1913 in accordance with de jure segregation policies in the United States. It comprehensively examines the school’s organizational culture and leadership from 1940-1951 through the voices of former teachers and students supported by scholarly literature. Educational philosophies that impacted the segregated school, the sociopolitical climate that ushered it into being, and the impact of desegregation on Black education are also addressed.

The purpose of the study was to uncover Dunbar’s inner culture and tap into contributing factors that led to its success. The gap in the research on the school called for an integration of empirical data with scholarly research. Answers about perceptions and characteristics of the school’s membership and the leadership philosophy that guided Dunbar are sought principally by drawing from the theoretical lens of organizational culture. Three other theoretical frameworks are also used to understand the school’s inner workings: code, resiliency, and leadership theories. The underlying themes of this study are: the critical importance of demonstrable care in schools, the need to invest in students’ cultural capital, the value of congruency among faculty, and an emphasis on academic excellence.

Data were collected from primary and secondary sources. Open-ended and semi-structured questions characterized the interviewing methodology, and governed the data collection process. A review of newspaper articles, published and unpublished archival sources, and current school documentation unearthed the historical development.
With remarkable consistency, findings reveal that Dunbar was a close-knit segregated school characterized by caring, qualified teachers who held high expectations, strong moral values, and an unwavering sense of resilience. Dunbar’s administration thrived on a vibrant school culture, invested in Afrocentric cultural capital, and practiced proactive, resilient leadership. These factors helped produce success. This study also makes known that school desegregation, in some instances, has produced a feeling of alienation among Black students, a loss of Afrocentric cultural connections, and that many students today lack a caring, highly-motivating, educational experience that encourages excellence. This dissertation adds to the genre of highly successful segregated schools, now obsolete.
"If you believe people have no history worth mentioning it is easy to believe they have no humanity worth defending."
~ William Loren Katz ~

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Dunbar School

The Arizona Daily Star, diurnal newspaper for the southwest city of Tucson, released groundbreaking news for the African American community on September 18, 1913. The Thursday morning storyline read: “For the first time in the history of Tucson, negro [sic] pupils will have their own school and their own teacher when the city schools open next Monday” (“Negro School,” 1913, p. 8). The new elementary school, labeled “Colored School,” was established in compliance with state mandated policies that enforced segregation. Known among the African American community as “Simmons’ School” after its first principal, Cicero C. Simmons, the school was renamed Paul Laurence Dunbar School in 1918, to honor the first African American to gain national prominence as a prolific poet and novelist.

Despite the fact that de jure segregation policies of 1912 constituted a separatist mandate that deprived African American children of an integrated educational experience, it nevertheless paved the way for the birth of a new school. Paul Laurence Dunbar School (hereafter referred to as Dunbar) eventually became noted as a highly successful segregated school. Morgan Maxwell Sr. took the reigns of the school in
January 1940, and together with a team of highly qualified teachers, many of whom hailed from Kansas, including Maxwell, led the school to its zenith.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to uncover perceptions of former teachers and students regarding the inside culture of Dunbar from 1940 - 1951, and to examine the leadership philosophy and characteristics of Principal Morgan Maxwell Sr.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to reconstruct Dunbar’s operations from 1940 -1951 with the aim of uncovering the school’s organizational effectiveness. Rather than focusing exclusively on historical chronology, this dissertation broadens one’s understanding of the segregated school by comprehensively examining influences that shaped the tapestry of the segregated school. This study explores the educational philosophies of the day, investigates macro level sociopolitical forces, and probes micro level inner workings of the school while also zooming in on the leadership characteristics of its last principal, Morgan Maxwell Sr. This is accomplished via perceptions of former teachers and students, and a detailed analysis of relevant documents and scholarly literature. The frameworks applied to this study are code, resiliency, leadership and organizational culture theories. Fundamentally important to this research are not only the factors contributing to Dunbar’s success, but also an understanding of the salient role that an effective organizational culture plays in providing a quality education for students.
The four research questions that drive this study are:

1. What are the perceptions today of former teachers and students about Dunbar?

2. What were the attributes of the teachers?

3. What were the characteristics of the principal and the leadership philosophy that guided Dunbar's operations?

4. What factors contributed to the school's success?

Importance of the Study

There is a plethora of reasons for launching this study. First, the study provides a researched body of knowledge that examines theories, perspectives, policies, events, and outcomes while simultaneously providing solid evidence of an educational model that ostensibly worked well.

Secondly, this research has significant, practical, educational value for the African American community and for those who are part of the African Diaspora. Inherent in this study is the belief that many Black students in the educational system in the United States are not experiencing a quality education (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993; Harris, 1983; Irvine & Irvine, 1983; Leake & Faltz, 1993; Schultz, Buck & Niesz, 2000; Wilkinson, 1996). While there may be other significant variables that impact Black education in the United States, there is nonetheless a voluminous body of research that attests to the importance of having a strong school culture (Barth, 2002; Carlson, 1996; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Lee 2000; Marriott, 2001; Peterson & Deal, 1998; Sergiovanni, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Research supports the need for
greater evidence of care in schools, stronger home-school relationships and respect for cultural capital.

Additionally, there seems to be a common assumption among members of the dominant culture in the United States that poor children will automatically be underachievers in school. Although research has shown that poverty is indeed a variable that can impede academic success (Payne, 1998), it does not follow that poor students will routinely under-perform in school. It is known that many of Dunbar’s students were poor. It is also accepted that segregated students were deprived of a mainstream education. Yet, despite the poverty and apparent deprivation, students performed well. Hence, obtaining an inside look at the contributing factors that positively influenced Dunbar is important. Further, this historical-educational study adds to the body of literature on segregated schools in the United States, and contributes to research on Black schools within the African Diaspora.

Thirdly, tantamount to grasping the importance of this study is the recognition that Black students not only perform well in a nurturing environment that fosters their success, but they can also develop a healthy sense of self-pride, even in the face of oppressive social conditions (Edwards, 1998; Hill, 1997; Siddle Walker, 1996; Ward, 1996). Black students, regardless of background, academic ability or socioeconomic status are often caught in the raging tide of educational policies. Students of color need not blame a virulent, sociopolitical climate for their academic failure. Neither must educators prejudge the capabilities of selected social groups, put them in the proverbial box, and perfunctorily assume that success is unattainable. This study will reveal the
resilience of a people who overcame limitations in the face of a turbulent sociopolitical climate governed by power and privilege. It is also hoped that this study will serve as a source of encouragement for future generations.

Fourthly, historical research on segregated schools in the United States has largely overlooked the investigation of the operational components of segregated schools. There is a dearth of academic studies that delve sufficiently into the organizational culture of the segregated school. Such was also a deficit in the literature on Dunbar. The gap lay in the fact that Dunbar's inside culture, supported by scholarly analysis, had been untapped. Little was known about teacher-student interactions, pedagogical approaches, and characteristics of the school's leadership and their impact on the school community. In essence, the ethos of Dunbar was unknown. Additionally, answers were sought as to why some poor, Black students performed well in school. No previous study on Dunbar is grounded in the theoretical frameworks of code, resiliency, leadership and organizational culture theories as mediums for uncovering the school's success. In short, this dissertation extends existing research by employing the aforementioned frameworks to enhance an understanding of the school's success.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Afrocentric
This all-inclusive term is commonplace in scholarly literature that embraces an appreciation for Black literature, culture, history and practice. It reflects a wider cultural lens that extends beyond the African American experience into the broader realm of the African Diaspora. Some scholars stress its usage as an intellectual ideology juxtaposed against a Eurocentric worldview (Karenga, 2002). They affirm that it is an empowering term that adds value to the Black experience. In this study the term is used descriptively to include African Americans; however, it does not exclude those who are not.

Black
The term is all-inclusive referring to African Americans who were formerly called “Negroes” or “colored.” It is also used to describe non-African Americans who are part of the African Diaspora. It is a term coined in the 1960s for Blacks by Blacks to denote racial pride. Some African American researchers regard the term as a negative description for those whose roots are tied to Africa (Lawson, 1996). In this study, however, the term “Black” is a positive classification for all those who are identified with the Black race. It is used interchangeably with the term “African American” to avoid redundancy. The term is always capitalized to give respect to people of color.
Colored

The term is an anachronism used in the jargon of people of the period. In this research, the term is principally used in quotation marks to emphasize its antiquity. It is synonymous with the terms “Negro,” “Black,” and “African American.”

Minority

This term has been purposely avoided in this study by the researcher. It only appears when quoting from other sources, or for emphasis. This researcher observes that the term is an Americanism that has been branded into the verbiage of academics and non-academics, Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, and cultural groups regardless of race or social class. The term categorizes and stigmatizes certain ethnic groups in the United States. African Americans, Native Americans and Hispanics principally carry the label. Oddly, Asians, though also few in number, are typically exempt from the phraseology. Thus, it is believed that such labeling is a sociopolitical maneuver that has been successfully maintained over the years. It subtly perpetuates and sustains a perceived underclass, and thereby maintains a social divide. It is hoped that this research will mark a turning point in academic literature produced in the United States, and signal the pathway to the oblitera­tion of the term as an ethnic classification. It is also hoped that such action will set a positive trend in academia that will trickle down successfully to the general populace. It is impossible to crush the walls of sociocultural polarity, and simultaneously maintain open doors of social unity.
Negro

The term is an archaic term used synonymously with the terms “colored,” “Black,” and “African American.” It is so employed because it appears in old legislation, archival documentation, and is referred to by speakers of the segregated era. In this study the term always refers to African Americans.

White

The term refers to individuals of the Caucasian race. It is used interchangeably with the terms “mainstream” and “dominant.” It is always capitalized to give respect to people of the Caucasian race.
"True leadership must be for the benefit of the followers, not the enrichment of the leaders."

~ Robert Townsend ~

CHAPTER 2

DRAMATIS PERSONAE – THE CHARACTERS:
PRELUDE TO THE “COLORED SCHOOL”

Background

In order to grasp an understanding of the evolution of Tucson’s “Colored School,” one must be cognizant that, in one form or another, two schools of educational thought dominated the thinking of African Americans in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Thus, the educational tide swelled and receded depending on the endorsements that were afforded the educational leaders of the day.

In the wake of the Reconstruction period of U.S. history, two prominent giants in the field of education stood center stage in the quest for uplifting the status of African Americans: Booker T. Washington (1856 – 1915) and William E. B. Du Bois (1868 – 1963). It was the philosophical beliefs of these leaders that infiltrated the mind-set of the Negro of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries with respect to the role of education. Although these two Black men were in fierce, public opposition to each other, they nevertheless embodied the psyche of African Americans, and shared some commonalities. Both were assertive. Both tenaciously upheld their ideals. Both were controversial figures. They were both advocates of social equality. Both even allowed a measure of respect for each other’s ideology. Clearly, both possessed the power to
transform the minds of the African American populace, and as such are justifiably revered as educational leaders of their time.

Educational Philosophy of Booker T. Washington

Booker T. Washington, commonly known as the Wizard of Tuskegee, was born a mulatto slave on a Virginia plantation in 1856 (Washington, 1901). He climbed the social ladder and became a leading figure in the field of education. There are three broad features that define Washington’s educational philosophy.

First, his platform advocated vocational education, which he believed to be the passport to Black economic success. He founded the Normal School for Colored Teachers in 1881, later renamed Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, which received national acclaim for its contribution to industrial education. In his autobiography entitled *Up from Slavery*, Washington writes:

> From the very beginning, at Tuskegee, I was determined to have the students do not only the agricultural and domestic work, but to have them erect their own buildings. My plan was to have them, while performing this service, taught the latest and best methods of labour, so that their school would not only get the benefit of their efforts, but the students themselves would be taught to see not only utility in labour, but beauty and dignity; would be taught, in fact, how to lift labour up from mere drudgery and toil, and would learn to love work for its own sake. (Washington, 1901, p. 148)
Upon reflecting on comments he made at the National Educational Association meeting held in Madison, Wisconsin in 1889, Washington states:

In this address I said that the whole future of the Negro rested largely upon the question as to whether or not he should make himself, through his skill, intelligence, and character, of such undeniable value to the community in which he lived that the community could not dispense with his presence. I said that any individual who learned to do something better than anybody else—learned to do a common thing in an uncommon manner—had solved his problem, regardless of the colour of his skin, and that in proportion as the Negro learned to produce what other people wanted and must have, in the same proportion would he be respected. (Washington, 1901, p. 202)

Clearly, Washington’s perspective on education vociferously underscored the importance of mastering practical skills not only to improve oneself, but to benefit the neighboring community. He also promoted a devotion to the work ethic and a dedication to the achievement of excellence. He believed that one’s practical skills were a requisite tool that would facilitate Blacks in acquiring a sense of self-sufficiency and independence, ipso facto commanding the respect of one’s fellowman. Washington (1901) says it best when he declares: “No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem” (p. 220).
Washington's staunch belief in vocational education was largely shaped by his mentor, General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a Union Army veteran who inculcated him with his own educational stance while he was a student at Armstrong's Hampton Normal and Agriculture Institute from 1872 - 1875 (Washington, 1901). Although he entered Hampton intending at some stage to pursue law, Washington was persuaded by Armstrong to re-consider his goals. He became caught up in the spell of the Hampton model, ended up complying with Armstrong's expectations, and thrived under his tutelage. Anderson (1988) observes that there were several Southerners who advocated industrial education for Blacks. Samuel Armstrong was one. Hollis B. Frissell and Rutherford B. Hayes were two others. Armstrong is quoted as saying: "The great mass of Negroes must be farmers and they need to be taught to farm intelligently" (Anderson, 1988, p. 70). Washington ultimately beckoned to the Hampton call, and opted for vocational education. It was Armstrong's prompting that led him to develop the Tuskegee, Alabama school (Anderson, 1988; Engs, 1999).

Anderson (1988) concludes that Armstrong's approach of relegating Blacks to mainly industrial education was diametrically opposed to the interests of African Americans. According to Anderson, Armstrong's framework of thinking was designed to eschew confrontations that would challenge the existing sociopolitical power structure of the South. Despite Washington's support for the Hampton model, researchers suggest that there was a clash between his aims and those of Samuel Armstrong (Anderson, 1988; Karenga, 2002). Karenga (2002) affirms that Washington was genuinely concerned with the elevation of Blacks from a position of subservience to a position of self-sufficiency.
and productivity. Washington advocated industrial education because he was truly interested in the plight of the Black man, and in having him develop a level of economic independence and respectability. Armstrong’s motive, on the other hand, favored education as a “civilizing” force for African Americans (Anderson, 1988). Anderson writes: “Armstrong insisted that the freedmen should refrain from participating in southern political life because they were culturally and morally deficient and therefore unfit to vote and hold office in a ‘civilized’ society” (Anderson, 1988, p. 38).

Anderson’s portrait of Armstrong parallels the picture drawn by Engs (1999). In his comprehensive research on the life of Samuel Armstrong and Hampton Institute, Engs reaches back and opens a window on Armstrong’s personality. He pinpoints Armstrong’s religious background as a contributing factor to his personality. Armstrong was the son of missionaries to Hawaii. This “PK,” in modern-day colloquial parlance - “Preacher’s Kid” - was groomed in a social climate where missionary zeal in foreign lands was assiduously channeled into “civilizing the heathens” (Engs, 1999, p. xv). Engs reveals that Armstrong was drawn to be a missionary, albeit on home soil, to educate “backward people.” Armstrong possessed an intense devotion “to the uplift of the freed people, women as well as men” (Engs, 1999, p. xi). Engs also observes that Armstrong “envisioned African Americans as becoming ultimately, if not immediately – like himself” (Engs, 1999, p. xi).

Thus, it appears that the Hampton educational experience was intended to have a reforming effect on African Americans. It emphasized the work ethic, practical knowledge, the uplifting of freedmen and women, and the morality of Christianity
(Anderson, 1988; Engs, 1999). Anderson (1988) concludes that Armstrong’s strategy was aimed at utilizing industrial education as a means for ensuring that Blacks remain in a constant, subordinate social role.

Secondly, Washington’s philosophical stance is characterized by a doctrine of accommodationism as a medium by which the social inequity of the times could be solved (Giddings, 1984; Karenga, 2002; Marable, 2000). His gospel of compromise attracted many disciples. His goal was “to cement the friendship of the races” (Washington, 1901, p. 217). Washington believed that the battle for integration was best won if African Americans supported the existing power structure. In so doing, they would gain respect for their efforts. He most certainly showcased this belief. In his famous Atlanta Exposition Address of 1895, Washington promised his White listeners: “You shall have at all times the patient, sympathetic help of my race” (Washington, 1901, p. 224). To his Black brothers Washington urged:

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbour, I would say: “Cast down your bucket where you are” – cast it down in making friends in every manly way of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded. Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. (Washington, 1901, p. 219)
Washington also chided the Black intelligentsia for challenging the unjust socioeconomic system of the South. He stated: “The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly” (Washington, 1901, p. 223). He also called for “the surrender of political power and emphasis on civil rights” (Washington, 1901, p. 224). Understandably, Washington’s conciliatory stance would have been regarded to some compatriots as the posture of an Uncle Tom. Although he won the favor of White political forces of the day, Washington also synchronously obliterated the support of a segment of the Black populace (Anderson, 1988; Giddings, 1984; Marable, 2000).

It was precisely this demonstrable support of the cliché, “If you can’t beat ‘em, join ‘em” that allowed Washington to soar to national acclaim, yet simultaneously caused him to fall from grace among a segment of African Americans. As far as the White establishment was concerned, Washington’s conciliatory posture was not a threat, but a tool for social harmony and peace. The Southern press applauded his speech at the Atlanta Exposition. He was praised for giving “one of the most notable speeches, both as to character as to the warmth of its reception, ever delivered to a Southern audience” (Washington, 1901, p. 226). However, Washington’s beliefs were also met with scathing opposition. Black activists, who did not subscribe to the belief of passive resistance, such as strong, outspoken Harvard scholar, Munroe Trotter, felt that Washington’s style was too hypnotic, and lacked the fiery tenacity needed to combat the unjust practices of the South (Anderson, 1988). Black heroines of the Women’s Club Movement, in particular, Ida B. Wells-Barnett and Mary Church Terrell also condemned Washington for his
placatory stance, and for failing, when called upon, to advocate women’s rights (Giddings, 1984). Washington’s chief rival, however, was clearly the prominent Black scholar W. E. B. Du Bois, who launched stinging criticisms of Washington’s accommodationist beliefs, and found them to be intolerable for the upward mobility of the Black race (Anderson, 1988; Giddings, 1984; Karenga, 2002; Marable, 2000).

Thirdly, Washington favored a juxtaposed doctrine of separatism and economic integration (Karenga, 2002). He was founder and life-long president of the National Negro Business League established in the summer of 1900 (Washington, 1901). This organization “brought together for the first time a large number of the coloured men who are engaged in various lines of trade or business in different parts of the United States” (Washington, 1901, p. 316). Also developed was The Tuskegee Machine, which was “a nationwide network of Washington supporters and lieutenants in every avenue of black life” (Washington, 1901, p. xiv). The Tuskegee Machine was established in the South, where there was a greater preponderance of Blacks than Whites. Marable (2000) explains that during the period leading up to the Civil War of 1864, there was an exorbitant number of slaves who were sold off to slavers in the South. He estimates that from 1790 – 1860, 575,000 slaves were traded, and from 1820 – 1860 “no fewer than one million slaves were sold” (Marable, 2000, p. 71). This researcher believes that Marable’s explanation of the large, forced, migratory pattern of Blacks to the South sheds light on the captive audience that Washington had, and attests to the inroads that he was making among some Blacks in the South.
In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of Washington's educational perspectives, one must give consideration to the plexus of the Tuskegee Machine. The Tuskegee Machine was a formidable force that speaks to Washington's influence in the South (Anderson, 1988; Karenga, 2002). It consisted of a cadre of agriculturalists, school teachers and small businessmen who accepted the axiomatic principle "in unity there is strength," and sought to make advances within the White power structure as a unified group. This network gained strength and sought to cast Blacks in a good light. The group held powerful sway and influence in the South, with manifest influence in the Baptist Church and in the press (Washington, 1901). Grant (1968) notes that Du Bois was quick to assert the notion, however, that the blame for Black exploitation did not rest solely on the economic infrastructure of the South. He pointed out that the Tuskegee Machine was not exclusively the brainchild and operation of Blacks at Tuskegee, but that White capitalists in the North financially supported its activities. Their aim, according to Du Bois, was to squash economic gains of the South, and re-direct them through Black labor to the North (Grant, 1968). Anderson (1988) also concludes: "Many black intellectuals and leaders recognized that the Hampton-Tuskegee program was essentially an educational blueprint for black subordination" (p. 102).

Thus, the economic and sociopolitical strands of the White South, and some strands from the North, endorsed vocational education. The economic climate endorsed capital accumulation because it provided an opportunity for the exploitation of Black labor (Anderson, 1988; Marable, 2000). The introduction of Up From Slavery clearly states: "Southern whites approved of industrial education as a means of keeping Blacks in
agriculture and in other lowly occupations, whereas many blacks saw it, as Washington did, as a means of gaining economic independence from the sharecrop system and becoming small businessmen and property owners" (Washington, 1901, p. xi).

Additionally, the sociopolitical hegemony of the South demonstrated its oppression of African Americans via Jim Crow practices of segregation, humiliation, torture and oftentimes death (Giddings, 1984; Karenga, 2002; Marable, 2000). The prevailing belief of Southerners was that Blacks were intellectually inferior and that they were in no position to compete with the perceived dominant race (Giddings, 1984). Socially, the integration of Blacks and Whites was prohibited. Therefore, many African American struggles were battles for integration, equal acceptance and justice.

Although never soaring to hold political office, Washington gained acceptance and public recognition during President Roosevelt's administration, and maintained a highly influential position throughout his life (Anderson, 1988; Marable, 2000; Washington, 1901). On the periphery of mainstream politics, Washington "controlled the black patronage of the party in power and used it to reward his key supporters in all the centers of black population" (Washington, 1901, p. xv). W. E. B. Du Bois felt compelled to conclude the following in *The Niagra Movement* speech: "There was no question of Booker T. Washington's undisputed leadership of ten million Negroes in America, a leadership recognized gladly by the whites and conceded by most of the Negroes" (Du Bois, 1906, p. 2).

Yet, posthumously, although Washington's philosophy stands tall in the archives of history, like all well-intentioned leaders, his views continued to face blunt criticism from
Black leaders. The most remembered African American Civil Rights giant, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., said of Booker T. Washington that his advocacy for contentment “had too little freedom in its present and too little promise in its future” (King, 1964, p. 22). King abhorred Washington’s tokenism stance, and was certainly not prepared to use his strategy in the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s considering the urgency of the hour. In discussing the flaws of tokenism, King wrote: “Its purpose is not to begin a process, but instead to end the process of protest and pressures. It is a hypocritical gesture, not a constructive first step” (King, 1964, p. 21).

Contemporary scholar, Manning Marable confesses: “Many historians have explored the striking prominence of Booker T. Washington [of whom it can be said was the most effective influential politician that Black America has yet produced” (Marable, 2000, pp. 184–185). He readily admits: “Washington was the most successful practitioner of accommodation” (Marable, 2000, p. 185). Marable also observes that Washington “achieved extraordinary influence in Federal appointments for Black members of the Tuskegee Machine” (p. 185). Further, he reveals that Washington “secretly funneled capitalists’ donations for Tuskegee to a variety of civil rights causes” (p. 185). Still, Marable concludes: “Washington failed” (Marable, 2000, p. 196). Despite the catalogue of distinguished accomplishments, unparalleled contributions and glowing accolades that Washington acquired for the African American struggle for equality and freedom, Marable (2000) still opts to write him off as a failure. Why? In Marable’s words: “Washington’s power was both real and an illusion; its inherent weakness was
rooted not in his own body of politics, but within the racist practices of U.S. capitalism” (p. 186).

It is clear that Marable’s ideological persuasion falls within the realm of Marxism. He writes: “Nothing less than the political recognition that white racism is an essential and primary component in the continued exploitation of all American working people will be enough to defeat the capitalist class” (Marable, 2000, p. 262). It cannot be denied that Washington was an extraordinary product of his time. Even Marable, despite his criticism of him, acknowledges: “Washington was a product of late nineteenth century Black cultural life” (Marable, 2000, p. 186). Therefore, recognizing this salient truth is imperative, for the successes of an individual must be measured within the ambiance of the sociopolitical sphere in which one finds oneself.

Further, if one were to embrace the belief of Robert Townsend that “True leadership must be for the benefit of the followers, not the enrichment of the leaders,” and apply it as a litmus test to the leadership of Booker T. Washington, one would have to conclude that the benefit of the followers was achieved. There were many Blacks who adopted the Tuskegee model, and made significant progress in life (Anderson, 1988; Marable, 2000). Cicero C. Simmons was schooled at the Tuskegee Institute under Washington’s leadership. He journeyed to Arizona to take up the principalship position at Tucson’s Colored School in 1912.
Educational Philosophy of W. E. B. Du Bois

W. E. B. Du Bois embodied the second strand of educational thought for African Americans of the early twentieth century. He was the chief antagonist of Booker T. Washington. Du Bois felt that the self-made Washington poorly represented the Black masses, and did not deserve to speak on their behalf. His scathing criticism of Washington is indelibly etched in the pages of Black history (Anderson, 1988; Du Bois, 1906; Karenga, 2002; Washington, 1901).

First, Du Bois is noted for his vehement attacks on Washington’s educational views. He rejected Washington’s demand for Blacks to acquiesce to the existing political system, and he abhorred his stance of accepting the Hampton Institute Southern model of education that sought to demoralize, limit and put down Blacks (Anderson, 1988). In Du Bois’ eyes this was relegating Blacks to a subordinate role in society (Anderson, 1988; Karenga, 2002). However, he readily admits: “I recognized the importance of the Negro gaining a foothold in trades and his encouragement in industry and common labor” (Du Bois, 1906, p. 1). Just prior to making this statement, Du Bois candidly states: “These two theories of Negro progress were not absolutely contradictory” (Du Bois, 1906, p. 1). Thus, one may gauge that Du Bois’ vitriolic attack on Washington was indirectly an attack on the Hampton model of education and its underlying motives. The seat of the Washington-Du Bois rivalry was not so much that Du Bois totally frowned on industrial education, but rather that Du Bois objected to “the exclusive emphasis on it” (Karenga, 2002, p. 174). In fact, Marable (2000) notes that Du Bois is remembered to have applauded Black entrepreneurs in North Carolina, and he recognized their progress as a
formidable force against Jim Crowism. Du Bois saw the self-directed progress that
Blacks were making as a means of establishing economic hegemony, and thereby gaining
the respect that they deserved. What the educational scholar objected to was
Washington’s attempt to acquiesce to the dominant public opinion. He writes:

It was characteristic of the Washington statesmanship that
whatever he or anybody believed or wanted must be
subordinated to dominant public opinion and that opinion
deferred to and cajoled until it allowed a deviation toward
better ways. It was my theory to guide and force public opinion
by leadership. (Du Bois, 1906, p. 1)

For Du Bois, leadership meant being forthright in order to force public opinion, whereas
“the Washington leadership became a matter of organization and money” (Du Bois, 1906,

The charges leveled against Hampton Institute were not trumped up assaults. They
were substantiated by evidence of social inequalities. Anderson (1988) highlights in his
research that the institute, under Samuel Armstrong’s leadership, acquiesced to Jim Crow
racial practices. It was the common perception of the day that Hampton Institute was
designed to keep African Americans in their place, and thereby maintain the legitimacy
of their subordination to the ruling class (Anderson, 1988).

Evidence of Hampton Institute’s obsequious behavior is substantiated by three
flagrant examples. First, Hampton’s Alumni Association returned to the institute for the
spring graduation exercises, and was denied the respect and courtesy extended to White
visitors to the school (Anderson, 1988). Students expressed their displeasure this way: “We the graduates of this Institution, after returning in compliance with the call of our Alma Mater, have had our feelings wounded most grievously by being barred from some of the privileges that ordinary white visitors enjoyed” (Anderson, 1988, p. 62). Second, the African American press of the 1870s launched an attack on Hampton Institute. Two Black journalists for the People’s Advocate, in referencing the May 18th Commencement Day activities charged that “the rudest and most ignorant white men and women were politely conducted to the platform; respectable and intelligent colored ladies and gentlemen were shown lower seats where they could neither see nor hear the exercises of the day with any pleasure” (Anderson, 1988, p. 63). Third, there was strong criticism from an influential Black leader, Henry M. Turner, who visited Hampton in 1878 and complained that the school reflected a definite Confederate orientation (Anderson, 1988). Turner further charged that Hampton shortchanged students intellectually by denying them access to subjects such as algebra, geometry, higher mathematics, Greek, Latin and Science (Anderson, 1988). Engs (1999) reveals that Armstrong himself was schooled in Latin, Greek and in the classics, subject matter to which his Black students were denied access. Further, he reveals that Armstrong was reluctant to address academic questions that would be responsive to the needs of African Americans (Engs, 1999). Perhaps he assumed that Blacks were somehow incapable of coping with foreign languages, the classics, and a mathematical and science curriculum.

Secondly, what sets Du Bois apart from Washington is his prescription for the liberation of African Americans. Instead of emphasizing the acquisition of skills through
the trades, Du Bois, by contrast, advocated the journey to freedom via the route of academia. As the first African American doctoral graduate from the ivy-league Harvard University in 1895, Du Bois advanced the philosophy of the Talented Tenth. Du Bois categorically states:

I believed in the higher education of the Talented Tenth who through their knowledge of modern culture would guide the American Negro into a higher civilization. I knew that without this the Negro would have to accept white leadership, and that such leadership could not always be trusted to guide this group into self-realization and to its highest cultural possibilities.

(Du Bois, 1906, p. 1)

Upon poignantly articulating his Talented Tenth philosophy, Du Bois simultaneously expresses his disdain for Washington’s leadership and ideologies. He writes:

Strange to relate! For this is certain, no secure civilization can be built in the South with the Negro as an ignorant, turbulent proletariat. Suppose we seek to remedy this by making them laborers and nothing more: they are not fools, they have tasted of the Tree of Life, and they will not cease to think, will not cease attempting to read the riddle of the world. By taking away their best equipped teachers and leaders, and by slamming the door of opportunity in the faces of their bolder and brighter minds, will you make them satisfied with their lot? Or will you not rather transfer their leading from the hands of men taught to think to the hands of untrained demagogues? We ought not to forget that despite the pressure of poverty, and despite the active discouragement and even ridicule of friends, the demand for higher education training steadily increases among Negro youth: there were, in the years from 1875 to 1880, 22 Negro graduates from Northern colleges; from 1885 to 1890 there were 43, and from 1895 to 1900, nearly 100 graduates. From Southern Negro colleges there were, in the same three periods, 143, 413, and over
500 graduates. Here, then is the plain thirst for training, for refusing to give this Talented Tenth the key to knowledge, can any sane man imagine that they will lightly lay aside their yearning and contentedly become hewers of wood and drawers of water?

No. The dangerously clear logic of the Negro's position will more and more loudly assert itself in that day when increasing wealth and more intricate social organization preclude the South from being, as it is so largely is, simply an armed camp for intimidating black folk. Such waste of energy cannot be spared if the South is to catch up with civilization. (Blight & Gooding-Williams, 1997, p. 100)

According to Du Bois, The Talented Tenth was comprised of "exceptional men" from the elite Black intelligentsia who considered themselves to be academically equipped to lift the Black race out of the doldrums of second class status and "away from the contamination and death of the worst" (Cross & Gates, 1998). They believed, by virtue of their academic prowess, that they were better able to compete with the White power structure that sought to monopolize the political strings, and keep them demoralized and subordinated (Anderson, 1988; Karenga, 2002). According to Du Bois, the Talented Tenth concept was the ticket to freedom for Blacks. This group of intellectuals would serve as the trailblazers who would lead Blacks on to victory by their example of scholarly excellence. Further, Du Bois abhorred the idea of acquiescing in any way to the White political systems and ideologies preferring instead to pursue a separatist route. According to Grant (1968), the Crisis editor noted: "In the last quarter of a century, the advance of the colored people has been mainly in the lines where they themselves, working by and for themselves, have accomplished the greater advance" (p. 168).
On the surface Du Bois’ views sound somewhat compatible with those of Washington. The commonality of suggesting that Blacks improve themselves is not so distant from each other. However, Du Bois’ stance at the time was indeed radical, almost insulting to the efforts and policies of Black groups such as the National Association For the Advancement of Colored People (hereafter referred to as N.A.A.C.P.) that fought tirelessly for school integration (Giddings, 1984). Although Du Bois was a founding member of the N.A.A.C.P., he crossed swords repeatedly with Walter White who in 1935 was the executive secretary of the N.A.A.C.P. (Giddings, 1984). The clash centered on Du Bois’ separatist views that seemed to deflate the efforts of the N.A.A.C.P. towards interracial cooperation (Giddings, 1984). Speaking of Du Bois, Giddings concludes: “He felt that Blacks should be devoting their efforts to building their own institutions instead of integrating White ones” (Giddings, 1984, p. 211). It appears, therefore, that Du Bois’ heavy emphasis on the pursuit of academia, separate from White establishments, in the minds of some African Americans, imposed a myopic limitation on their progress.

Thirdly, Du Bois’ view embodied the cliché, “Speak up and be counted.” Marable (2000) defines Du Bois as a “political militant” (p. 232). Du Bois classifies himself as “an avowed socialist” (Marable, 2000, p. 147). His strategy was characterized by forthright protest. Du Bois’ believed that the confrontational approach was the crucial ammunition needed for advancing the social, political and economic rights for all African Americans (Karenga, 2002). Thus, his venomous attack on Washington that he was acquiescing to “a silent submission to civil inferiority… bound to sap the manhood of a race” (Karenga, 2002, p. 174), explains his disdain for Washington’s political positions.
Fourthly, Du Bois was moved by his own persuasions without regard for Blacks (Grant, 1968). Despite Du Bois’ sardonic criticism of Washington, ironically the tables were turned on him in a similar way. In July, 1918, Hubert Harrison, founder of the Liberty League of Negro Americans and a former Socialist Party proponent, expressed his displeasure with Du Bois (Grant, 1968). Harrison rejected Du Bois because he felt that the White power structure had embraced him as the leader of “Negro Americans without taking the trouble to consult us” (Grant, 1968, p. 186). Oddly enough, Du Bois launched a similar vitriolic epithet on Washington denouncing him as the leader of African Americans without the endorsement of the Black majority. Harrison hurled his criticism against Du Bois when it was learned that he was being preened to be a captain-assistant in World War I (Grant, 1968). He knew that Du Bois had flirted with the idea and that the negative outburst that arose among the Black community was of his own doing. According to Grant (1968), Harrison did not fully explain all the reasons for the Black opposition. Perhaps one might extrapolate from this incident that the African American community felt that Du Bois was siding with the White establishment that he consistently publicly opposed.

In his criticism of W. E. B. Du Bois, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote:

Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, in his earlier years at the turn of the century, urged the “talented tenth” to rise and pull behind it the mass of the race. His doctrine served somewhat to counteract the apparent resignation of Booker T. Washington. Yet, in the very nature of
Du Bois's outlook there was no role for the whole people. It was a tactic for an aristocratic elite who would themselves be benefited while leaving behind the "untalented" 90 percent. (King, 1964, p. 22)

Thus, Du Bois' leadership, like that of Booker T. Washington, was fraught with controversy. His precepts were followed by a small group of subscribed followers, while others subsequently rejected them (Washington, 1901). However, if one were to apply again the litmus test of Townsend's wisdom on leadership: "True leadership must be for the benefit of the follower, not the enrichment of the leaders," Du Bois stands as a leader. His belief in the transfer of knowledge from the educated populace to those in search of an education, aptly applies to this window of wisdom. Many students at the segregated school in Tucson benefited from the pursuit of academic excellence from those who were trained to deliver it.

**Nexus with the Tucson "Colored School"

This study on Dunbar is predicated on the belief that the effectiveness of the school's organizational culture is the leading feature that precipitated its success. The educational concepts of Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois are the bedrock that contributed to the school's academic culture, and laid the foundation for the establishment of the Colored School from which Dunbar evolved. The educational climate that garnered school success was set at its inception, and is believed to have been sustained at Dunbar under the administration of Morgan Maxwell Sr.
What evidence is there that the Washington and Du Bois educational perspectives were operative? What was the nexus that bridged the Colored School and later Dunbar in the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries? In an effort to connect the dots that led to Dunbar, one must gather up significant minutiae, which when taken together, shape our understanding of the school's development.

One salient fact about the early school is that Cicero C. Simmons, its founding father, was an alumnus of Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute. Simmons, the first principal of the segregated school, arrived in Tucson, via Phoenix, in 1912 for the express purpose of heading the Colored School (Zanders, 1946). He came highly recommended by Washington who gave him the following commendation: "Besides being a fine, sincere man, Mr. Simmons will interest any audience before whom he may be permitted to speak. I beg to commend him to the favorable consideration of those upon whom he may call" ("Negro School," 1913, p. 8). Simmons arrived in Tucson steeped in the Hampton-Tuskegee tradition that advocated vocational education, and emphasized a devotion to work and excellence. His area of expertise was carpentry (Cooper, 1967). Upon accepting the position at the segregated elementary school, Simmons was expected to teach, carry out janitorial duties and oversee the school (Zanders, 1946). His job description aptly fit what Anderson found to be consistent with those who trained in carpentry following the Hampton model (Anderson, 1988). He writes: "The "carpenters," like the shoemakers, were trained to be handymen rather than craftsmen and artisans" (p. 60).
Another observation is that Simmons was awarded a Bachelor’s degree from the University of Arizona in 1922. He had accumulated credits for all the practical work that he had done in education in the years between his Tuskegee graduation and 1922, much like an internship (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Simmons’ educational journey confirms Anderson’s research on the early normal schools, of which Tuskegee was a part.

Anderson (1988) writes: “Unlike students pursuing trade and technical training, normal school students sought professional education courses to achieve their major goal of becoming elementary school teachers” (p. 35). This researcher surmises that Simmons’ quest for higher education plausibly explains his conviction that vocational education training was not enough. Further, Simmons’ pursuit of higher education at the university level exemplifies his belief that attaining a higher degree was a sine qua non for better equipping himself academically, and gaining a level of respectability for his accomplishments. It is known that Simmons aimed to encourage a sense of racial pride among the African American community. The Arizona Daily Star revealed: “Not long ago, in a public address in Tucson, he [Simmons] advocated the employment of negroes [sic] for the purpose of teaching negroes [sic] in order to foster race [sic] pride and to aid race [sic] progress” (“Negro School,” 1913, p. 8). Simmons modeled the pursuit of academic excellence before his students and the Black community. African American Tucsonans commend his accomplishments. According to The Dunbar Project (1995), “Mr. Cicero Simmons could easily be considered the Father of African American Education in Tucson” (p. 29). Upon finishing his principalship position at Dunbar in
1925, Simmons decided to travel to California where he taught manual training for a year (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

It is not known what Simmons expected when he arrived in Tucson to be the first principal of the segregated school. However, upon his arrival, he found unsavory school site conditions. He was paid a monthly salary of $90 for the principalship job, and ended up spending $3 out of his wages on the school’s telephone bill (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Simmons was housed behind the school with his wife, Emma (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

Whether by accident or design, there are parallels between the beginnings of Hampton Institute and the formation of the Colored School. Hampton Institute was housed in a dilapidated building, formerly army barracks converted from a plantation owner’s mansion (Engs, 1999). The pre-Dunbar era school, located near the corner of Sixth Street and Sixth Avenue, formerly Stonecypher’s Bakery, could hardly be called a mansion. It was a one-room structure deemed inadequate for housing a school. The school’s 211 East Sixth Street site was situated in a busy industrial area without a recreational area for children (The Dunbar Project, 1995). The physical conditions of the building were considered so poor that it is reported that the first teacher, Mabel Bland, terminated her position (Zanders, 1946). Bland was the assistant hired to help Simmons during the early days of the school (Cooper, 1967). Her name is listed with other elementary school teachers in the July 21, 1917 Pima County School Trustee Minutes of District Number 1. According to The Dunbar Project (1995), Bland remained at the school for two years. She earned a monthly salary of $75, ten dollars less than other
elementary teachers in the district (Pima County School Trustee Minutes, 1917). In addition to the deplorable conditions, the school site was too far away from the children’s homes. Further, the railroad tracks that separated children from the school, posed a serious danger (Zanders, 1946). Thus, the early beginnings of the segregated school reveal that little attention was paid to the school site. This neglect extended into Dunbar years later. The Colored School, which kept its name from 1913-1917, emerged during a period of segregation, and was formed when the prevailing White sociopolitical climate of the day was laden with airs of superiority, power and privilege.

Formally established in 1918, Dunbar later became an amalgamated elementary and junior high school that seemed to blend educational philosophies of both Washington and Du Bois. Testimonials by Dunbar students reveal that the junior high school, under the leadership of Morgan Maxwell Sr. endorsed Booker T. Washington’s devotion to work and the achievement of excellence. However, the focus for Dunbar students was not restricted to excellence in vocational education, but rather excellence in education overall. One former student remarked: “I was successful in school. I was successful in my athletic endeavors. I had success in whatever I attempted to do” (Personal communication, March 26, 2004). A veteran teacher stated: “Excellence was our goal” (Personal communication, July 22, 2004). The mere selection of the school’s name, Paul Laurence Dunbar School, on October 31, 1917 (Zanders, 1946) is a testimonial to the academic emphasis that the school was to have. The fact that Cicero Simmons was at the helm at the time of the name change further attests to his belief in Afrocentric pride and his desire for the school’s academic excellence.
The difficulty in framing the school's philosophy lies in the fact that it seesawed between the educational stances of Washington and Du Bois. Simmons himself, the first principal, personified a hybrid educational experience. Hudson, the acting principal who led the school in 1939 on the eve of Maxwell's arrival, was also schooled at Tuskegee Institute (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Maxwell, by contrast, enjoyed professional training steeped in academia. Yet, a segment of the curriculum offerings at Dunbar during his administration included Shop classes for boys and Domestic Science for girls. This offering was congruent with the menu of subjects provided by junior high schools in the United States at that time (Hansen, 1963). Although some of Dunbar's leaders were trained in vocational education, and the school offered industrial and domestic science classes at the junior high level between 1940-1951, its greater emphasis right from its inception and into the years of Maxwell's administration was on the academic development of its students as advocated by Du Bois' philosophy, which aimed to equip Blacks to compete with the mainstream.

This researcher believes that the difference in the educational ideologies of the day as they relate to Dunbar lies in the acculturation process. The Tuskegee-Hampton model of schooling emphasized an end product of subservience and conformity to the status quo, almost in a sense of reverence for the existing dominant culture. By contrast, the Du Bois' position fostered in students a sense of self that stressed assertiveness and confidence in one's abilities to do well in the face of external, oppressive circumstances. Students heard words of encouragement on a daily basis. They were inculcated with the
belief that there was nothing that could stop their success. They were expected to do well, and they did.


"Booker T. and W.E.B."

"It seems to me," said Booker T.,
"It shows a mighty lot of cheek
To study chemistry and Greek
When Mister Charlie needs a hand
To hoe the cotton on his land,
And when Miss Ann looks for a cook,
Why stick your nose inside a book?"

"I don't agree," said W.E.B.,
"If I should have the drive to seek
Knowledge of chemistry or Greek,
I'll do it. Charles and Miss can look
Another place for hand or cook. Some men rejoice in skill of hand,
And some in cultivating land,
But there are others who maintain
The right to cultivate the brain."

"It seems to me," said Booker T.,
"That all you folks have missed the boat
Who shout about the right to vote,
And spend vain days and sleepless nights
In uproar over civil rights.
Just keep your mouths shut, do not grouse,
But work, and save, and buy a house."

"I don't agree," said W.E.B.,
"For what can property avail
If dignity and justice fail.
Unless you help to make the laws,
They'll steal your house with
trumped-up clause.

A rope's as tight, a fire as hot,
No matter how much cash you've got.
Speak soft, and try your little plan,
But as for me, I'll be a man."
"It seems to me," said Booker T. ...
"I don't agree,"
Said W.E.B.

Dudley F. Randall
Summary

In the late nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois were pioneers of educational thought for African Americans in the United States. Washington advocated vocational education as the vehicle by which Blacks could rise above the turbulent sociopolitical conditions of the day. By contrast, W. E. B. Du Bois upheld the elitist philosophy of the Talented Tenth as the medium through which African Americans could conquer de jure oppressive conditions, and elevate the status of Blacks. Both Washington and Du Bois were prominent contemporaries who held startlingly different positions on educational reform for Blacks, and who endured an array of controversy. What may appear to have been a gaping gulf between two polar perspectives may just have been a line drawn in the sand. Whereas Washington favored practical, economic self-sufficiency and independence as the door to success, Du Bois’ forthright recalcitrant approach esteemed academic growth and development as the correct pathway to advancement. The thread that unites these two opposing views is the fact that both Washington and Du Bois had an insatiable desire to see African Americans compete with oppressive forces, rise up in society, and excel.

The contributions of Washington and Du Bois must not be ignored in that each significantly helped to shape the educational framework that led to the inception of Tucson’s segregated “Colored School” and later Dunbar. It is known that Cicero Simmons, the first principal of the segregated school, and William Hudson, the fourth school leader, embodied the ideologies of both of these two illustrious African Americans. Both Simmons and Hudson came equipped with industrial school training,
and emphasized academics at Dunbar. Simmons had a desire to further his education and to improve himself academically. He embellished his credentials and earned a Bachelor's degree at the University of Arizona in order to better prepare himself to lead the elementary school. The first principal led the school through its early stages of growth and development, and continued steadfastly for six years before surrendering his leadership to the next principal. Simmons' foundational years at the segregated school set the stage for Dunbar's future. It is believed that the interim school principals took up the academic baton and carried this emphasis at the segregated school. Morgan Maxwell Sr. entered the Dunbar arena in 1940 and continued the trend of academic excellence for the duration of the school's existence.
Rationale

The historical development of Dunbar can be best understood and appreciated by lending scrutiny to the contours that ushered it into being. These contours are multi-textured and inextricably bound to each other in a tapestry of interwoven threads that helped to shape the eventuality of the segregated school. To pay scant attention to those threads is to eschew the wider implications of the study. Thus, a study of the evolution of the “Colored School” is not exclusively an educational matter, but rather a matrix of broader sociopolitical strands of influence.

A Closer Look at Tucson’s Social Climate in the Early to Mid-Twentieth Century

It is no secret that segregation was the order of the day in the early to mid-twentieth century for cities across the United States. The city of Tucson was no exception. While it is known that segregation existed, there is a chorus of conflicting opinions regarding the degree to which it was branded into the fabric of the old pueblo society. In an effort to piece together evidence that addresses Arizona’s social climate, and specifically Tucson’s racial climate at the inception of the “Colored School,” and later Dunbar, one must draw from existing records.
Reporter Tom Danehy of the *Tucson Weekly* states that Tucson’s attitude towards segregation paralleled that of the southern states. He writes:

The time was only decades ago. Not just in Selma, Alabama, nor Oxford, Mississippi, but right here in Tucson, Arizona. In the last of the contiguous 48 states, black people were treated no better than in the South, where hatred and bigotry were seen as a birthright. (Danehy, 1999, p. 14)

Danehy, who interviewed Dunbar alumni, states:

Many of those survivors [who] remember the time when Arizona’s bigotry was more oppressive than the heat and the laws more absurd than the petty folk who clung to them for an artificial sense of superiority gather every couple of years to see old friends and to bask modestly in the warmth of the victories won through silent dignity and unflinching perseverance. (Danehy, 1999, p. 14)

In contrast, Wagner (2004) of the *Arizona Daily Star* says that discrimination in Tucson did not equal that of other latitudes. He headlines his article this way: “Bias against blacks wasn’t as intense here as elsewhere.” He explains: “And so the black people’s history in Tucson is as old as Tucson’s history itself. It is a story of segregation and separation, but also of equal rights, peaceful integration and religious celebration” (Wagner, 2004, p. E3).
When asked about the social climate in Tucson for this research study, one former Dunbar teacher and student remarked:

Oh, we talked about it [the segregation climate]. In fact we had films that showed us what was happening in the South. Some of the conditions that people had to live under, some of the problems that they had and what we had here was not similar. They at least exposed us to that. They had presentations that were made that said, “Here are some of the problems that Negroes had to experience,” and that we should be glad that we are living here. And while we are not happy with all of the conditions here, at least they are not that bad. (Personal communication, March 26, 2004)

When the researcher probed further and asked if the segregation climate in Tucson might have been described as “benign,” the former teacher and student replied:

Yes [meaning it was accurate that segregation was benign]. There were no signs anywhere, just quiet indication. “I am sorry I can’t serve you,” or “I am sorry you can’t go there,” and if you ask, “Why?” then we were told that we don’t serve Negroes, that kind of thing. (Personal communication, March 26, 2004)

However, according to Taylor (1998), there were indeed traces of blatant Jim Crowism in Tucson. African American soldiers, in particular, fell victim to added discrimination. Taylor (1998) informs: “Discrimination followed African American soldiers throughout
the West. Businesses in towns as diverse as San Bernadino, Walla Walla, El Paso, and Tucson posted WE CATER TO WHITE TRADE ONLY signs" (pp. 264 -265). Another Dunbar teacher, the late Irene George, reported to the Arizona Daily Star:

I hated it [meaning segregation]. Even today I have a very low
tolerance of [sic] anything that smells faintly of segregation....

Take me by my merits. Accept me for what I’m able to be, but
don’t judge me by the color of my skin. (Cook, 1993, Section A, p. 9)

At the Tucson Council for Civic Unity Conference held April 15, 1950, one speaker stated: “Tucson is neither fish nor fowl, neither wholly southern nor wholly
western. It has derived elements from the South but also from the North and West.”
(Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950, p. 4).

Delving further into Tucson’s social climate, Lawson (1996) notes: “The Klan
burned crosses in Tucson” (p. 23). However, he also informs: “Unlike the states in the
deep South where lynchings by Klan members were common, no record of that kind of
torture by white-sheeted men are recorded in Arizona’s history” (Lawson, 1996, p. 23).

Harris (1983) conducted a study entitled The First 100 Years: A History of Arizona
Blacks. One of his interviewees, formerly of Georgia and Oklahoma, declared: “At least
they didn’t lynch you here, like they did back there” (p. 51). According to Harris (1983)
the Klu Klux Klan began to creep into Arizona between 1916 and 1917 with evidence of
its presence being noted in Phoenix, Glendale, Flagstaff and other rural areas. Statistics
provided by the Archives of Tuskegee Institute reveal there are records of lynching that
occurred in Arizona between 1882 and 1968, but all victims were cattle-rustlers (Council
for Civic Unity, 1949). It appears there is no recorded evidence that African Americans were ever lynched in the state. As Lawson (1996) correctly surmised, the Klan did not have a stronghold in Arizona.

Tapping only a few sources might leave one with a nebulous perception of Tucson's social climate in the early to mid-twentieth century. Thus, in order to come to terms with the truth in the midst of a seesaw of opinions, one must dig further. One approach to deciphering the social climate in Tucson is to examine the bigger picture - Arizona as a whole.

One strand of research provides evidence that the early territory mirrored the prevailing separatist attitudes of the South. Zanders (1946) conducted a study on Negro Education in Tucson, Arizona, in which she argued that separatist attitudes of the South existed in territorial Arizona. Zanders built her argument on observations made by Lockwood (1932). Lockwood, who presents his research from a Eurocentric point of view, explains that on the eve of statehood “Arizona was decidedly democratic in its proclivities” (Lockwood, 1932, p. 369). Zanders used this statement as a premise for her observations. She proposed that the Confederate slant of the territory favored practices bent toward segregation of Whites and Blacks. She further noted that it was not until the Democrats won a majority footing in the capital's House of Representatives that Arizona was welcomed into the Union (Zanders, 1946). Her conclusion about the sociopolitical climate of Arizona's early days was: “Segregation of the Negro in everything social has been a perpetual policy of the Democratic Party, and it is natural that the territory should follow the principles established by the political party it favored” (Zanders, 1946, p. 15).
It is interesting to note that originally Democrats for the most part favored pro-slavery efforts while Republicans opposed. However, in the late nineteenth century the slavery issue caused a split among the Democrats. It was during Franklin D. Roosevelt’s era when the tables turned and the Democratic Party became the voice of the masses and the Republican Party favored the elite.

An Arizona journal, *The Nation’s Schools*, sheds light on segregation in the southwest state. It reveals: “Arizona had a comparatively long history of race segregation. The territory was populated mostly by settlers from Texas, Kentucky and Tennessee, who brought with them strong Southern traditions” ("A Pattern for Integration," 1956, p. 43). Similarly, Harris (1983) concludes: “The Arizona Territory, furthermore, was unique in that this southwest area of predominant Mexican and Indian population, soon legally adopted most of the trappings and customs of the Deep South, from where many Blacks were fleeing” (Harris, 1983, p. ii).

Nimmons (1971) conducted a study entitled *Arizona’s Forgotten Past: The Negro in Arizona 1939-1965*. Like Harris (1983), Lawson (1996) and Zanders (1946), Nimmons also writes from an Afrocentric point of view, although with slightly different conclusions. He found that Southerners did not immigrate to Arizona in overwhelming numbers. Although recognizing the dominance of prejudice across the entire United States, Nimmons posits: “To claim that Arizona became another typical ‘Southern-conservative’ stronghold during this era is misleading” (p. 89). He adds:

Racism in the Southwest, and in Arizona in particular, was therefore not all Southern in origin, nor was it strictly a
combination of North-South attitudes either. Its roots lay deep in the minds of a far more heterogeneous group who settled Arizona. Besides the original Spanish and Mexican settlers and those who came to the territory from all parts of the United States, a considerable number emigrated from throughout Europe as well. Some even immigrated from Asia. Generally speaking, all the members of these various groups arrived with a set of pre-conceived ideas concerning race and society. (Nummons, 1971, p. 90)

In tracing the history of conquering settlers in Arizona, Nimmons (1971) notes they were predominately European. Nevertheless, one is not naive to the fact that there were Native Americans dispersed all over the Southwest long before the arrival of the Europeans. Interestingly, researchers have noted that the first person to traverse Arizonan soil was a Black Moroccan man, Esteban, also referred to, in derivative terms, as “Estevan” or “Estevanico,” after whom Esteban Park in Tucson is named (Lawson, 1996). His name translates from Spanish as “Stephen.” In tracing the history of conquering settlers in Arizona, Nimmons (1971) points out that they were predominately European and lays the blame for the prevailing racist attitudes in the cooper state at their feet.

Critical to our understanding of the social climate in early Arizona, however, is the root of prevailing racist attitudes. Nimmons (1971) attributes the social climate of the early territory to “social and political conservatives and racist-minded whites” and their
"pre-conditioned beliefs" (p. 5), but also points out that not all Whites embraced anti-Negro sentiments. Drawing from the research of Wilgus (1936), Nimmons provides a hierarchical analysis of a European-designed caste system utilized by colonial Hispanic America. At the top of the hierarchy were White Europeans. The middle class was comprised of "peones," who were non-Whites. "Mulattoes" were Negro-White. "Mestizos" were Indian-White. "Sambos," were Negro-Indian. Full-blooded Negro slaves, at the bottom of the totem pole, were labeled "puras castas." They were not only treated cruelly, but were also not easily integrated into mainstream Hispanic American (Nimmons, 1971). It is also interesting to note, however, that "Negroes" could advance within Latin American society (Nimmons, 1971). Nimmons informs: "Mulattoes, as well as slaves, could escape their lowly estate through marriage or the accumulation of wealth, both of which advanced the status of the non-white within his or her community" (p. 15). 

The aforementioned information points to the classifications of individuals according to ethnicity and racial mixture. The labeling of such individuals is significant because labels box people into categories. Thus, the hierarchical race structure broadens our understanding of the mentality of Arizonans during territorial days and beyond. It is believed that the racial attitudes that accompanied these social delineations were a major contributing force that molded the cultural atmosphere throughout the southwest state.

Fast forwarding to the mid-twentieth century, the city of Tucson was faced with a larger and more diverse population, the breakdown of which is provided later in this chapter. As a result of increased social tension in the pueblo, several interest groups driven by a sense of justice and equality, launched comprehensive investigations to
uncover the situation. Such groups were the Tucson Urban League Service Council, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, the Tucson Council for Civic Unity, and the Arizona Council for Civic Unity.

**Tucson Urban League Service Council**

The Tucson Urban League Service Council decided to investigate the racial situation in 1954. In March of that year the Council hired W. Miller Barbour, Western Field Director of the National Urban League, which was an affiliate of United Community Defense Services, Inc., to conduct a study on *Racial Minority Conditions in Tucson and the Tucson Urban League Service Council*. Barbour hailed from east of the San Francisco Bay, California (Taylor, 1998). His investigation lasted seven days. He gathered information largely through personal interviews with distinguished citizens from the community and through random selection of members of the community (Barbour, 1954). Additionally, he collected information from group leaders and the newspaper. He also chaired several group meetings. The goal of the Council was not only to assess race relations in Tucson in the mid-twentieth century, but also to address the problems "affecting minority groups, and their relation to the predominant Caucasian group of Tucson" (Barbour, 1954, p. iv).

Barbour cited five principal facts that contributed to the personality of Tucson. First, he noted that Tucson’s border town location made it easily accessible to immigrants from the Mexican frontier, Texas and the South. Barbour remarked:

Many of the recent in-migrants, as well as the early white
natives of the area, have come to this community from the South. They brought with them their traditions and mores, and these affected and gave cultural form to the community. Thus, Tucson, became southern in its approach to and the handling of minority problems. There were modifications from the more rigid southern customs, and some of this was influenced by the presence of a large group of Spanish speaking residents whose cultural patterns did not accept this differentiation of racial groupings. Although the southern influence tended to win out, the usual accompanying hostility and intensity of negative feelings lessened. (Barbour, 1954, p. 13)

Secondly, Barbour recorded that industry, manufacturing, and in particular labor unions [he emphasized in his report] were clearly on the rise. Due to the increase in available jobs, outsiders from other states were flocking to the city. The problem with this, according to Barbour, was that some of the newcomers to Tucson “did not share the view of those coming in from the South” (Barbour, 1954, p. 13). Additionally, he observed that there were inequities in the local hiring practices; a fair democratic system was not being utilized in the process. “Minorities” were simply excluded. Barbour sensed, however, that Tucsonans were conscious of the injustices of segregation, but chose benign neglect instead (Barbour, 1954).

Thirdly, Barbour pointed to the fact that Tucson was a tourist attraction, a sanctuary for good-health seekers, and that its natural attributes attracted individuals from across
the United States. He also observed that although many newcomers to the city “did not accept or like the idea of a segregated society” (Barbour, 1954, p. 13), they brought ideas that were conducive to a positive change in the realm of interracial politics. Barbour also noted that the newcomers were not eager to exert energy to solve Tucson’s problems (Barbour, 1954).

Fourthly, Barbour noted that attempts by the University of Arizona to become a cultural center were a sore reminder to the Tucsonan society of the need to embrace all groups, including all ethnicities and races.

Lastly, Barbour highlighted that young leadership within the White circles of the day aggressively expressed the desire to bridge the gap between the races. He felt that their leadership could be trusted to develop a formidable force in the face of more flagrant, racial injustices.

The findings made by Barbour (1954) paralleled the observations made by Nimmons (1971) in one respect – the race classification strata used in Arizona. Barbour speaks about conflicts between the Spanish-White community and the Caucasian segment of the community. He also suggested that there were contentious issues between Blacks and Whites. In addressing his findings about racial attitudes in Tucson, he writes:

It should be pointed out that the Spanish-white [sic] is still largely a census definition. In 1940 the United States Bureau of the Census yielded to contentions that the Spanish-speaking group was Caucasian. Anthropologically speaking, this is true. In terms of the status of the Spanish speaking people in many southwestern
communities, and this goes for Tucson, he [meaning the person who is Spanish-White] fits the criteria established for minority group position. In other words, the Caucasian segment of the population still considers him as non-white. This role is flexible, of course, and there are many instances that when the Spanish speaking person achieves educational or economic status he can overcome this barrier and be accepted as white. For other minority groups, indicated in Table 111 on racial distributions, their position in the social scheme of things is a more fixed one. Their high visibility lessens their chances of escaping the community taboos and restrictions based on race or ethnic origin [all parts italicized are emphasized in the Barbour report]. (Barbour, 1954, p. 10)

In an attempt to comprehend the nuances of race relations in Tucson in the mid-twentieth century, this researcher will comment on several puzzling aspects of Barbour's report. He underscores a grave concern for the increasing number of ethnic groups in the city of Tucson. Zanders (1946), in setting the stage for her study of Negro Education in Tucson, likewise focuses on city officials who felt threatened by a growing “Negro problem” in the desert town. The problem was an increased number of Blacks. Barbour's study spells out the concerns of 1954:

*The fact that there is a large racial-ethnic minority grouping of itself points to the need for very careful planning, if all of these*
groups are to be made a part of a truly integrated community.

Of interest is the inter-relationship of the minority groups with the majority groups, as well as the inter-relationships that exist between the minorities. The question then posed is whether the sum total of these inter-relationships is reacting to the benefit or detriment of the community. The total community, and what happens to it, is the final answer. But the answer can only be measured in terms of what is happening to the various population segments that make up the whole community.

(Barbour, 1954, pp. 10-11)

The racial groups to which Barbour refers are Native American, Chinese, Japanese and "other." Although he mentions several groups throughout his study, the group that he principally targets is the "Negro" (listed separately from other ethnic groups).

Ostensibly, it does appear that the previous quote reflects a genuine concern for integration of the races. This researcher believes that the leaders of the Council who initiated the study were motivated by altruism attempting to rectify the problems of racial inequity in Tucson, specifically between Blacks and Whites. Hence, the Council made an effort to secure someone from the outside to investigate such a sensitive issue. The sincerity of the Council's motives is underscored by the laudable suggestions made by the new president, Laura Owen, and her assistant, Mrs. Hubert H. d'Autremont, at the end of the report. They called for the following: A job development program with emphasis on career guidance, a housing program for underrepresented groups on an
"open occupancy basis," and the formation of an Urban League servicing visible
"minorities" of the Tucson area, namely African Americans, Spanish-Americans,
Orientals and Native Americans. These suggestions raised by Tucson officials at the
conference indicated genuine concern for the improvement of race relations. However,
just two years prior to the Tucson conference, Barbour was noted as having stated at
another Urban League function: "The Negro does not think of temporary housing units as
temporary. He knows that very little housing is available to him and the reasons it will
not be provided" (Taylor, 1998, p. 274). As one carefully scrutinizes Barbour's
comments in the Tucson report, salient observations are highlighted.

First, Barbour makes no recommendations at all in the first part of the report
addressing the racial climate in Tucson. This was the chief purpose of the investigation.
Referring to his report, Barbour states: "These are the writer's impressions and they are
shared with the community out of a sincere professional desire to render a service to the
community" (Barbour, 1954, p. 48). Typically, investigative reports provide clear
recommendations. Barbour admits that he deliberately makes none.

In the second part of the report, entitled Tucson Urban League Council:
"Strengthening Inter-Group and Race Relations," Barbour does provide the Council with
recommendations. He reiterates the goals of the new president and makes a bold
suggestion:

That the present Board be enlarged (number to be set by
present Board) and strengthened by the addition of persons
from industry, business, labor, other community organizations,
and in particular, emphasis be given to finding good leadership from minorities other than Negroes” [italics added for emphasis] (Barbour, 1954, p. 56).

Barbour’s comments reveal his belief that African Americans were unsuitable for leadership positions. The question that arises is: Why would African Americans be unsuitable for leadership?

Furthermore, to the Council, he writes: “It is also possible that the Council might conduct its own community inventories of problems with which it wishes to concern itself with implemental help and direction from qualified research people at the University or in the community” (Barbour, 1954, p. 55). The question that arises here is: Are non-academics inept to raise concerns with the Council? The Barbour report repeatedly makes reference to the fact that African Americans were unable to secure better jobs because they were unqualified. This researcher deduces from Barbour’s own words that he believed that Blacks were unfit to address social injustices.

No doubt, Tucson was experiencing racial problems during the mid-twentieth century. Given the presence of segregation throughout the state, and indeed throughout the nation, Tucson echoed, to some degree, attitudes of White supremacy. Likely too, that Barbour himself, who was recruited for the study, harbored attitudes of racial prejudice. Further, the tone of the report, although appearing to have a veneer of neutrality and professionalism, seems to be targeted primarily at Tucson’s Black-White relationships, which may point to the fact that this was the area of greatest tension at that
time. Although Barbour's judgment appears to be negative, the information provided in the report has proven invaluable for this study.

Although Barbour cites other racial groups in his report, there is minimal discussion about Hispanic-White relationships. There is sparse mention of the Chinese. There is little reference to Native Americans. The preponderance of discussion reflects Barbour’s analysis of the Black-White relationships in Tucson and their impact on the social climate. Yet, the study is entitled *Pima County Arizona: A Study of Race Relations.*

When discussing the economic depression in the United States at that time and its impact on the employment situation at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, for example, Barbour specifically raises the following question: “How does this [the depression] affect the minority groups, particularly the Negro, in Tucson?” (Barbour, 1954, p. 21). Yet, Hispanics outnumbered Blacks at that time.

According to the 1950 Tucson Census Report, there were 10,964 people classified as “Spanish-White” compared to 2,783 “Negroes” (Zanders, 1946). However, the focus of concern was “Negroes” at the Air Force Base, not Hispanics. It is believed that African Americans at the time were concerned about their livelihood in the face of the Depression. Jobs were being lost. African Americans, as well as other racial groups in the old pueblo were not happy. Barbour (1954) underscores in his report: “*Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, where the civilian employees have amounted to 1000 or more persons, has also laid off some individuals*” (p. 21). In that same paragraph he states: “Motels that were usually filled at this season of the year reported vacancies. The stores indicated less spending was taking place” (Barbour, 1954, p. 21).
comment that Barbour raises the issue of the impact of such conditions on the Negro in particular. He explains: "The Negro community has been fairly hard hit, particularly by the closing down of Grand Central and the Southern Pacific Repair Shop and in the construction industry" (Barbour, 1954, p. 22). He writes: "A number of Negroes had been employed as machinists and in other technical jobs at these two companies" (Barbour, 1954, p. 22).

Due to the Depression, several families opted to leave Tucson while others remained (Barbour, 1954). However, those who remained were forced to accept more menial and custodial jobs that resulted in salary cuts, ultimately signifying less income for families. Barbour (1954) states: "Negroes were not in high enough skilled categories" (p. 22). He continues:

It should be emphasized that most of the Negroes who worked in these two particular shops were not offered employment elsewhere because they were not in high enough skilled categories. By and large these companies, recruiting workers from plants, were searching for the technically and highly skilled worker. Not only were they seeking this type of qualification but they were searching the employment records very carefully in terms of the workers' productivity. There were some instances in which a highly skilled or technically trained person did not get a job because his work record was not good. Negroes made up a percentage of this category..." (Barbour, 1954, p. 22)
The Council expressed its concern about how to best address the needs of such social groups. It began by examining the history of Tucson and its demographics. The Council’s historical analysis revealed that since 1775, the year that marked Tucson’s birthday, there had been stable growth in the city’s population up until 1940 (Barbour, 1954). By contrast, 1940 signaled a year of astronomical growth in Tucson’s population making it the leader in Pima County (Barbour, 1954). Other western cities also experienced astronomical growth, especially among their Black population; Las Vegas led the numbers (Taylor, 1998). Even with a marked increase of Black migrants to Tucson, the number was modest comparatively (Taylor, 1998). Still, the population explosion of racial groups raised an alarm for city officials in Tucson.

Nimmons (1971) concludes: “In general, then Arizona’s relationship with Negroes had been a strange combination of Southern benevolency and urban de facto segregation and discrimination” (p. 5). Lawson describes the social climate in Tucson best when he writes that there was a spirit of “territorial ambivalence” in Arizona (Lawson, 1996, p. 40). An obvious dichotomy comes to mind: Did the segregation in Tucson develop alongside the separatist legislation? Or, did the de jure legislation actually create a divide in Tucson which otherwise would not have arisen? To answer these questions, one must turn to additional documented evidence from several organizations.
Fair Employment Practices Commission

While civil rights were being violated in cities across the United States, Tucson took substantial, proactive steps to quell the vestiges of segregation, and to iron out its own social inequities. Several organizations participated in this effort. One such organization was the Tucson chapter of the Fair Employment Practices Commission (hereafter referred to as F.E.P.C.) that had already enjoyed success in seven other states, namely New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, and in three large cities Philadelphia, Cleveland and Minneapolis (Furnas, 1952). The aim of the F.E.P.C. was to police discrimination in hiring practices in the workplace. Simultaneously, the organization sought to educate employers about their need to integrate the work environment, and to subvert obvious prejudice. Of course, the F.E.P.C. could not forbid prejudice, but it prohibited overt actions that facilitated racial discrimination in the workplace (Furnas, 1952). On September 26, 1950, the Tucson chapter proposed an ordinance for the city in which it emphasized equal opportunity for all of its citizens (Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1950). The proposal urgently called for a special election to empower the F.E.P.C. on behalf of racial discrimination. The following excerpt outlines their mission:

That each man – in Tucson – shall know “justice”… and security… an equal chance to do his best…,150 people gathered at a public conference during Brotherhood Week in 1950, and decided to establish a Citizens Committee for Fair Employment Practices in Tucson. This committee, made up of representative
Tucsonans of all faiths and walks of life, has but one purpose: To secure passage of an effective FEP ordinance for Tucson, so that Brotherhood may become the rule every day of every year.

(Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1950, p. i)

The F.E.P.C. called for an immediate end to discrimination. The need was dire. The Commission wrote:

Tucson needs an FEPC now to put an end to discrimination being practiced every day, sometimes subtly, sometimes openly, against members of minority groups who comprise one third of the city’s population. All men and women in Tucson are NOT being given an equal chance. It is only right that an ordinance be established by the people of Tucson to guarantee that henceforth every just means be employed to insure all members of the community the same chance to work and to support themselves as their abilities permit. Not only the minorities, but ALL of Tucson stands to benefit by such action. (Fair Employment Practices Commission, p. 2)

Clearly, racial discrimination was practiced in Tucson. Although the city was not steeped in Jim Crowism, its presence was felt nonetheless. Tucson was not a paradise of harmonious interracial living. It was uncommon to see Mexican American clerks behind drug store counters, or Blacks as bank tellers. Black men were prohibited from
becoming foremen at industries regardless of competence or years of experience (Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1950). Restaurants and lunch counters did not serve "Negroes." Hotels and motels refused Blacks. Movie theaters forbade Blacks to sit where they wanted. Fraternities and sororities at the University of Arizona prohibited Blacks from joining their groups; they had to start their own. University dormitories were closed to "Negroes." African American university graduates, who sought employment in their chosen field of study, were turned down in Tucson, and were forced to pursue job possibilities elsewhere. Labor unions completely bypassed Franklin Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802 of June 25, 1941 that outlawed discrimination in the workplace (Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1950). Thus, the F.E.P.C. rightly concluded: "There was a great deal of discrimination being practiced in Tucson" (Fair Employment Practices Commission, p. 4). The commonality of injustice contributed to its acceptance. One member of the F.E.P.C. wrote: "Perhaps many of us have become so accustomed to discriminatory practices that we accept them as "natural" and no longer recognize them" (Fair Employment Practices Commission, 1950, p. 3). For these reasons the F.E.P.C. sought legislative support in order to squash discrimination in Tucson.

The Tucson Council for Civic Unity

In the 1950s the issue of housing was at the forefront both for city officials and for various racial groups in the city of Tucson. Archival documentation and newspaper articles revealed that "visible minorities" in particular were being affected by the lack of affordable living accommodations. The Tucson Council for Civic Unity took up the
mantel and sought to address the city’s concerns. At a Conference on Human Relations, held on April 15, 1950 at Mansfield Junior High School, the Council held a forum with several local organizations to discuss matters of critical importance to the city. The following organizations participated in the conference: Alianza Hispano-Americana, B’nai B’rith of Tucson (a Jewish organization dedicated to fighting discrimination in Tucson), Holy Name Union, the N.A.A.C.P., Pima County Council, Parent-Teachers Association, Society of Friends, Tucson Central Trades Council, Tucson Council of Churches, Tucson Ministerial Association, Tucson Service Council of the National Urban League, and the United Council of Church Women.

Housing, the first matter on the conference agenda, was a hot topic that generated an acrimonious debate within the Tucson community. The opening statement of the Council’s report reads: “Much was done to clear the air and to make a frank appraisal of housing conditions in Tucson today” (Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950, p. 2). Specifically, the Council writes: “The great problem in housing segregation concerns the Negro. There is decided resistance in our community to Negroes living in residential areas that are now dominated by other groups” (Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950, p. 2). According to the Barbour Report (1954), the majority of African Americans were indeed living in the oldest sections of Tucson under sub-standard conditions. Some African Americans had purchased homes in other areas of the community. Tucson’s historic “A” Mountain was an all-Black residential area where residents enjoyed home ownership. African Americans were not welcomed in specific residential areas of Tucson. Mexican Americans, who were in greater number, had occupied the city longer
than other racial groups. They had established their neighborhoods and formed their own communities. Barbour (1954) claimed that some members of the Jewish community had also experienced housing discrimination in selected residential areas, but that this opposition was minimal. However, African Americans experienced far greater housing discrimination than other racial groups according to the Council's report (Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950). In an effort to minimize this hostility, two principal suggestions were offered: a long-term educational plan aimed at raising community consciousness and an aggressive stance against legislation that perpetuated racial discrimination.

Notwithstanding the long-term suggestions for ameliorating Tucson's housing problem of the 50s, the Council also highlighted a short-term plan. Because there was a dire need for affordable housing for low income families in Tucson, particularly African American, the Council citing the Public Housing Act of 1949 that permitted federal funding of housing projects, garnered local support from local governments. In this vein, the Citizens' Low-Cost Housing Committee suggested public housing projects. The plan was to circumvent access to federal funding and instead draw resources from the private sector to meet this need. A committee of Tucson businessmen led by Roy Drachman, agreed to fund a low-income housing project specifically designed to meet the needs of African Americans. The Committee planned to do its homework by surveying African American families to ascertain the kind of housing they desired, determining the initial payments they needed and the number of bedrooms required ("Negro Housing Project," 1951). The lot in the city had been selected, which was to be East 26<sup>th</sup> Street and South Third Avenue. The land had been donated by Mrs. Hubert d'Autremont of the Tucson
Council for Civic Unity. The aim was to build two and three bedroom homes for $6,000 each. The Tucson businessmen also sought to arrange for financial aid from banks for people in need ("Negro Housing Project," 1951).

Despite the noble intentions and optimism of Drachman's committee to create a modicum of respectability and a level field of opportunity in Tucson's housing situation, fierce opposition arose from African Americans, namely Major D. J. Watson of the N.A.A.C.P. and Eugene T. Lies. Watson protested that the housing was restrictive, a "ghettoization" of African Americans that "would set them back forty years" ("Negro Housing Project," 1951, p. 2A). Lies argued that because the legislature had just passed a bill for the desegregation of schools, a housing project would be ill-advised at that time. He felt that the desegregation initiative might impact the housing plans. Further, the concern was whether the committee could adequately handle the demand. In defense of the housing plan, the committee explained that the public housing need was to be met by private entrepreneurs, and not by governmental authorities. However, the plan still raised skepticism. The move was unprecedented. The *Tucson Citizen* expressed: "Such an undertaking, it is believed, has never been attempted in this country." ("Housing Group Closes Meeting," 1951, p. 2). On August 1, 1951, another meeting was held. This time only members of the planning committee were permitted to attend. Blacks were barred. Perhaps Blacks were prohibited from attending the meeting because of the stir that they caused at the previous Council meeting. A subsequent joint protest was issued from five civic organizations against the segregated, low-cost housing project for Blacks only. The dissenting organizations were the Tucson chapter of the N.A.A.C.P., the Tucson Council
for Civic Unity, the Tucson Ministerial Alliance, and the Charles Young Post of the American Legion. The plans were halted.

The wider Arizonan community kept a close eye on schools, as did the Council of Civic Unity. A theater manager in Tucson was approached by a member of the Tucson Urban League and was asked if he would eliminate segregation in his business. He candidly replied: “I’d like to oblige you, but you can’t expect us to not segregate when the state law and policy provides for segregation in schools. Get the school laws repealed first, and then we can talk this thing over” (Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950, p. 7). The Tucson chapter of the Council of Civic Unity continued its investigation of the racial climate at their April conference. That meeting confirmed the mindset of the theater manager with regard to school segregation.

The first speaker at the Council’s Conference on Human Relations who had recently arrived from the North “was shocked to find that there was a law in the State of Arizona requiring segregation and that there is a segregated school” (Conference on Human Relations, 1950, p. 1). That speaker was Margaret Knight, a White American. When asked why students were segregated, it was explained to her that the reason was “fear of the Negroes” (Conference on Human Relations, 1950, p. 1). Obviously, this mentality was steeped in the prevalent belief that Blacks were dangerous, and therefore needed to be feared. At the close of the conference, Knight gave a clarion call for social justice. She stated:

I went to public school in the north and had friends among many races. However, the city was really too large to know well the
individuals of other races. Since I have come to Tucson I have had the chance to really know people. At times we forget that we Anglos lose if we do not give our children a chance to work and play with other races. I beg that everything be done in this community to make that possible. (Conference on Human Relations, 1950, p. 6)

Also speaking at the Conference was Charlotte Wagner of the Tucson Community School. Her topic was to discuss inter-cultural education. She spoke powerfully:

It does no good to tell students; you must show them. We as individuals, as teachers, as parents, must learn to put our arms around the shoulders of the little Negro child...and have within us that legitimate affection for him as an innocent child. If we do that, the children will adopt our attitude and there will be no problem. There are many ways to teach children about other people and about other ways to do things without using stereotypes and without carrying over an attitude. ... If the teacher feels that people are important, so will the children. If she has all the material in the world but does not “feel” it... it is no use.

(Conference on Human Relations, 1950, pp. 5-6)

Raphael Brandes, chairman of the education committee, concluded his remarks at the Conference by saying: “We still have the problem with us in the form of adults who must
be unpoisoned by the poison of discrimination” (Conference on Human Relations, p. 1950, p. 7). The following quote summarizes the feelings of the attendees:

The Tucson Council for Civic Unity has felt that the priority in state action should be to remove discriminatory laws and that this one should be the first for us to work on since many people justify other forms of segregation on the grounds that the school law makes segregation the public policy in the state of Arizona. (Tucson Council for Civic Unity, 1950, p. 2)

Thus, what was happening in schools became the gauge for determining how the wider community should proceed in matters of segregation.

The Arizona Council for Civic Unity

The Arizona Council for Civic Unity was a socially conscious organization comprised of individuals who diligently sought to address the matter of segregation in schools. It was the parent group for the Tucson Council. Its members were motivated by the deep conviction that discrimination against any person regardless of race, color, creed or national origin was morally wrong.

Despite the agitation at the time with regard to equal opportunity for African Americans, the Arizona Council found that throughout the state, schools were the index that defined the social landscape in the Southwest. Whatever progress in race relations was being made, or lack thereof, was best reflected in schools. The a priori judgment at
the time was that if educational policy set the example for social equality, then other societal advances would follow suit.

Like the F.E.P.C. the Arizona Council for Civic Unity found that the Black population was the main victim of discriminatory practices, though not exclusively. The Council also recognized that the Hispanic and Native American communities in Arizona had fallen prey to discrimination. Given their genuine desire to ameliorate discriminatory social practices, the Council, headquartered in Phoenix, conducted a study on school segregation, and released a report on January 12, 1949. Using as a cornerstone the call of President Truman’s Committee of Civil Rights of 1946 to close the gap between philosophical ideals and daily practices, that is, to end social inequities, the Council inaugurated an assault on segregation in Arizonan schools.

The Council, like the F.E.P.C., attacked the logic of the *Plessy vs. Ferguson* separate-but-equal doctrine. Lifting their stance from the Truman Report findings, the Council quotes:

No argument or rationalization can alter this basic fact: a law which forbids a group of American citizens to associate with other citizens in the ordinary course of daily living creates inequality by imposing a caste status on the minority group.

(Arizona Council for Civic Unity, 1949, p. 4)

In 1940s, Arizona was the only state in the West that legalized segregation of African American children at the elementary level of education. Wyoming and New Mexico permitted segregation in both the primary and secondary grades (Arizona Council for
According to the Council, Arizona acquiesced to its baser instincts. In trying to find itself, the desert state attempted to assert influence by grievously copying the traditional pattern of the South. The Council, like the F.E.P.C., drew attention to the presence of racial injustice in places of public accommodation: restaurants, hotels, motels, movie theaters, public swimming pools and schools. The Council pointed out that in the cases where African Americans could gain entrance at movie theaters, their seating was restricted to the balconies. The Council discovered that trailer courts also denied access to Blacks, and that the Arizona National Guard did not enlist African Americans. Yet, feigning fairness, the state boasted the absence of steeped Jim Crowism, an integrated University of Arizona, mixed church memberships, the presence of Blacks in some places of entertainment, and no lynchings.

The Council’s report, however, uncovered a lack of uniformity regarding the implementation of segregation in Arizonan schools. Some cities strictly enforced segregation. Others cities merely permitted it. Still others chose to ignore the legislation altogether. Globe, Miami and Ajo were mining towns that adhered to the legislation, segregating Blacks. Nogales and Douglas, the Spanish-speaking border cities, segregated Negroes, but upheld a non-segregation policy toward Spanish-speaking students. According to the Council, “the reason for this policy is obvious: many of the prominent citizens are persons of Mexican extraction” (Arizona Council for Civic Unity, 1949, p. 12). Flagstaff segregated both African Americans and Hispanic children in the earlier elementary grades. St. Johns bent its segregation rules towards Spanish speaking and non-Spanish speaking students. Previously they maintained rigid separation of Mexican
and Anglo students. Springerville, a neighboring town to St. Johns, ignored the segregation mandate completely. The farming towns of Coolidge, Buckeye, Chandler, Casa Grande, Eloy, Safford and Duncan enjoyed their own measure of variation. Coolidge and Buckeye segregated only African Americans at the elementary levels, but desegregated the high school. Chandler, Casa Grande and Eloy rejected Black-White integration at both levels of schooling, while Safford and Duncan fiercely maintained segregation practices for both African American and Mexican children at the elementary level. Tucson was unique. Although it segregated students at the elementary and junior high levels, it was the only urban city that maintained a strong reputation for a "general spirit of fairness" (Arizona Council for Civic Unity, p. 14).

By 1949, the stage was set for the dismantling of segregation in Arizonan schools. Similar feelings of desegregation were brewing across the nation as the time grew closer and closer to the landmark victory of Brown v. Board of Education of 1954, which would forever erase legalized segregation from the face of education in the United States. What this ultimately meant was that segregated schools like Dunbar were on the threshold of disappearing forever. The evil of de jure segregation was crumbling, but the baby was about to be thrown out with the bath water. Dunbar would soon cease to exist.

Segregation in Arizona was a formidable force. News reports, research studies and local organizations all attest to its cancerous presence in the 48th state of the continental United States. The National Urban League, the F.E.P.C., the Arizona Council for Civic Unity, and the Tucson chapter made substantial strides to eradicate segregation in Arizona. The N.A.A.C.P., which led an active chapter in Tucson beginning in 1922, also
mobilized change (Harris, 1983). However, presently no archived records from the N.A.C.P. are available. All of the aforementioned organizations were harbingers of social change in Tucson.

The Miscegenation Act

Another way to assess the mind-set of early Arizona is to examine other laws that were passed. The Miscegenation Act of 1865 reflected Arizona’s legislative attitude towards race relations in the southwest state.

On December 18, 1865, W. C. Rowell of Hardyville presented a miscegenation statute at the Second Territorial Assembly in Prescott (Hardaway, 1986). It was a bill that prohibited intermarriage between Whites and Blacks, and Whites and mulattoes. The statute read:

The marriage of persons of Caucasian blood, or their descendants, with Negroes, Hindus, Mongolians, members of the Malay race, or Indians, and their descendants, shall be null and void. The marriage between parents and children, including grandparents and grandchildren of every degree, between brothers and sisters, of the one-half as well as of the whole blood, and between uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews, and between first cousins, are incestuous and void. Children born out of wedlock, or the relations thereof, are included within the prohibition. (Revised Statutes, 1901, pp. 3092-3093)
This legislation came into being at the end of the Civil War and was in keeping with national trends designed to regulate African Americans. Punishment for violation of the Act was not only meted out to the married couple, but also to the clergy who performed the marriage (Hardaway, 1986). Heavy-handed fines were on the books for contravening the Act. Offenders could be fined between $100 and $10,000 as well as face imprisonment for anywhere between three months and ten years (Hardaway, 1986). Upon confession, the judge had the power to impose the fine, imprison or issue both punishments (Hardaway, 1986).

The Miscegenation Act went unchallenged for 31 years in Arizona until a Supreme Court ruling challenged its constitutionality (Hardaway, 1986). In an effort to maintain a lily-white populace, according to Hardaway, between 1887 and 1913 the Act was amended to extend prohibition of intermarriage between anyone who descended from the White race, and anyone of Negro, Mongolian or Indian origin. The law eliminated the possibility of marriage between anyone of mixed White blood with another of mixed White blood. This piece of legislation appears to be a clear case of theater of the absurd: that a mixed individual would not be permitted to marry at all!

Nimmons (1971) records that between 1860 and 1890, over 500 mixed marriages took place in Arizona. Yancey (1933) reports that several mixed marriages occurred in Tucson. Given the large number of interracial marriages that took place in Arizona, it appears that the stiff punishments decreed by legislators were not strictly enforced. Surprisingly, it was not until March 12, 1962, when Governor Paul J. Fannin realized the folly of the legislation, and declared the law unconstitutional (Hardaway, 1986).
This piece of information is essential to build an understanding of the attitudes of Arizonan legislators in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

**Arizona Legislation and Its Impact on the “Colored School”**

By examining the background on the establishment of Tucson’s Colored School, one is better able to appreciate the school’s historical development. Early in the twentieth century, Woodrow Wilson of Virginia was the U. S. President. His administrative years span 1913-1921. He was a Democrat who supported discriminatory practices of the South that sought to limit the economic advancement of Blacks (Anderson, 1988).

Early on, the southwest territory functioned independently. Lockwood (1932) writes: “There was no other person in Washington, save General Heintzelman, who took any interest in Arizona affairs. They had something else to occupy their attention, and did not even know where Arizona was” (p. 149). Arizona did gain the attention of Washington, however, early into the twentieth century. On February 14, 1912, Arizona relinquished its territorial status to officially become the 48th state (Lockwood, 1932). In its first year of statehood, in keeping with the national trajectory of de jure legislative policies, Arizona opted to maintain the segregation law that extended to school segregation.

On May 20, 1912, the Twenty-fifth Legislative Assembly of Arizona convened and revisited the Civil Code of 1909 that permitted segregation and amended it to read:

To prescribe and enforce rules not inconsistent with the law or those prescribed by the State Board of Education for their own
government and the government of schools. They *shall* [italics added] segregate pupils of the African race from pupils of the white race, and to that end are empowered to provide all accommodations made necessary by such segregation. (Revised Arizona Statutes, 1913, p. 921)

This legislation was passed. It must be noted however, that Governor Joseph Kibbey, head of the newly formed state, vetoed the decision to segregate, but the legislature had its way and overturned his decision (Barbour, 1954). This legislation signaled a face change in Arizonan education sparked by the separate school policy. This meant that Black students would be precluded from receiving a formal education within mainstream classrooms. Prior to the implementation of the legislation, African American children in the southwest territory were scattered among the mainstream school-aged population. The *Arizona Daily Star* quoted Morgan Maxwell Jr., son of Dunbar’s last principal, who remarked: “Up until Arizona began its statehood, the schools were not segregated” (Wagner, 2004, p. E3). Some private Catholic schools welcomed Blacks. Sacred Heart Catholic School, for example, located in the Fort Lowell area, was a fee-paying school that catered to grades one through eight, and enrolled African American children (Personal communication, October 20, 2004). Similarly, De Porres Elementary School, which was located on Speedway, was an African mission school that accepted Blacks and Hispanics. Due to the passage of the legislation, public schools closed the door to integration.
Lawson (1996) reports that prior to the passage of the legislation, there was only a sprinkling of Blacks in the southwest territory. At the time, there were only 15 African American families living in Tucson. At the turn of the century, Arizona’s population started to boom. According to Yancy (1933), in 1900 the Federal Census Bureau reported that there were 92,903 Whites and 1,848 Blacks in the southwest territory. By 1910, there were 171,468 Whites and 2,009 Blacks; the latter were dispersed throughout the region (Yancy, 1933). In Tucson, the Bureau reported that in 1900 there were 86 "Negroes" in the old pueblo. However, by 1910 there were 222 (Yancy, 1933).

Giddings (1984) points out that racial strife in the South forced African Americans to migrate to the North and West. Indeed by 1920 the populations of the North and West had increased significantly. Giddings (1984) writes: “There were 470,000 more Afro-Americans in the North and West in 1920 than there had been in 1910, and their presence inflamed the labor competition in a shrinking job market” (p. 145).

It appears that the influx of Afro-Americans into major cities of Arizona posed a potential threat to the existing power structure. This point is echoed consistently throughout the Barbour Report (1954), in Arizonan legislation, and by scholars (Taylor, 1998; Zanders, 1946). The “Negro problem” for the mainstream Arizonan community was the swelling of the Black population, which nearly tripled between 1890 and 1909 (Zanders, 1946). For this reason, Arizona policy makers sought pro-segregationist legislation, which in turn brought the segregated Colored School into being.

Some Black Tucsonans, among whom were Rev. Cole and Rev. Raven, strongly favored the idea of a separate school for African Americans (Zanders, 1946). According
to Zanders (1946), Rev. Cole, in addition to being a clergy member, was a realtor, rooming house manager and owner of an employment agency (Zanders, 1946). Both Cole and Raven rallied under the leadership of Charles Phillips, who is described as "a person of questionable character, a self-styled political potentate who at one time was sergeant-at-arms in the elections during Governor Hunt's administration" (Zanders, 1946, p. 23). Phillips, selected clergy, and their followers petitioned for a separate school approximately a year and a half before it came into being (Zanders, 1946).

According to an account provided by the late Willie Fears, Dunbar alumni committee chairlady, anecdotal testimonies reported that Cicero Simmons contacted Rev. Cole prior to his arrival in Tucson, soliciting a job (Dunbar School Reunion, 1989). The alumni bulletin also revealed: "He [Simmons] agreed to pay Rev. Cole if he could locate employment for him in Tucson" (Dunbar School Reunion, 1989, p. 1). Yet, Harris (1983) writes that Simmons "was one of the vocal leaders of the protest against segregation" (p. 64). It is reported that Simmons initially came to Arizona from Alabama seeking a health sanctuary. He lived in Phoenix before coming to Tucson, and had proven himself to be an able leader there (The Dunbar Project, 1995). However, despite his anti-segregation beliefs, Simmons accepted the Tucson position because he needed a job (Dunbar School Reunion, 1989).

One would have thought that the Thursday morning newsbreak in the Arizona Daily Star announcing the new "Negro School" would have been met with unanimous cheers in the African American community. However, the reaction to the news was anything but unanimous. Several Black Tucsonans vehemently opposed the idea of a segregated
school (Zanders, 1946). A mass meeting of “colored citizens of Pima County, Tucson, Arizona” was held on July 11, 1912 in which they expressed their discontentment with the decision, and the conditions under which children would be forced into schooling (Zanders, 1946). The following excerpt appeared in the minutes of the School Board Trustees of 1912:

Whereas the educational code for the State of Arizona was passed and approved by the Governor that certain children or groups of children should be segregated and whereas the school board of Tucson, Arizona, construes this mandate to mean that they are empowered to separate the colored children from all the others, although no particular race is mentioned in said legislative enactment;

Be it therefore resolved that the colored citizens, taxpayers and patrons of Pima County do hereby in mass meeting make strong protest against this unjust decision. And it be further resolved that as the state legislature in the said enactment made no provision for the maintenance of said segregation which would mean deprivation of school advantages to our children.

Resolved therefore that we beseech the school Board of trustees that they take no further steps in segregating our children this session, unless the facilities arranged such as an adequate number of teachers, charts, ventilation, heating and other requirements, appropriate and enjoyed by the children of the present-day schools are equally as good as the law expressly reads. (Zanders, 1946, p. 26)

According to the Board of Trustees Minutes, there were several reasons for the outcry against the establishment of a separate school. First, the feeling was that Black children would be deprived of the equal educational opportunities afforded to White children. At the segregated school, there was going to be only one teacher, Principal Simmons, who had recently applied. He would be expected to teach, carry out janitorial duties and oversee the school (Zanders, 1946). Secondly, the facilities of the segregated
school were substandard. Fifty school-aged children were to be housed in a small, substandard schoolhouse. Thirdly, there would be insufficient resources to maintain the segregated school. A lack of teachers, charts and proper ventilation at the site were also among the concerns. Fourthly, the dilapidated building, near the corner of Sixth Street and Sixth Avenue, formerly Stonecypher's Bakery, was deemed inadequate for housing a school. Fifthly, the school site was too far from the children's homes. Finally, crossing the railroad tracks to attend school was deemed a danger for students. On these grounds, the "colored" citizens of Pima County protested any further plans for the school (Zanders, 1946).

The majority of Tucsonan Blacks protested the establishment of the segregated school. In August, 1912 a letter of dissent was presented to Superintendent Steele and Trustees of the City of Schools of Tucson by "colored" protestors. This time they demanded equal facilities as tax paying citizens of Tucson as prescribed by the law. The letter of protest read:

While we as a race must suffer these humiliations and proscriptions as a result of this segregation law, to which we loyally yield but as law abiding citizens and tax payers of this commonwealth, eligible to the full rights and privileges under the law governing the educational code of the State, we therefore contend for equal provision, proper location and sufficient number of teachers for our school. (Zanders, 1946, p. 27)

The matter of a separate school surfaced again in September, 1912 when the Board of Trustees reconvened to discuss the situation. Present for that meeting was a committee
of seven African Americans, men and women, including Rev. Dixon. Apparently, opponents came up empty-handed because no decision was made to squash plans for the segregated school (Zanders, 1946). Instead, the matter was forwarded to the attorney general for an opinion (Zanders, 1946).

According to the Session Laws of Arizona, First and Special Sessions of 1912, Arizona permitted school boards of trustees in 1909 to segregate Black and White students. The permissible statute read:

To prescribe and enforce rules not inconsistent with the law
or those prescribed by the Territorial Board of Education for
their own government and the government of schools; and when
they deem it advisable, they may segregate pupils
of the African race from pupils of the White races, and
to that end are empowered to provide all accommodations made
necessary by such segregation, provided that the power to segregate
pupils of the African race from pupils of the White races
shall only be exercised where the number of pupils of the African
race shall exceed eight in number in any school district.

(Acts, Resolutions and Memorials of the Twenty-fifth Legislative
Assembly of the Territory of Arizona, 1909, p. 129)

It should be noted that the 1909 statute was “largely instituted by one man” (Barbour, 1954, p. 32). However, Barbour does not reveal the name of the individual in question. According to the Tuesday morning 1909 editorial of the Arizona Daily Star, the laws
enacted by the Twenty-fifth Legislature were a step in the right direction. The editor commends the enactments and concludes: "When the people of Arizona become cognizant of the beneficial workings of the laws passed by the Twenty-Fifth Legislature it will receive the high commendation to which it is so justly entitled" ("The History is Complete," 1909, p. 4).

In response to the bill on segregation enacted by the Legislature, African Americans in Phoenix felt that if schools were going to be segregated, then they wanted "colored" teachers. Henry Davis, a Black resident of Phoenix and spokesperson for a group of concerned African Americans said: "If we can have our own teachers and buildings and our children can get as good an education as they would in white schools, I believe that segregation will work out to the advantage of us all" ("Want Teachers," 1909, p. 3). At the time it may have sounded as if Davis was adopting a placatory stance by welcoming segregation as an expedient approach to education. However, what is underscored in the tone of the article was his desire for equality of opportunity and resources for African American children. Davis' remarks assume though that White children were being provided with superior education. Such was the prevailing perception of many African Americans and desegregationists (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Schultz, Buck & Niesz, 2000). His words were prophetic. It is believed that the clergy in Tucson who fought for the Colored School were of a similar mindset. Given the positive outcome of the segregated school, one can conclude that these African American men were trailblazers and visionaries who could see beyond their time.
Three years after the passage of the 1909 legislation, Arizona experienced its own version of *Brown v. Board of Education*. On July 15, 1912, the case of *Dameron v. Bayless* surfaced in the Arizona Court. Samuel F. Bayless, plaintiff, requested of the Board of Trustees, L. D. Dameron, that his two school-aged children residing in District One of Maricopa County in Phoenix, be given admittance into a White school near their home. Bayless was a Black businessman and leader of the Phoenix Advancement League, established in 1919, and forerunner to the N. A.A.C.P. (Harris, 1983). Bayless, through his lawyer, Joseph H. Kibbey, a former Governor of Arizona, argued that the civil code of 1909 made segregation permissible, not mandatory. However, the Arizona court, in upholding the separate-but-equal ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), stressed that the segregated school on Madison Street in Phoenix was a new school with equipment “equal, if not superior” to any other school in the district (Arizona Reports, 1913). The Arizona court supported its argument by citing nine other national cases, which upheld segregation practices in schools (Arizona Reports, 1913). Additionally, the court emphasized that the Bayless children would be better served in the segregated school for three reasons: 1) they would be spared the ostracism by White children and White teachers, 2) they would receive individual attention due to the smaller number of students, and 3) they would have the opportunity for equal access to schooling in a new facility (Harris, 1983). The Bayless request was flatly denied. The court ruled that “equality and not identity of privileges and rights is what is guaranteed to citizens” (Zanders, 1946). Consequently, the Bayless children had to attend the Madison Street School in Maricopa County regardless of distance or inconvenience.
This court ruling was the catalyst that prompted the Arizona legislature to revisit the 1909 law that permitted segregation. What resulted this time was the following amendment to the statute: “They shall [italics added] segregate pupils of the African race from pupils of the white race, and to that end are empowered to provide all accommodations made necessary by such segregation” (Revised Statutes of Arizona, 1913, p. 921). The bill gave the power to the Board of Trustees within a school district to enforce segregation. Thus, this measure ensured irreversibly tight segregation policies for Arizonan schools. No more could Black children, though few in number, be included in the mainstream classrooms of Arizona. No more would there be integrated classrooms in the desert town of Tucson.

The History of Desegregation

Efforts to squash public school segregation in Arizona began in 1943 in the heat of World War II (Barbour, 1954). 1949 marked the year of the first legislative challenge. In 1950 the issue of desegregation of schools resurfaced, and was placed on the ballot once more, only to be overturned again by the legislators. The abolitionists of school segregation soon became canny and called for legislation that would permit desegregation on a district level. The Legislative House Bill was adjusted in the spring of 1951 to read: “They may [italics added] segregate groups of pupils” (Journal of the House of Representatives, 1951, p. 211). This statute did not abolish segregation in the state of Arizona, but it abolished mandatory segregation. Because revised legislation provided an option for school districts, the doors opened for integrated classrooms.
In March 1951 Tucson made the decision to adhere to the permissive legislation. Superintendent Robert Morrow, the longest serving superintendent in the Pima County Number One School District, headed the school district in Tucson. He opted to set Arizona on a course of total school desegregation. Morrow not only chose to implement the provisions of the revised statute, but he did so speedily. The legislation was passed in March, 1951. By April the Board of Trustees in Tucson had voted to integrate. On June 15, 1951 desegregation was written into Tucson school policy (Barbour, 1954). The ink was barely dry in the legislature; it was only a matter of days after the signing of the governor’s bill that schools in Tucson were desegregated (“A Pattern for Integration,” 1956). By September of that same year, school segregation in Tucson had been dismantled.

The record indicates that Superintendent Morrow was not only a visionary leader who could see the inevitability of desegregation, but he was also a good-natured man who was motivated by a moral consciousness of right and wrong. Remarkably, the Pima County School District, under Morrow, had already begun the process of desegregation five years prior to the new legislation. Tucson High School was completely desegregated by 1946 (Morado, 2001). In speaking about his decision to jumpstart the integration process at Tucson High sooner than the legislative amendment of 1951, Superintendent Morrow explained: “We were not acting within the spirit, or even the letter of the law, but rather we acted according to our beliefs” (Morado, 2001, p. 96). In an interview with Morrow about his decision to shift to desegregated classrooms, Barbour (1954) reports:
Robert D. Morrow indicated that his approach was based on both ideality and reality. In the actual procedure, as a part of the same process, came 1. a conviction of the right of children to live and learn together; 2. sound planning; and 3. firm administrative decisions. (p. 34)

In another interview, Morrow recollected:

The Board wanted to go slowly at first... But I recommended that we integrate as rapidly as possible. I don’t believe in cutting off a dog’s tail an inch at a time. If you have a tough job, the quicker it’s started the easier the task (“A Pattern for Integration,” 1956, p. 44).

The Pima County Superintendent achieved school desegregation relatively peaceably, but the initiative did not escape verbal protest. One article revealed that Morrow had “been called virtually everything – including both “Communist” and “Fascist” (“A Pattern for Integration,” 1956, p. 46). Barbour (1954) reveals:

There were protests from a good many sources. ..Several people felt that The Board and Superintendent of Schools were overstepping their rights not to call for another election on this issue. Other people, who objected to this program, did a little name-calling. We received a few anonymous letters and telephone calls. The rabid dissenters were among the minority in
most instances. Even people who had honest prejudices against desegregation were fair. (pp. 35 - 36)

Clearly, Tucson, under Morrow’s leadership, had set the pace for school desegregation. However, like all good-intentioned leaders, he caught criticism. All factions of the Tucson community were not pleased with the school desegregation initiative. In fact, his efforts were laden with controversy. Some White parents did not want their children taught by Black teachers. African American parents were anxious about their children being suddenly thrust into a newly integrated classroom. Dunbar students had become well adjusted to their warm, segregated learning environment. Dunbar teachers were concerned about losing their jobs. On the other hand, The Council for Civic Unity, the N.A.A.C. P., the National Urban League, and other civic groups were elated, and felt that their long-awaited fight for equal education was over (Morado, 2001).

The capital, Phoenix, did not jump on the desegregation-of-schools bandwagon as quickly as Tucson did. In fact, it was not until 1954, following the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education, that the desegregation mandate was upheld in Phoenix at the high school level. The city then outlined a plan to complete the integration process at the elementary school level. The timetable for this process ran as late as 1958 (“A Pattern for Integration,” 1956).

Dunbar was to undergo yet another name change. This time the school’s name changed to John Spring Junior High School, named after a blonde-haired Swiss who was the first teacher in the district. John Arnold Spring was born in Thun, Switzerland May
8, 1845 (Cooper, 1967). He enlisted in the army, and was stationed in Southern Arizona (Cooper, 1967). Spring later received his citizenship January 29, 1870 (Cooper, 1967).

Dunbar’s name change created a bit of a stir for the Dunbar community. One interviewee stated:

I don’t want to say that there was a human cry or an outburst that kept asking questions. Just in small groups we were asking: Why change the name to John Spring? I think you would have found a lot of people interested in taking the position: “Let’s just keep the name Dunbar because it would still give Black kids in the city someone to look at, that school is named after Paul Laurence Dunbar, regardless of who attends there.”

(Personal communication, May 26, 2004)

The interviewee continued:

I think that the greatest participant in the name change was the principal of Dunbar at that time and the President of the N.A.A.C.P. as I recall at that time, who were consulted and they agreed to change the name. They [the district] wanted to get rid of any part that reminded you of segregation after desegregation took place. I thought it was odd because I don’t think the people cared too much about name changing because why would they want to change the name of the Black school, but they did not change the
names of the non-Black schools to some other person? (Personal communication, May 26, 2004)

The same interviewee went on to say:

So when they changed the name to John Spring, I had never heard of John Spring other than later on they said they wanted to honor the first teacher in the District. I could understand where they would have a place but I don’t see them changing a name of a school just to accommodate this particular person at that time. I think that they could have built a school later and said that [in] the next school these are the names that had made a contribution to education and humanity in this city.

So, that was my objection. I know there were others who thought, “Why did they change the name from Dunbar to John Spring?” Dunbar was named after an African American poet, and they could have gone on with the school. In pointing out the stark difference between the segregated era of yesterday and the desegregated era of today, the interviewee continued: When Maxwell Junior High School was named after Morgan Maxwell, he was still living. .... It did not have any effect on the populace.

As a matter of fact, it is just another school trying to reach the goal and the level of participation as a school meeting the level of the other schools already established, with a usual curriculum and the teachers are involved and the school fits right in... It’s Maxwell School. I don’t think the kids today say, “I don’t want to go to that school ‘cause it is named after a Black man.” (Personal communication, May 26, 2004)

The historical development of Dunbar has revealed much. Clearly, the school developed during an era of social and political turbulence. What may have been considered an educational disadvantage for African Americans in the early days of Arizona’s history turned out to be a great advantage. Had it not been for the national legislative fervor that trickled down to the individual states to keep the races apart,
segregated schools across the United States would not have come into being. It is believed that such would have been to the great detriment of all African Americans. Segregated schools such as the Paul Laurence Dunbar Elementary and Junior High School in Arizona, Trenholm High School in Alabama, Caswell County Training School in North Carolina, Booker T. Washington High School in South Carolina, Royal Elementary School in Ohio, and a host of other schools across the United States, may never have been formed.

Thus, the historical development of the early segregated school must be understood within the context of the sociopolitical environment. Anderson (1988) affirms: “Black education developed within the context of political and economic oppression” (p. 2). Though oppression was evident in the fabric of the Tucson society, it was not enough to hinder the growth and development of the African American people. Zanders (1946) reported that with Simmons at the helm, the Colored School opened with 11 faithful Black children. According to research done by the Dunbar Coalition, the first student body at the school was comprised of 19 students (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Although the numbers may differ, what is clear is that concrete steps were made to establish a new school. Within the first year of Simmons’ administration, student enrollment rose to 30 (Zanders, 1946). Simmons’ administration continued for six years in which he was indeed the sole teacher, janitor and administrator. Others followed. Morgan Maxwell Sr. was the last principal of the segregated school.
Summary

The United States government under the leadership of President Woodrow Wilson, initiated segregation laws which were to presage a new way of life for the state of Arizona. Tucson, like other cities in Arizona, was porous with segregation practices that infiltrated many aspects of community life. There was segregation in the workplace, in housing, hotels, motels, university dormitories, restaurant and lunch counters, theaters, and other places of public accommodation. Although largely conspicuously free of brutal Jim Crow signs, the separatist racial attitudes prevailed in the city. On a broad state level, a colonial European caste system divided racial groups, and created echelons of perceived superiority and inferiority. According to Nimmons (1971), Whites headed the hierarchical chain leaving pure Blacks to languish at the lowest level. Many social attitudes of the Spanish colonialism trickled down to even the mid-twentieth century. However, Tucson citizenry was a mixture of Southern bigotry and compassionate humanitarianism, with the latter spirit prevailing.

The Miscegenation Act of 1865 barring interracial marriages pointed to the social attitudes of Arizonan legislators towards racial groups in the state. Despite the legislation preventing interracial marriages, individuals of mixed blood defied the law and still married according to their personal preferences underscoring their disregard for the absurd law.

Schools, in particular, were greatly affected by de jure segregation laws. As a result, the Colored School was established in 1913. It developed amidst a wave of protest from the African American community in Tucson. Some Blacks favored it. Others did not.
Despite the opposition, the school continued, and evolved into Dunbar. Thirty-nine years after de jure segregation laws were implemented, de jure desegregation laws appeared, and led to Dunbar's closure in 1951, this time amidst a quiet outcry of protest.

Some mainstream residents of Tucson had a genuine desire to correct the separatist racial attitudes. Several interest groups namely the Tucson Urban Service League, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, the Arizona Council of Civic Unity and the Tucson chapter of the Council, as well as the N.A.A.C.P., motivated by an altruistic sense of justice and equality, led the good fight for social equality. All groups aggressively sought to unravel social injustices, and to find solutions. The Tucson Urban Service League revealed pockets of social tension, and recommended corrective programs. The Fair Employment Practices Commission monitored hiring practices and overt racism in the workplace. The Arizona Council of Civic Unity in Phoenix and in Tucson, focused on school segregation, and sought to dismantle it. The N.A.A.C.P. brought grievances to the forefront. Each organization was an indispensable facet of the movement that helped to shape the Tucsonan community. Paul Laurence Dunbar School served a preeminent role in that effort.
"The perfect historian is he in whose work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature. He relates no fact, he attributes no expression to his characters, which is not authenticated by sufficient testimony."

~ Thomas Babington Macaulay ~

CHAPTER 4

CARPE DIEM-SEIZE THE DAY: INSIDE DUNBAR SCHOOL (1940-1951)

Dunbar School at 300 West Second Street

The story of Dunbar fits on a continuum of segregated schools that were established across the United States during an era of intense racial prejudice. It begins with the foreknowledge that Dunbar was a highly successful segregated school, and seeks, in this chapter, to uncover reasons for the school's success.
Success Defined

"Success" is a relative term that denotes positive outcomes. No attempt is made in this study to calculate a statistical determination of successful outcomes. Conversely, this section provides a qualitative approach to the assessment of results. The Oxford Dictionary offers the following definitions of success: "outcome of undertaking, favorable outcome, accomplishment of what was aimed at" (Sykes, 1976, p. 1152). These clinical definitions place an emphasis on outcomes and offer a framework that assists in assessing the success of the segregated school. Thus, particular attention is given to perceptions of former teachers and students that point to outcomes. Keeping in mind the cultural context of segregation that engulfed Dunbar, success is viewed in terms of how students and teachers fared under oppressive social conditions, using their perceptions as the yardstick. Schein (1992) places emphasis on how outsiders view organizational culture. Thus, researcher perceptions will also factor in the assessment of the school.

School Description

Paul Laurence Dunbar School derived its name from the first recognized prolific African American writer. Dunbar evolved from the Colored School, initially established in 1913 as a segregated elementary school, located on 211 East Sixth Street. It was the only public, segregated school in Tucson, Arizona. The leased one-room Colored School, situated in back of George A. Stonecypher’s Bakery, previously an undertaker’s parlor, catered to approximately twenty students at its inception (Zanders, 1946). African
American parents boycotted the school in its early days because of the building’s deplorable physical conditions and the lack of promise for adequate staffing (Zanders, 1946).

Due to the expansion of Stonecypher’s bakery, and the renumbering of city buildings, the school’s address changed to 215 East Sixth Street (The Dunbar Project, 1995). In October 1917, at a School Board meeting, the Colored School was officially renamed Paul Laurence Dunbar School (Zanders, 1946). The purpose of the name change was to associate the school with “a person connected with excellence” (The Dunbar Project, 1995, p. 59). The change did not come into effect until 1918 when the school became more commonly known as “Dunbar.” In May 1917, the School Board decided to build to meet the demand for space, and on January 19, 1918 a new building was completed (Zanders, 1946). Students were moved to the new two-room government-owned site on 300 West Second Street in the heart of Tucson, just north of the commercial and municipal center (Cooper, 1967). The new Dunbar was situated in a quieter area across from a former cemetery lot and near residential housing (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Surrounding Dunbar were Barrio Anita, West University and El Presidio neighborhoods, as well as seven churches located within or adjacent to the district (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Mount Calvary Missionary Baptist Church, formerly called Second Baptist Church, established in 1900, was located on 635 North Tenth Avenue during Dunbar years. Friendship Missionary Baptist Church, established in 1937, is located across the street from the school site. By all accounts, the new Dunbar was in a pleasant, relatively quiet area.
By the 1940s Black businesses had also sprung up in the area: Jack’s Restaurant, a beauty salon and an insurance business (The Dunbar Project, 1995). A Black-owned social club and another restaurant were located on Main Street. Five Chinese businesses were also operative in the Dunbar district. The nearest play area to the school was Estevan Park, established in 1941. It was located on West First Street.

The school’s population grew to 66 by 1920 (Daniels, 1941). As the numbers rose, there became a need for more space. Dunbar underwent further structural expansion between 1921 and 1948. By 1948, junior high students were being educated in a two-storey building on a campus equipped with 23 classrooms, a cafeteria-auditorium and administrative offices (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

Dunbar became a combined elementary and junior high school between 1921 and 1925. In the 1930s a Junior High School Movement surfaced, and the segregated school joined the list of Tucson’s junior high schools (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Hundreds of African American children passed through Dunbar that catered to grades one through nine. Students were either bussed or they walked to school from neighboring districts. By 1940, 418 students were registered (Daniels, 1941). At the elementary level there were 228 in attendance, 100 girls and 128 boys; at the junior high level, 109 students were enrolled, 52 girls and 57 boys (Daniels, 1941). By 1946, there were 425 students in attendance (“Dunbar Faces Student Rise,” 1947). In 1947 more than 525 students were enrolled (“Dunbar Faces Student Rise,” 1947). In order to accommodate the increased number of students, elementary students were schooled in the Dunbar Annex, believed to be located at 140 West Speedway, formerly De Porres Elementary School, a school for

Dunbar passed through the leadership hands of four principals: Cicero Simmons, Benjamin James, Roy Lee, William H. Hudson, and finally Morgan Maxwell Sr. (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Maxwell led Dunbar until 1951 when the local Board of Education jumpstarted the desegregation process, and ordered its closure. De jure desegregation policies demanded the removal of all vestiges of segregation, which not only included the closure of the school, but also the elimination of the Dunbar name (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Dunbar was renamed John Spring Junior High School, after a Swiss, and after whom the John Spring National Historic District, where the Dunbar Cultural Center currently sits, is named. John Spring Junior High operated as a combined elementary and junior high school until June 1961 when it became exclusively a junior high school (Cooper, 1967). In the fall of 1961 some students were sent to Davis and Roosevelt elementary schools (Cooper, 1967). Others transferred to Borton Elementary School (Personal Communication, June 4, 2004). John Spring Junior High permanently closed in 1978 and the building was used as a warehouse (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

In 1993 the Dunbar Coalition, comprised of the Juneteenth Festival Planning Committee, the Dunbar/Spring Neighborhood Association, the Dunbar Alumni Association and the Tucson Urban League, was established (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997). In 1995 the Coalition purchased the two-acre Dunbar site and 51,000 square feet of building space for $25 from the Tucson Unified School District (Dunbar
Sixth School Reunion, 1997). The plan is to convert the historic Dunbar building into an African American Cultural Center and Museum.

November 28, 1987 marked Dunbar’s first alumni reunion celebration. Tucson’s Mayor Lew Murphy endorsed this historic event by proclamation stating the following:

WHEREAS, in a day when Tucson was younger and immature, there was a school that would become a symbol of an unfortunate past in our community; and

WHEREAS, DUNBAR SCHOOL was a segregated experience that gave prejudice an undeserved foothold in this otherwise favorable place, where the rich tapestry of a multicultural community would eventually be woven; and

WHEREAS, despite the injustice of its being, DUNBAR provided a solid education for hundreds of black youngsters, with student bodies that produced outstanding achievers in all disciplines and adult leadership for all manner of human endeavor; and

WHEREAS, in 1951, the DUNBAR reality was ended by community conscience, but the happy memories of those who attend DUNBAR were left for them to keep and to later share; and

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Lew Murphy, Mayor of the City of Tucson, Arizona, in order to call attention to this event, do hereby proclaim Saturday, the 28th day of November 1987, to be

DUNBAR SCHOOL REUNION DAY
In this community, and urge that all citizens take this occasion to reflect that good memories can take wing even when denied the full flight of fancy due them.

In witness WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Tucson to be affixed this 27th day of November 1987. (The Arizona Historical Society, Tucson Library Archives)

Dunbar’s Alumni Association is currently active and continues to host reunions at the school site biannually.
Theoretical Framework of Organizational Culture

The primary paradigm of inquiry utilized for determining Dunbar’s success is the lens of organizational culture. “Organizational culture” is a rather newly coined term that defines the pulse of an organization. In an attempt to better understand the phenomenon of organizational culture, a plethora of formal definitions has emerged. Hoy and Miskel (2001) state: “Organizational culture is an attempt to get at the feel, sense, atmosphere, character, or image of an organization” (p. 176). Snowden and Gorton (2002) observe, “Any organization operates according to a set of values, goals, principles, procedures, and practices that help define what it is all about. Another word for these combined operating characteristics is culture” (p. 113). Carlson (1996) and Schneider (1991) present an identical synthesis of researched definitions of organizational culture. Drawing from the research of Ouchi (1981), both Carlson and Schneider conclude the following: “Organizational culture is the set of symbols, ceremonies, and myths that communicate the underlying values and beliefs of the organization to its employees” (Carlson, 1996, p. 34; Schneider, 1991, p. 155). The myriad of definitions reflects a concerted effort on the part of researchers to assess what organizational culture is all about.

There has been sustained curiosity amongst researchers, dating back to the mid-twentieth century, which has focused on how organizations work (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Scholars examined elements that contributed to performance outcomes in the workplace. The educational world, influenced by the prestige of the business arena, endeavored to increase institutional effectiveness by investigating organizational culture. Educational
researchers, like corporate scholars, began to acknowledge an organization's culture as a variable for assessing school effectiveness, and thus, it evolved as an indicator of school success. Scholars have concluded, therefore, that assessing the theoretical framework of organizational culture is tantamount to understanding the covert assumptions, norms, values and beliefs that drive an organization, ipso facto assessing its institutional effectiveness. Thus, it can be argued that organizational culture is the nexus that provides the gateway for all the affairs of the schooling process.

Schein (1992) and Hofstede (1991) comprehensively examine the concept of organizational culture with an emphasis on organizations in general. Their research is referenced as a guide to understanding Dunbar's school culture. There are, however, several scholars who specifically examine the organizational culture of schools (Carlson, 1996; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Snowden and Gorton offer a succinct schema for assessing a school's organizational culture. They suggest three major components for analysis: the history of the organization; the membership's characteristics; and the problems and external demands placed on the organization (Snowden & Gorton, 2002). It is this overarching tripartite outline that aids the investigation of Dunbar's operations.

Following the outline of Snowden and Gorton (2002), the history of the organization is the first rung on the ladder of analysis. This component was addressed in Chapter Two. Thus, the next focal point for consideration is the membership's characteristics. The questions specifically addressed here are the following: What were the perceptions of former Dunbar students and teachers? What attributes did teachers bring to the learning
experience at Dunbar? This chapter, therefore, paints a portrait of the school by concentrating on the internal operations at the segregated school via the perceptions of former students and teachers. These inputs hidden from the public eye, and untapped by previous scholars, command attention.

Profile of Dunbar School Days

Oral accounts about Dunbar reveal a collage of information. Students who lived outside walking distance to school were bused on the infamous, affectionately called, “sardine can.” Dozens of children were packed into one yellow, non-airconditioned city bus, which originated on the south side, and then headed for Dunbar. The same bus made a second trip to “A” Mountain to collect more children, passing Elizabeth Borton, The Carrillo and William C. Davis elementary schools on route to the 300 West Second Street school site. Given the multitude of children who were bussed at once, in all weather conditions, as one alumnus commented, “It was a miracle no one was hurt” (Personal communication, Nov. 29, 2003). Students hurriedly disembarked at the school gate.

Upon arrival at school, students congregated on the playground. Teachers volunteered their time to supervise early students while the bus made a second trip. When the bell sounded, students lined up in designated areas according to grade level. Immaculate, professionally groomed teachers stood at the front of class lines. Students were then guided to their respective classrooms. Several Dunbar teachers were single females. It was illegal at that time for a female teacher to be married (Cooper, 1967).
For some classes, the school day began with a prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance. An alumna revealed:

_Interviewer:_ *Did you say the pledge?*

_Interviewee:_ Not only did we say the pledge, we said the prayer too. Every day.

_Interviewer:_ *Every day?*

_Interviewee:_ Every day. We said the “Our Father” and the 29th Psalm for my fourth grade teacher, Miss Williams.

We memorized all of it. It didn’t hurt us. Some of us were Catholics. We didn’t have all that garbage when we were growing up, “I don’t want to recite this or that because of my religion.” No, all of us did it.

(Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Students remained in care of their grade teachers for the entire academic year. Classrooms were sparsely furnished with wooden student desks, visibly defaced by previous occupiers from other schools. Under each desk was a drawer that held students’ school supplies. On the top of the desk, there was an ink well. Students did not use ball point pens. They dipped into the ink well to fill their fountain pens. On many occasions ink spilled everywhere, and spoiled students’ clothing.

Teachers assigned academic homework daily, and it was expected that students complete it on time. Subjects included Spelling, English, Mathematics, Penmanship, Spanish, Social Studies, Home Economics, Physical Education, Music and Art. English
embraced Reading and Writing as sub subjects. Home Economics included Sewing, Cooking, and even Shop for some Dunbar girls. Boys did Carpentry and Metalwork. Spanish was a respected subject. It was mandatory for all junior high students. Neat, legible penmanship was heavily stressed. It was imperative that immaculate work be submitted. Names were to be written clearly in cursive at the top of the page, together with the subject of the assignment. Work had to be dated. If an assignment was due on a particular day, as one alumna recalled, “Oh, it better be done. Ninety-nine percent of us had it done” (Personal communication, June 1, 2004). For the 1% who failed to produce homework on time, they could expect stiff punishment. For the boys, punishment meant a trip to Elmore Carrier’s office, adjacent to the principal’s. One male student recalled:

I have to admit that we did get whipped, spankings... [He chuckles]. And now, with all of the restrictions against corporal punishment... but every student that came through Dunbar would admit, “Yeah, we got whippings,” but it made us better persons because we learned to respect authority and we learned limitations. Everyone I have ever talked to said, “Yeah, I remember I getting whippings.”

Mr. Carrier, you probably heard people talk about him, he was determined that we were going to learn that Math, and if we didn’t he would give you the keys to the P.E. room.

You probably heard about that room. [He laughs]

Interviewer: He actually would give you the keys?
Interviewee: He would give you the keys [and say] meet me in the
P.E. room, you know. So, you knew you were in
trouble. [He laughs]

(Personal communication, December 3, 2003)

For the girls, there was a trip to visit with teacher Laura Nobles if misdemeanors were
committed. Reprimand and corporal punishment went hand-in-hand at Dunbar.
Punishment did not end there. When students arrived home, typically news of the
infraction committed at school that day had reached there before they did. Parents
repeated the stern punishment that students had experienced at school. Invariably,
overdue assignments would appear on the expectant teacher’s desk the next day, and the
unacceptable behavior would disappear. One alumna commented: “We called it the
Board of Education because you learned.” (Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Upon reflecting on their school days, alumni remain with the belief that the firm
discipline they received at Dunbar was in their best interest, although at the time the
disciplinary method that their teachers chose to implement may not have always been
fully appreciated. However, in retrospect, students now have a greater understanding and
intense appreciation for the firm approach taken towards their personal and academic
development. Some alumni commented on the current social state of some African
American youth, and one person concluded: “We did not turn out that bad” (Personal
communication, Nov. 29, 2003).

Prior to 1948, when the west wing was added, there was no cafeteria or auditorium at
Dunbar. There were no showers. There was no Ramada on the playground. There was
no playground equipment. Students socialized on the playgrounds before and after school. Baseball games were the star activity at break times. Bases were creatively made from cement blocks; students used strips of wood to frame them. Students planted mulberry trees on Arbor days to create shade on arid school grounds. The *Tucson Citizen* recounted Maxwell's words: “The classrooms were crowded, poorly furnished and outmoded. There was no cafeteria, no physical education department and an inadequate playground” (“Former Principal Dead at Age of 84,” 1987, p. 4A). The nearest play area was Estevan Park, named after Esteban, the African slave who was the first Black to traverse Arizonan soil with Spanish conquistadors in 1539 (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Mayor Jaastad gave Maxwell the honor of naming Estevan Park in the 1940s (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

Graduation exercises were held at Safford Junior High. One alumna recalled memories of the graduation ceremony:

> We did not have an auditorium. We had to use the facilities at Safford Junior High School and use their auditorium. That was a big day for us, you know. That was important to us. They drove it into us, you know they told us, “You gotta graduate from Dunbar, you got to graduate from high school.” It was important to us. The boys had their suits and we had our white dresses. We had speakers. We had everything just like everybody else. It was just that we were by ourselves. (Personal communication, June 1, 2004)
School assemblies were held inside in the “T” shaped space that ran north to south. Principal Maxwell and special guests stood at the top of the “T” while the elementary children sat on the floor. Junior high students stood in the back of the open space. Teachers sat beside their respective classes. School supplies were hand-me-downs from other schools. One alumnus recalls:

**Interviewee:** We had second hand books. In fact, two or three times we had a book burn. We would burn the books.

**Interviewer:** Why?

**Interviewee:** Because they were second hand books, and they came from the other junior high schools. Like at Mansfield, they would give them new books every year, and they would give us the second hand books. One time, Mr. Maxwell called Dr. Morrow and said the books were brown. Nobody knew why it happened. We were given hand-me-down books and second hand chairs. In fact we even broke up some desks every now and then because they were all used and broken up.

All we wanted was the same books as Mansfield, Safford, Roskrug and Wakefield. (Personal communication, March 11, 2004)

At recess and lunch times, students who lived within walking distance of the school walked home for lunch. Others remained at school. Occasionally, teachers who lived
near the school invited students home with them for lunch. Some students walked to
Main Street to get lunch. Principal Maxwell created a cafeteria where students could buy
a hot meal for a nickel. Mrs. Warrior was the cook who prepared food in the Domestic
Science room in the basement of the school. For students who could not afford lunch,
Maxwell would give them a nickel from his own pocket, and treat them to a free lunch.
Dunbar is reportedly the first public school to offer hot lunches in Tucson.

Students enjoyed Physical Education activities: football, basketball, baseball,
softball, dodge ball, volleyball, and track. Girls took P.E. under Laura Nobles. Donned
in her white P.E. shorts, she taught softball and volleyball. The girls wore blue uniforms
with buttons lining the front. Boys took P.E. classes with Elmore Carrier. Teacher and
student testimonials consistently reported that Dunbar produced some of the finest
athletes. Billie Harris, coached by P.E. teacher Laura Nobles, was a talented softball
player. After leaving Dunbar, she went on to Tucson High where her athletic abilities
continue to blossom. Upon graduating from high school, she played professionally for
the Phoenix Ramblers, and later for the Yakima Webb Cats in Yakima, Washington.
While in Washington, she was named Most Valuable Player, and was given the All
American honor (Dunbar School Reunion, 1993). Sisters Willie Hall-Fears and Bobby
Hall are also noted for their athletic abilities. Joe Batiste towered over the crowd at
Dunbar and Tucson High for his athletic prowess. He set outstanding records at Tucson
High in basketball, football and track, and later earned national fame for track and hurdle
events. Ernie Mc Cray was an avid basketball player. He was the first Black basketball
player to graduate from the University of Arizona (Dunbar School Reunion, 1993). He
earned degrees in Physical Education and Elementary Education. He later gained national fame when he played for the Cincinnati Royals (Dunbar School Reunion, 1993). Dunbar’s sports teams outshone many of their local competitors. Students were invited to Mansfield and Roskruge for competitions. They participated. The other schools never came to Dunbar.

Music played a prominent role in the life of Dunbar. Sidney Dawson taught music to the junior high students; Miss Edwards taught the elementary level. Dawson took students on many field trips to venues around Tucson including musical performances at the University of Arizona. His chorus ensembles were well known and reportedly, second to none. Students sang four to eight part harmonies mostly a capella. The chorus performed pieces from a wide repertoire of composers, including Bach, Brahms, Burleigh, Flemming, Mallotte, Praetorius, Romberg, to name a few. Students also performed Waring-Ringwald’s Battle Hymn of the Republic and Handel’s Hallelujah Chorus. Dawson stated: “The highlight of our three year existence was a concert presented at the Temple of Music and Art sponsored by the Saturday Morning Musical Club” (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997, p. 9). The school’s drum and bugle corps, under the leadership of Sergeant Armstrong, was equally well known. The highlight for many students was the Rodeo Day parade where the marching band - the drum and bugle corps - comprised of boys and girls and talented, smartly outfitted majorettes performed annually. Dunbar’s cheerleaders also stole the limelight. Through her affiliation with the YWCA, Laura Nobles arranged for three Dunbar cheerleaders to represent the school at one of the football games at the University of Arizona. The school also held annual
Christmas and Easter programs, which were open to the public. One December in 1944, officers of the Negro Elks Lodge distributed gift bags of candies, nuts and fruit to Dunbar students, and the Red Caps of the Southern Pacific Railroad donated a Christmas tree for the Christmas program ("Dunbar Holding Christmas Party," 1944). Students took delight in performing in school plays. Teachers, parents, students and the community at large also appreciated Dunbar's talents.

Students had the opportunity to participate in extra curricula activities. Although participation was not mandatory, students chose to take part. They could choose from a wide menu of activities including the following: girl scouts, girl reserves, newspaper publishing, sewing, baseball, basketball, football, softball, cheerleading, and the drum and bugle corps, to name a few. Knowledge gained through their participation in these activities contributed to a well-rounded education. Dances were held at Dunbar on Friday nights. One alumna stated: "We loved for our fathers to be chaperones because they sat outside" (Dunbar School Reunion, 1993, p. 6).

Dunbar groomed students for leadership. It was an honor for students to be chosen for safety patrol. Teachers chose responsible individuals who would stand on the street outside the school to monitor traffic, and to make sure that their fellow students arrived to class safely. Students proudly wore orange banners across their chests, from shoulder to waist, which singled them out. They also had opportunities to showcase their artistic talents. They were selected to read or recite poetry for special assemblies and activities. Their roles in school plays complimented their natural abilities. This opportunity not only gave them recognition, but also a sense of accomplishment and appreciation.
Students also practiced governmental skills. Each class had an elected class president and officers who were responsible for holding meetings and organizing class activities. This approach to student leadership allowed many students the opportunity to use their talents, and to execute leadership roles. The President of the Student Council represented the student body at special public functions. Many students benefited from the leadership opportunities that Dunbar afforded them. They not only gained a strong sense of self worth, but also, upon graduating from high school, they were able to confidently enter the job market, and maintain leadership positions.

Dunbar alumnus, former Tucson housing administrator and Dunbar Coalition chief, Cressworth Lander, was named Tucson Citizen of the Year in 2002 (Petruska, 2002). Also, two well-known Dunbar alumnae returned to their alma mater to teach, and later became prominent educators in the Tucsonan community. Dr. Anna Jolivet earned the title “Woman of the Year” in 1996 from the Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce for over 40 years of dedicated service to education and to the Tucsonan community. She held leadership roles in a voluminous number of organizations (Burchell, 1997). Dr. Laura Nobles Banks also holds an outstanding record of service to education and to the community. She too returned to Dunbar as a teacher, and later became the first African American to graduate with an Education Specialist Degree from the University of Arizona, and the first African American Assistant Superintendent for the Tucson Unified School District. Her exhaustive list of accomplishments and honors for exceptional service is second to none. On February 1, 2003, the Laura Nobles Banks Elementary School was dedicated in her honor. Both women are also graduates of the University of
Arizona. Principal Morgan Maxwell Sr. led by example. He was also recognized for his outstanding contribution to education and to the community. Morgan Maxwell Middle School was established in 1973 in his honor.

In sum, one alumna recounted: “We were the little school that had nothin’, but we always came out on top” (Personal communication, June 1, 2004).

Norms, Perceptions and Assumptions of Dunbar Students

Early weekday mornings, neatly dressed Dunbar students would converge on 300 West Second Street from the north and south sides of the city center, and from “A” Mountain, located on the west side. The district south of Grant Road, and east of Sixth Avenue, was labeled by Black residents of that area as “Sugar Hill,” a name coined during post-Dunbar years. African Americans, who were previously residents on the north side of town, moved into this area and purchased homes. Some “A” Mountain residents also owned property. Interestingly, there was a dividing line of perception that invisibly separated one segment of the African American community from the other, the reasoning for which remains nebulous. Some say that affluence was not the measuring stick for the dividing line (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). Most Blacks were relatively poor. Some families did not own a telephone. Many fathers worked as construction workers, machinists or for the Southern Pacific Railroad. Several mothers worked as domestics. Some families sported fancy cars. Many African American children, regardless of the district, came from two-parent families. Several Dunbar teachers lived on the north side. It is known that the north side of the city center is the
oldest part of Tucson, therefore, the most historic. However, during the 40s and 50s, it was also the most densely populated. In some circles, north side residents were perceived as having an air of superiority over residents from the south side, and over those from “A” Mountain. One interviewee commented: “We [north side residents] thought that we were better than them” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). Yet, “A” Mountain residents perceived themselves to be the ones who were higher up on the social totem pole. Some African American residents, on the other hand, frowned on the “A” Mountain District. One interviewee commented: “And the ‘A’ Mountain people were even further down the scale, but it had nothing to do with property or property ownership because they owned” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). A Sugar Hill resident reported to the Arizona Daily Star, “People from South Park would say: ‘You from Sugar Hill, you think you’re better; you live on the hill’ ” (Wagner, 2004, p. E1). Some Blacks equally perceived the south side of Tucson with disdain. Area residents produced many children quickly. One alumna remembered: “We lived in a tent [on the south side] as we were building our house; that was the edge of civilization” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). A few alumni recalled no ambivalence at all within the Dunbar culture. One alumna remarked:

We all grew up together. We all knew each other. Actually, we were all like one big family. Nobody had no more than anybody else, and nobody thought they were better than anybody else. We were all, as far as I could see, we were all happy children. Now,
what happened to us after we got grown, and out on our own, now
that’s a whole different thing. (Personal communication, June 1,
2004)

Scholars note the presence of ambiguity within organizations (Carlson, 1996; Schein, 1992). Carlson (1996) points out: “Typically, more attention is given to organizationwide cultures and subcultures within organizations, with little recognition and/or acceptance of organizational ambiguities” (p. 35). Schein (1992) sums up the organizational ambivalence that often occurs:

In summary, one of the most important dimensions of culture is the nature of how reality, truth, and information are defined. Reality can exist at physical, group, and individual levels, and the test for what is real will differ according to the level – overt tests, social consensus, or individual experience. (p. 105)

Clearly, varying perspectives of ambiguity existed within the Dunbar culture. Research revealed that the line of separation that existed in the school community was drawn by the railroad tracks. The busy, Southern Pacific Railroad journeyed past the Dunbar district. Upon recounting their school days, alumni would say: “I lived on the north side of the tracks,” or “I lived south of the tracks” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). Thus, the line of perception was created according to where one lived. However, the precise source of the social conundrum remains a mystery. As one alumna succinctly remarked, “It was all in the perception” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004).
Scholars of organizational cultural have also observed that layers of assumptions arise within the culture of organizations. Hofstede (1991) writes: “Social classes carry different class cultures. ....The criteria for allocating a person to a class are often cultural: symbols play an important role” (p. 17). Carlson (1996) expands on the notion of symbolism: “Symbols include words, objects, conditions, acts, and characteristics of people that help explain relationships between their people and their environment” (p. 41). For Dunbar students, however rightly or wrongly, the railroad tracks were a symbol of social delineation, despite the fact that most Blacks in Tucson seemed to fall within the same social echelon. Testimonials reflect the presence of a subculture within the broader Dunbar culture. Schein (1992) observes: “The power of a culture comes about through the fact that the assumptions are shared and therefore mutually reinforced” (p. 25).

Another perception that surfaced during a couple of interview sessions was the issue of the color line. The following focus group conversation sheds light on a dimension of the psyche of the Dunbar community:

Interviewer: Was there any perception in the black community in terms of light skinned and dark skinned? Favor...non-favor? Did that exist?

Interviewee 1: Yes. Always.

Interviewee 2: No, I wasn’t aware of it.

Interviewee 3: I was. I don’t want to name names. There was a
light skinned girl that everyone thought she was the smartest and seemed to get favors. It may not have been true, but it was a perception.

**Interviewer:** *Was this evident in the wider black community?*

Interviewee 3: [Yes, but] this is [sic] post-Dunbar. We took dance together and stuff like that, and I was not one who had a lot of close friends at that time, but there was an occasion when her mother decided that I was not appropriate company for her. I was from the wrong side of the tracks. I was too dark.

(Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

The subject of race, even for contemporary America, is always a sensitive one. Philogène (2004) writes: “The issue of race, a dominant cultural marker guiding people’s thinking and actions, tells us a lot about America” (p. 3). Treatment of the subject says even more about the psyche within the U.S. Typically, the color line is the line that separates one race from the other. However, researchers note that the line of delineation does not end at the door of another race. Philogène (2004) observes: “Race can be characterized as a key cultural marker. It has permeated every facet of American culture—its laws, its language, its political ideologies. It forms the basic context for social exchange within and between groups” (p. 5). Thus, there is an intercultural treatment of race, that is, the way that race is perceived between cultures. Additionally, there is an intracultural racial dimension that reflects how those within a racial group regard each
other. Scholars have pointed to a myriad of reasons that account for the apparent cultural hegemony that oftentimes prevails between Whites and Blacks in the U.S., and within the Black race.

Philogne (2000) points to the institution of slavery as the genesis for exclusion of African Americans from mainstream America. In her later research, she spotlights the practice of segregation as a systematic progression of exclusion that followed slavery (Philogne, 2004). She asserts:

Segregation, was of course, much more than just Black-White separation or the restriction of contact between the groups. It fostered a pervasive social-psychological condition of American society, one that could be characterized as a state of mind as well as a constructed daily reality. A dynamic structure articulated around the issue of race gave meaning to social life and organized intergroup relations. This institutionalized form of exclusion marked the core of America’s history by centralizing the issue of race as a normative and prescriptive component of social life.

(Philogne, 2004, pp. 5-6)

Philogne posits that because segregation was the accepted norm, it created a cultural monopoly for White America. Blacks complied with the social delineation, and regarded the mainstream culture as the dominant force upon which Blacks were socially dependent (Philogne, 2004).
Cherry (2004) studied the work of Panamanian-born social psychologist, Kenneth Clark, highlighting his observations that “distortions of both personality and behavior were fostered by enforced segregation, a structural barrier that stood in the way of full and healthy development of both Black and White Americans” (p. 23). It is well known that indeed stereotypical images of Blacks in literature, the media and in entertainment created distortions of personality and behavior for African Americans. Blacks were the object of ridicule, disdain and discrimination. African Americans, as their name indicates, clearly have their roots in Africa, which was commonly referred to by European slavers as “the dark continent.” Connotative literary images of negativity, drawn by even the finest of writers, including Shakespeare, painted disparaging portraits of Blacks. Equally, the film industry in the U.S. exported myths about Black culture, and framed Black caricatures (Bogle, 2001). The word “Negro” by which African Americans were labeled, and by which they even labeled themselves during early years of their history, has its origin in the Latin word “niger” translated as “black,” and often describes sinister things, people or events. Images of Blacks, therefore, were predicated on the belief that they were inferior to the dominant race. Foolish researchers, steeped in ignorance, and hiding under the cloak of academia, sought to perpetuate this notion of Black inferiority through the doctrine of the Bell Curve, for self glorification, elevation or their race, and cultural hegemonic control. More profound thinkers vehemently oppose the doctrine of the Bell Curve. Herbert (1995) terms Charles Murray’s theory: “a scabrous piece of racial pornography masquerading as serious scholarship” (Jacoby & Glauberman, 1995, p. 249). Sedgwick (1995) believes that the Pioneer Fund’s
subsidization of inflammatory research on racial differences “puts blacks in a highly unfavorable light” (Jacoby & Glauberman, 1995, p. 144). Thus, distortions of which Clark speaks are not surprising. Interest in eugenics has an ancient legacy dating back to Plato (Pearson, 1995). The U.S. keenly embraced the study of eugenics, and renewed interest in the science during President Theodore Roosevelt’s administration was welcomed (Pearson, 1995). Pearson (1995) affirms:

The concept of new eugenic science was welcomed in the United States, which shared the same traditional appreciation of the role of heredity held by those Europeans who had remained behind in Europe. … America at that time did not think their country as a potential microcosm of all humanity, but as an emerging micro-race of predominantly European origin. President Theodore Roosevelt, credited with the advancing melting pot” ideology, wanted only quality immigrants from ethnic stocks which would readily assimilate into the “Old American” population a term used to refer to persons descended from Europeans who had settled in North America prior to the War between the states. …Like Theodore Roosevelt, eugenicists felt that the new America must remain a vital and homogenous nation. (p. 8)

Thus, factions of White America rekindled an interest in race for political reasons, and such thinking was embedded into the cultural fabric of the nation.
Brown (2004) highlights Clark's research of the 1930s and 1940s that studied the perceptions of Black children using white and brown dolls. Findings indicated that Black children attributed importance to skin tone as a marker for perceptions of favor and non-favor. Brown (2004) notes:

When compared with both the medium and dark-complexioned groups, children with light complexion showed greater favoritism toward the white doll than the brown doll. In discussing this finding, the Clarks speculated that because skin tone is a physical characteristic, skin tone identification might precede racial identification, a process based on learned social definitions and cues. (p. 111)

Drawing from the research of Maddox and Gray (2002), Brown also reveals:

Skin tone can be a status marker determining how Black Americans will be perceived by others. ... A greater proportion of stereotypic traits commonly linked to Black people were applied to dark-complexioned people, and a larger proportion of counterstereotypic traits were assigned to light-complexioned people. (Brown, 2004, p. 112)

Lake (2003), however, lays blame for the strengthening of the color line at the feet of the church. The pivotal axis for the continuation of the racist color line in the U.S. was the American Civil War. However, beyond the war the practice of racial segregation
continued. According to Lake (2003), the church was the chief contributor. Referencing Frazier (1963), she notes:

While European Americans were forceful and singular in their siege upon African American people, African Americans weakened their own efforts for de facto freedom due to fissions around issues of class and color. Even the African American church, which served as the locus for organizing freedom movements, operated within a color caste system. (Lake, 2003, p. 38)

Lake (2003) explains that in 1870 the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church separated from the African Methodist Episcopal Church because of a color strata notion. On discussing color struggles in the U.S. in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, she graphically reports:

Color-conscious congregations existed in many parts of the United States and usually used a lightness test to determine who was eligible for admittance. In some churches, African Americans were subject to the bag test which involved placing an arm inside a brown paper bag. Only if the skin on the arm was lighter than the color of the bag would a prospective member be invited to attend church services. Other churches painted their doors a light shade of brown, and anyone whose skin was darker than the door was
politely invited to seek religious services elsewhere. (Lake, 2003, p. 38)

Thus, both inter and intraracial prejudice is evident as a cultural reality in the U.S.

Clearly, differences of treatment between Blacks and Whites in the U.S. as well as differences within the Black race exceeded the boundaries of perception. They were real. Distinctions within the cultural arena were not only limited to skin tone, but included hair texture as well (Brown, 2004; Lake, 2003).

Oral accounts from Dunbar alumni did not reveal incidents of blatant bias or overt color consciousness at Dunbar. There was no evidence that perceptions of skin tone or hair texture hampered the productivity of students at the school. However, oral accounts did reveal a tinge of negativity. Essentially, Dunbar was a microcosm of the wider society. Thus, the school, although functioning within the cocoon of segregation, was not impervious to mainstream societal perceptions. Findings did reveal ambiguities that existed within its culture. Subcultures were created, and perceptions were branded. Assumptions of superiority and inferiority, based on where one lived, were embedded into the school community. There was some evidence of color consciousness. Assumptions were shared amongst the Black community, and over time were reinforced. The ambiguous quality of perceptions at Dunbar underscores the idiosyncratic nature of organizational culture. Hofstede (1991) makes an interesting observation. He observes: The Western concern with Truth is supported by an axiom in Western logic that a statement excludes its opposite: if A is true, B, which is the opposite of A, must be false. Eastern logic does not
have such an axiom. If A is true, its opposite B may also be true, and together they produce a wisdom which is superior to either A or B. This is sometimes called the complementarity of yang and yin, using two Chinese characters, which express the male and the female elements present in all aspects of reality. (Hofstede, 1991, p. 171)

Having acknowledged the duality within reality, what also must be considered is the origin of perceptions. Fact should always be separated from fiction. Often, what becomes a near impossibility is the task of unraveling distorted perceptions that have already taken root. The key is to zealously guard spoken adulteration so that truth is not falsified, character is not tarnished, and performance and productivity are not dwarfed. Fortunately, perceptions did not spoil the spirit of camaraderie for the Dunbar community. Neither did they detract from students’ academic performance or teachers’ productivity. No malice was detected from alumni commentaries. There was no evidence of grudging spirits. There were just perceptions.

**Characteristics, Values and Beliefs of Dunbar Educators**

Characteristics, assumptions, values, norms and beliefs are the bedrock of any organization. According to Schein (1992), such enter the realm of the organization principally via founders and leaders, and secondly, through the membership. At Dunbar, values and beliefs were evident both in the leadership and in the membership. Leadership values are discussed in Chapter 5. Chapter 4 focuses on perceptions of
former teachers and students regarding Dunbar’s school culture. Participants principally shared information about teachers, students, Principal Maxwell and parents. Several salient characteristics about the school emerged. Among them are the following: (a) the care ethic, (b) a sense of community, (c) parental involvement, (d) qualified teachers, (e) a sense of resilience that fostered excellence, (f) cultural pedagogy, and (g) a desire for lifelong learning. The aforementioned characteristics played a prominent role in promoting success at Dunbar. Each characteristic is discussed in detail in the subsequent sections.

1. The Care Ethic

With relentless consistency, the characteristic that towers over all the rest is care. One hundred percent of the former students interviewed stated that Dunbar teachers demonstrated genuine care for students. Interestingly, there was no evidence found that teachers ever articulated the words “I care” to their students. However, there is overwhelming evidence that indicates that teachers proved their care for students by their actions. There was absolutely no doubt because students knew it. Noddings (1992) states: “Personal manifestations of care are probably more important in children’s lives than any particular curriculum or pattern of pedagogy” (p. 676). Former students discussed their teachers collectively. They also discussed them individually. However, whether referring to teachers as a collective group or as individuals, students shared a common conclusion - Dunbar teachers cared about their students. Thus, care is a value that teachers not only believed in, but embodied, and communicated to their students.
The care ethic of Dunbar teachers had several effects. First, students felt protected. The outside world of de jure segregation alienated them, but the inside world of teacher acceptance embraced them. The following interviewee excerpts reveal the protective nature of Dunbar's teachers. One alumna stated:

The funny thing is, not only did we not recognize that we were being segregated, we were so loved and cared for that that did not bother us. ... I would say that the teachers on a whole were like parents. You know you could go to them and you could talk. I cannot think of one teacher that I could not talk to. It was like a family thing. (Personal communication, November 29, 2003)

Another alumna recalled: “It [school] was like an extension of mamma” (Personal communication, December 11, 2003). Another conversation revealed:

*Interviewer:* Did you sense that you were growing up in a segregated time?

*Interviewee:* No, I did not.

*Interviewer:* Why do you think that was?

*Interviewee:* I guess because I was protected from home to school, then school, back to home. I had this cushion of protection around me. (Personal communication, Nov. 30, 2003)

Yet, another conversation revealed:
I can remember that they [Mr. Hudson and Mr. Carrier] were always on patrol. I can remember boys walking down the halls holding the girls’ hands, and Mr. Carrier would be behind them and he would say, “Aw right boys, turn that girl’s hand alone and get some brains in your head.” They kept on top of us. We did not get away with nothin’. If you thought you were gettin’ away with somethin’ you had another thought comin’. They were always on patrol. They were watchin’ us. Like I said, when we went to school, we were under their supervision. When we left home, then we were under our parents’ supervision, and when we came back to school we were under their supervision [again].

(Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Bernard (1991) draws attention to protective factors found in positive families, schools and communities. He identifies sustaining, caring and supportive relationships as an impetus for success in children. Thus, Dunbar teachers displayed a caring, protective nature that positively impacted student performance, and ultimately led to their success.

Secondly, in addition to feeling protected, students knew that they had to tow the line, conform to teacher expectations, or face the consequences. The consequences were corporal punishment, first at school, then later at home. Firm discipline was instituted and implemented. At that time, the Tucson Board of Education permitted schools to exercise corporal punishment (Cooper, 1967).
There was an aspect of duality to the care ethic of Dunbar teachers. On one side of the coin, care for students was strong and compassionate. On the other side, discipline was stern. Firm discipline was held at a high premium. A conversation with an alumnus revealed:

*Interviewer:* I have been hearing that Dunbar teachers were caring teachers....that they went out of their way.

*Interviewee:* Oh yes.

*Interviewer:* How do you know that they were caring teachers? I mean, you know when somebody cares for you, but what did that look like at Dunbar... a caring teacher at Dunbar?

*Interviewee:* It is very interesting because it has two faces...

like I said, we were in a different time. Even though they were hard on us, but at the same time, it is like a spank and a hug. You know, they would discipline you, but at the same time they would still let you know they still loved you, and we accepted that. We knew that they loved us. So, even when we did something wrong, or we did not do our lessons or somethin’, the punishment that they meted out...we knew that behind that was a whole lot of love. I don’t know of anyone that ever came through Dunbar that is still harboring hatred for
the teachers.

**Interviewer:** How many reunions have you attended?

**Interviewee:** Oh, this is my fifth one.

**Interviewer:** Was there physical contact between teachers and students or was it such that you just knew?

**Interviewee:** Oh yeah, it was nothing for us to go up and hug them, you know, after class was over. This kind of thing, sure, oh yes.

(Personal communication, December 3, 2003)

An alumnus noted another aspect of the duality. He recounted:

I remember Mr. Carrier who was my Math teacher.

One time I got in serious trouble because this boy who lived near where I lived and some older boys, they broke the windows in the Math room. Mr. Carrier knew that I knew who did it, and I wouldn’t tell ‘cause I’d get beat up if I did. So as a result, he made me go to summer school. Years later I got the chance to confront him about it and I asked him, “Mr. Carrier, I made all ‘A’s why did you send me to summer school?” He said, “Well, I wanted better than your best.” We had terrific teachers and one thing I do remember is, “We thought that they were being mean, but they were really concerned, and we did not know the extent of segregation and what it meant, but they were well
on top of it. They made sure that we were ready for that
outside world, and those that wanted to get it and did not get
it, I am sorry, it was there. (Personal communication,
May 29, 2004)

Thirdly, some teachers at Dunbar stood out over the others because of a
demonstration of charisma. It was not a lack of care that separated one teacher from the
other. All teachers cared. However, charisma seemed to be a feature that produced a
dividing line among the faculty. Some teachers were more open, expressive and
charismatic, while others were more conservative and refined. Bennis (1994) highlights
that charismatic leaders master the skill of dealing with differing personalities in such a
way that their charisma outshines any negativity. In this sense, charismatic Dunbar
teachers can be termed “teacher-leaders.” A conversation with an alumna uncovered
memories of her favorite teacher. She recalled:

Interviewer: Who was your favorite teacher?

Interviewee: My favorite teacher was Dr. Laura Nobles Banks.

Interviewer: What do you remember about her?

Interviewee: I remember, I guess that she was a very beautiful
woman. She was the teacher who taught the young
girls about coming into womanhood. She was also
my Girl Scout leader. So I had a lot of
interaction with her. I felt that if I had a
problem, I could have gone to her and I knew
that she was the one that would have helped me.

Some teachers stood out in your mind more than others, but not because they particularly cared for you, it was just that the charisma was there.

(Personal communication, November 30, 2003)

Fourthly, teachers were not *only* concerned about academics. Their care extended to the well-being of the whole child. Student testimonials reveal that teachers at Dunbar took time to encourage students, and to build meaningful relationships with them. They complimented students on the little things that they did on route to their successes. Some made home visits. Others were extracurricular leaders. Some invited students to their homes. Overall, there is overwhelming evidence that teachers were not only interested in students’ academic progress, but they were also concerned about students as individuals. Teachers wanted students to be successful, but they were equally concerned about students’ well-being. One alumna recalled:

I remember Miss Horn. She was the nicest teacher. She cared about you as an individual. She made you feel important. And now years later, every now and then, I would just pick up the phone and call her and just say, “Hi,” and then it was, “Do you remember me?” And that is something that you did not get when you moved to the other schools. They did not give you that attention that we got when we were at Dunbar.

(Personal communication, June 4, 2004).
It appears that Dunbar teachers took their teaching responsibilities very seriously. Their responsibilities extended beyond providing students with knowledge. Siddle Walker (1996), who researched a segregated school in North Carolina, writes:

Teaching then was a worthy occupation and equivalent to a religious calling. Their job did not separate the teaching from the taught. They were teaching subject matter to human beings. They were to be interested in “the whole child.” (p. 150)

By caring for the whole child and conveying their interest to students, teachers inadvertently provided a sense of hope for students. Worrell and Hale (2001) studied the impact of hope in the future as a variable for determining students’ desirability to continue school. Their findings pointed to a perceived school climate as pivotal as to whether students stayed in school or dropped out. Former teachers and alumni revealed that the school climate was intensely positive, and helped to facilitate student success. Researchers affirm that a positive school culture unequivocally points students in the direction of successful learning (Snowden & Gorton, 2002; Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Teachers made sure that no student was alienated or left behind. For many students, care from their teachers was a lifeline. One student best articulated the feelings of several alumni: “It [Dunbar] was a stepping stone. I think that without Dunbar, I would not have made it” (Personal communication, March 29, 2004).

Teachers instilled values that students carried with them throughout life. Respect, appropriate behavior and discipline were high on the teacher priority list. Students were taught to be courteous, not only to other teachers, but to any adult and to their fellow
students. Some teachers addressed students by their surnames. Others opted to use their Christian names. Students always addressed teachers or older members of the community by their surnames. In the Dunbar culture, a characteristic of being educated was the demonstration of core values. One had to show character, sport good home training, display manners, and be courteous to everyone at all times, whether they be rich or poor, black or white, schooled or unschooled. Failure to do so meant that one was a disgrace, not only to one’s biological family, but also to the Dunbar family as well. “Education,” although grammatically a noun in its standardized usage, was regarded as an action word in the Dunbar culture. Education demanded excellence, not only academically, but socially as well. It was education in its manifested form that made parents, the school and the community proud. Core values were constantly reinforced.

Essentially, students were taught life skills. One alumna articulated:

It [the Dunbar school experience] made me what I am. I remember
more things from my Dunbar years than I did from high school. I don’t want to say they pounded it into us, but we heard this [be on
good behavior] over and over and over. And because these teachers cared so much for you, you did not want to let them down
by doing something that was negative. So, you always wanted to
do positive things. (Personal communication, July 8, 2004)

Fifthly, teachers extended care not only to those who exemplified pleasing conduct and high academic performance, but also to those who had difficulty adjusting to school life. All Black children who attended public school, regardless of ability level, were
schooled under the tutelage of Dunbar teachers. There were no gifted programs. Neither were there any special-needs programs. An alumnus reported:

*Interviewer:* Was there a big difference in your education in

*Arkansas and your education in Tucson?*

*Interviewee:* Oh yeah! Oh, it was quite a big difference. I started Dunbar in the 4th Grade. I'll never forget, my first teacher was Laura Banks. She was Laura Nobles then. Oh, she’s lovely and I never had the chance to thank her. She always would come around. For some reason, the first day in her class I was shakin’ and she came by and she said, “Tyler, [pseudonym] read.” And oh, I just couldn’t get a word out of my mouth. I would just.. shhhh. She sort of sensed that I was afraid and she said, “That’s O.K. Tyler, you’ll get used to the kids and everything.” And that was the best kind of calm-me-down I ever had.” And after that, you know, she would take a little time with someone who was a slower learner like that. I wasn’t too slow at learning, I was just kinda picking it up because there were 25 or 30 kids in one room.

*Interviewer: So, who was your favorite teacher?*
Interviewee: I would say Miss Banks, Laura Nobles Banks, she was my favorite teacher. I often find when something comes up, I refer back to her. If it hadn’t been for her I never would have stayed in Dunbar. She said, “Well, Tyler [pseudonym], I realize that you are...” Well, I was two years older than the rest of the kids. And the kids used to tease me. [They would say] “You sixteen, you shouldn’t be going to school.” She said, “Well, Tyler, don’t let that worry you. You seem like you’re determined, you want to get a good education,” said... “Don’t pay ‘em no tention, you just go right on.” So without that, I would have probably dropped out. (Personal communication, March 29, 2004)

Thus, it was the warm human interactions between teachers and students that personified Dunbar, and characterized the core of its positive school climate. Several researchers observe that a positive school climate characterizes a strong school (Deal & Peterson, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1996; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Scholars have also addressed the issue of alienation in schools, and have found that students who are labeled “at risk” are demonstrably treated differently from other children (Cummins, 1986). Such alienation leads to students dropping out of school. Dunbar teachers did not treat students differently on the basis of ability. Labeling was
not a part of their pedagogy. Everyone was treated with the same measure of care and devotion. Consequently, all students interviewed felt a sense of belonging. Abraham Maslow’s well-known theory on the hierarchy of needs states that human beings possess a need to belong, and a need for acceptance and love which must be fulfilled before they can self-actualize, and reach their fullest potential (Maslow, 1970). Based on Maslow’s findings, student alienation, therefore, can hinder the process towards success.

Student perceptions revealed an extensive list of characteristics about the caring nature of Dunbar’s teaching staff. Teachers (a) were protective, (b) willingly gave of themselves, (c) displayed charisma, (d) believed in tough love characterized by demonstrable care and firm discipline, (e) looked for opportunities to reward students, (f) provided guidance, (g) built positive relationships, (h) showed a respect for individual uniqueness, ability and learning style; (i) demonstrated a sense of compassion and warmth towards students, (j) expected all students to be successful regardless of their ability, (k) allowed students to feel a sense of connection and positive effects of care, and (l) believed that to educate meant to contribute to the development of the whole child. If one were to measure the comments of Dunbar students against clinical definitions of care, one’s understanding becomes broadened.

Mayeroff (1971) conducted a comprehensive study on the ethic of care. He dissects this concept, and writes:

To care for another person, in the most significant sense, is to help him grow and actualize himself.....Caring is the antithesis of simply using the other person to satisfy one’s own needs...
Caring, as helping another grow and actualize himself, is a process, 
a way of relating to someone that involves development in the 
same way that friendship can only emerge in time through mutual 
trust and deepening and qualitative transformation of the 
relationship. (p. 1)

Mayeroff addresses the fact that care does not have an abstract posture, but rather it is 
personified by a relationship that nurtures another human being, and produces growth. 
He further points out that care is goal-oriented, and expects positive results. This frame 
of thinking hinges on beliefs grounded in expectancy theory, an ideology grandfathered 
in the field of psychology, but made applicable to organizations during the 1960s by 
Victor Vroom (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). This theory exports the belief that if one believes 
that dedication and hard work will yield successful results, success will come. Dunbar 
teachers expected students to achieve. Their expectations were characterized by a 
conscious effort to influence student performance. Care was demonstrated through the 
personal interest that teachers took in their students. In fact, their care was evident to the 
degree that students felt a sense of connection with their teachers. In order for any 
relationship to form, one person must take the first step. Dunbar teachers were initiators 
of student-teacher relationships. They extended themselves. They bonded with students 
and their families. It was precisely their effort to stretch themselves that students seemed 
to appreciate. This personal interest was metamorphosized and reaped dividends. 
Consequently, students were motivated to do their best. Thus, one of the direct outcomes 
a display of care was student success. It is safe to conclude, therefore, that the absence of
a display of care in teacher-student relationships, coupled with the students’ feeling of a lack of care, equals an absence of care. It may seem trite to add that care is only as meaningful as its effect upon the recipient. The axiomatic principle here is the following: “Care is not care until you give it away.”

Valenzuela (1999) conducted an ethnographic study of American-born Mexicans and immigrant Americans pitted against the traditional ideology of education in the U.S. She found, on the one hand, that the accepted assumption in the U.S. is that youth become educated in the hands of caring adults. Yet, teachers, administrators and decision makers in her study failed to display a caring attitude. This caused Valenzuela to zoom in on ambiguities of the Texas educational system. She spotlights a difference in perception between Latino students and their teachers regarding teacher-student relationships. Her study revealed that some teachers perceived care as “abstract,” while others perceived it as “aesthetic” (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 61). According to Valenzuela, a distance in teacher-student relationships characterizes abstract care. This form of care paints a picture of the teacher who executes duties in a perfunctory manner. By contrast, aesthetic care is the traditional form of care that exudes compassion and concern. Valenzuela’s study revealed that Latino students in a Texan school district were severely short-changed due to an absence of aesthetic care. Yet, students expected teachers to demonstrate aesthetic care. Teachers displayed “abstract care” (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 61). The irony here is that teachers thought that they were demonstrating care towards students when in actuality they were distancing themselves by failing to build relationships with them. Drawing
from the research of Noddings (1984, 1992), Valenzuela articulates the nature of true caring:

Authentic caring teachers are seized by their students and energy flows toward their projects and needs. The benefit of such profound relatedness for the student is the development of a sense of competence and mastery over worldly tasks. In the absence of such correctedness, students are not only reduced to the level of objects, they may also be diverted from learning the skills necessary for mastering their academic and social environment. Thus, the difference in the way students and teachers perceive school-based relationships can bear directly on students’ potential to achieve. (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 62)

The aforementioned description of a Texan school district poignantly articulates by stark contrast what Dunbar teachers were not. According to Valenzuela’s definition of care, Dunbar teachers demonstrated traditional, aesthetic care. Students flourished in this academic ambiance because their teachers nurtured them, and felt their genuine care. Consequently, students excelled. Students carried the fruits of their nurturing school environment beyond the walls of segregation and into the wider arena of their adult life.

Research has shown that care promotes personal growth and development in students (Beck, 1992; Bernard, 1991; Finley, 1994; Oakes, Hunter Quartz, Ryan & Lipton, 2000; Noddings, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996). Students have a need to be accepted by their teachers. Genuine care embodies the ability to extend oneself towards another. It also
involves catering to the needs of another individual. Dunbar teachers were able to do this successfully. The late Mother Teresa of Calcutta, India, cited in Beck (1992), expressed the following: "The biggest disease today is not leprosy or tuberculosis, but rather the feeling of being unwanted, uncared for, and deserted by everybody" (p. 454). Her position speaks to the moral responsibility of educational leaders to meet the needs of students, and to be welcoming towards those who are daily entrusted into their school care.

Beck (1992) emphasizes that educators must actively choose to care by making a conscious decision to accept students unconditionally. Dunbar teachers made such an effort with their students. Valenzuela (1999) purports "additive schooling" is the missing ingredient of the schooling experience (p. 88). Additive schooling, as the term implies, means that teachers add value to students' lives through the schooling experience. Dunbar teachers embodied additive schooling by recognizing the uniqueness of each student's personality, as well as the natural gifts that each brought to the learning process. Teachers at the segregated school exemplified aesthetic care. They added value to students' lives which in turn encouraged them to be successful. Valenzuela states that "subtractive schooling," which opposes additive schooling, has a direct correlation on student achievement (Valenzuela, 1999). She concludes: "Real learning is difficult to sustain in an atmosphere rife with mistrust" (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 88). The Dunbar experience trumpets Valenzuela's definition of additive schooling.

Noddings (1984) amplifies our understanding of care when she writes: "When I care... there is more than a feeling; there is a motivational shift. My motive energy flows
toward the other...I allow my motive energy to be shared; put in the service of others" (p. 33). Mayeroff (1971) explains that this kind of care epitomizes a sense of devotion. He notes: “It is shown by…..‘being there’ for the other in a way that is the converse of holding back and ambivalence” (p. 6). Thus, the care ethic was the bedrock upon which Dunbar’s success was built.

2. A Sense of Community

Researchers affirm that layers of culture are operative within an organization (Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1991). There is an outer layer and an inner layer. The outer layer is the more obvious dimension. It is a tangible layer that people can see, and sometimes touch. On the other hand, there is an inner layer of values, assumptions and beliefs that is less obvious to the observer (Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1992). Outwardly, Dunbar was an isolated, segregated school. Inwardly, it was a cohesive, connected school with a strong sense of community. Repetitively, alumni and former teachers articulated: “We were all one big happy family.” When examining the concept of community, Sergiovanni (1992) puts forth an explanation of community. He writes:

The concept [of organizational culture] is similar to that of a community, but it is not the same. All schools have cultures, but not all schools are communities. The idea of a school as a learning community suggests a kind of connectedness among members that resembles what is found in a family, a neighborhood, or some
other closely knit group, where bonds tend to be familial or even sacred. (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 46)

Sergiovanni's explanation of community articulates the dynamics of Dunbar very well.

The late Willie Fears, former Dunbar Alumni Association Chairlady and organizer noted:

In the beginning, Dunbar had no auditorium, no real library, no cafeteria, and no gymnasium. The class books were used and handed down from other schools to us. Despite those inadequacies, there was among us an atmosphere of unity and togetherness. (Lawson, 1988, p. 4)

Indeed, there was a strong sense of community. The bond inside Dunbar was strengthened by connections that the membership had with the local church. Another interviewee noted: "I felt close bonds existed between the church, school and home, and the life of the community depended on these three" (Personal communication, November 29, 2003). Daniels (1941) observes:

Before and after the Civil War colored people have placed their hope for peace and happiness in religion. Defeated and distressed, these people, through the church, looked to the Almighty above for deliverance from an evil, sinful world. Through a period of slavery, through a period of hate, struggle, and blood-shed, through a period of readjustment of themselves and a nation, and through a period of economic exploitation and progress, they have kept faith with God. They had hope of a future world where eternal love and
brotherhood would become a part of all men. Such was the philosophy of an oppressed minority. (p. 1)

Thus, the church provided an axis on which beliefs and values of the Dunbar membership were shaped. No one church in particular outshone the others. There were several Baptist churches in the vicinity of the school that practiced Judeo-Christian values. For the Dunbar community, the church was not only a place of worship, but a focal point for community fellowship, particularly since the wider world excluded them from membership and participation. To some degree, it offered an added sense of cohesion. The connection that the Dunbar community made with local churches, all of which are still operative today, allowed teachers, students and their families the opportunity to form lasting friendships.

Another by-product of being connected with the church was the congruency between values of the home and those of the school. Dunbar inculcated home values. The home reinforced school values. There was no margin of separation between the stated values and beliefs of the school and espoused values and beliefs of the home. In fact, they were largely one in the same. Teachers and parents appeared to be metaphorically “on the same page.” Agreement between home and family eliminated dissonance. It seemed to create harmony that fostered a sense of freedom on the part of the school to promulgate their interpretation of biblical beliefs, knowing that the home would endorse their beliefs, values and expectations. Dunbar’s values and beliefs were watered by Judeo-Christian doctrine, and they permeated the school. It is believed that the congruency of home-school values helped to facilitate student success.
One strand of congruency of home-school values was the emphasis on respect for authority. Dunbar teachers and parents were equally intolerant of poor behavior. They practiced firm discipline, and insisted on respect for authority. One interviewee recounted:

When I was coming up, we feared adults. [When] you did wrong at school, make no mistake about it we got a spanking and all your momma had to do is know that you got a spanking and you got another one. See, we were not allowed to say, “Well, you know I did not do that.” Because then the older people would say, “Are you calling Miss So and So a liar?” No! We had to be respectful. That was number one. Kids [today] are not made to respect anybody. Like I said, you not only had to respect your parents, you had to respect the outside people too. (Personal Communication, June 1, 2004)

Another alumna stated:

We lived mostly in the same area. Everybody knew everybody. Other parents could chastise other children if they were doing wrong. We as kids had respect for those other parents. As an example, if someone was smoking and we saw a parent coming, you [sic] would either swallow that cigarette or you’d get rid of it [she laughs] because you knew when you got home [she laughs], your mother or your dad was going to find out about it. It was
more like... it was a lot of respect. We respected our elders.

Today, maybe it is not that important, but we were taught to say,

"Yes, ma'am, no ma'am." (Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Clearly, there was collective responsibility at Dunbar. There was a reciprocal sense of culture. This reciprocity of values created harmony between home and school. A key ingredient was trust. Parents could trust teachers to educate their children in accordance with their core values. Students, therefore, by natural progression, were expected to measure up to all of the school’s expectations. Dunbar’s values and beliefs were a beacon of light that provided consistency that safely guided students toward common goals of success. On occasions when students may have fallen short, either academically or socially, they could rest assured that Dunbar would cushion them, and set them back on the right track. Unquestionably, this reciprocity of home-school values helped to facilitate student success.

It must be noted that time favored the Dunbar experience, and fortified the sense of community. As time elapsed, students and teachers grew together as they would in any close relationship. By recognizing the prominent role that time plays in the development of organizational culture, researchers are able to place events and behaviors into an historic frame of reference. With the passing of time, patterns of behavior form, assumptions are embedded, and values are engrained. Van Maanen and Barley (1985) endorse the role of time as an important ingredient for assessing organizational culture. They attest: “Cultural manifestations therefore evolve over time as members of a group
confront similar problems, devise and employ strategies that are remembered and passed on to new members” (p. 33). Peterson and Deal (1998) make a similar observation: “Culture is the underground stream of norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals that has built up over time as people work together to solve problems and confront challenges” (p. 28). Bolman and Deal (1997) widen our understanding of organizational culture. They observe: “Over time, every organization develops distinctive beliefs and patterns. Many of these are unconscious or taken for granted, reflected in myths, fairy tales, stories, rituals, ceremonies, and other symbolic forms” (p. 231). Clearly, several researchers have found that the variable of time is a sine qua non for the development of organizational culture.

Dunbar’s teachers and students lived through years of segregation over an extended period of time. They learned together in a common environment. Many students entered Dunbar in Grade One, and remained there through Grade Nine when they departed for high school. Therefore, teachers and students spent considerable time together. Teachers had the opportunity to bond with families, and to build strong relationships with them. This sense of community added value not only to individuals, but to the school as a whole. Thus, Dunbar was not just an organization. It became a close-knit family. The church played a role that added value to the Dunbar membership. Each group was proud of the other. No group felt threatened by the other. They functioned, metaphorically speaking, on the same playing field, and for this reason they supported one another willingly. In fact, limitations of the wider sociopolitical climate catapulted the Black community into a greater sense of oneness. One alumna stated:
The thing was... it was a community. It wasn’t a teacher. If you did something wrong and you got sent to the office, that was not the end of it. It was a community offense when you did something wrong. It wasn’t just about school work, we were small enough and integrated enough that whatever we did to mess up, got home before we did. If you did something wrong down the street, the neighbor got it. It was in a true sense of community. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Etta Dawson, former Dunbar teacher and librarian, writes:

Dunbar was a winning school – highly competitive and highly visible in the Tucson community...Behind its achievements and accomplishments was a team of winners – the entire hard-working school staff; the supportive families of the students; visitors from the local community. (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997, p. 9)

Schein (1992) observes: “The most useful way to think about [organizational] culture is to view it as accumulated shared learning of a given group, covering behavioral, emotional, and cognitive elements of the group members’ total psychological functioning” (p. 10). This notion of “shared learning” is one that is supported by several other researchers (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1992; Snowden & Gorton, 2002).

In his discussion on care, Mayeroff (1971) states:
Caring assumes continuity, and it is impossible if the other is continually being replaced. The other must remain constant, for caring is a developmental process. In situations of great social mobility man becomes rootless, and loyalty to one’s community becomes increasingly difficult. We do not stay in one place long enough for any sense of loyalty to develop; powers like devotion and trust do not get a chance to come into play. (p. 24)

Thus, the Dunbar membership developed a sense of community. Time was a critical element that allowed the stakeholders space for growth and development. This contributed to a strong school culture. Peterson and Deal (1999) write: “Educators and community relationships thrive in a jointly controlled, emotionally satisfying, spiritually uplifting educational community” (p. 134).

3. Parental Involvement

Because of the level of trust that existed between parents and students, this naturally facilitated a high level of parental involvement at Dunbar. Testimonials report that its Parent Teachers Association was strong. Drawing from the research of Levine and Lezotte (1990), Deal and Peterson (1999) affirm: “Across nearly all studies of school effectiveness a key factor stands out: School performance and parent involvement are intimately intertwined” (p. 132). They continue:

Having parents involved in schools can narrow cultural gaps that arise when parents are held at arm’s length or feel apathetic toward
a school or their children’s learning. Only when a solid and positive partnership prevails between schools and parents will education flourish. (Peterson & Deal, 1999, p. 132)

Dunbar flourished because it welcomed parental input and involvement. Trust was the catalyst that led to strong parental involvement. Because school was not threatened by the home or vice versa, each was a meaningful contributor to the betterment of the Dunbar community. As previously stated, they regarded each other as part of the family. Therefore, parents were not outsiders to the school community, and Dunbar’s teachers and the administration were comfortable with their participation. One alumna said it best: “They [teachers] made you feel relaxed, as if they really cared. Then you got it from the home. The most important thing here was the parents and teachers worked together” (Personal communication, November 30, 2003). Hence, Dunbar parents felt comfortable participating in school activities supporting the maxim, “In unity there is strength.”

4. Qualified Teachers

Oral accounts underscore the fact that teachers were highly qualified and skilled. Dunbar teachers were some of the most qualified in the Pima County District. They were first and foremost qualified in the subjects they were expected to teach. Students appreciated their knowledge and their ability to communicate their subject to their students. All teachers held Bachelor’s degrees. Arizona Law required teacher certification by 1946 (The Dunbar Project, 1995). Many earned Master’s Degrees, and
sought further accredited professional development. Apart from their qualifications and skills, it appears that Dunbar's teachers enjoyed teaching young people.

Teacher expertise facilitated smooth operations in the classroom. Classrooms were orderly. Teachers took a vested interest in students' academic abilities. It was not uncommon for students to have to repeat assignments in order to gain mastery. Neither teachers nor students perceived this as punishment, but rather as a guarantee for student success. At the time, students had an entirely different view of the process, one that was less favorable. Teachers celebrated student success. Celebrations of success validated students' confidence that they could do well, and they did.

There was no evidence found of a singular style of pedagogy employed by Dunbar teachers. Generally, teachers used the group instruction methodology. However, they also practiced individual instruction techniques when students were in need of extra help. Students often remained after school, sometimes voluntarily, other times involuntarily, to gain direction and guidance on assignments, or simply to seek teachers' advice or make informal contact. Some teachers incorporated songs in their pedagogical approach. Others did not. Some championed peer coaching as an approach to learning. In some classes, the more able students helped the weaker ones. It was also noted that in some classrooms, stronger students earned special seats and special privileges, which included assisting teachers with classroom duties.

Teachers used questioning techniques, read to students and assigned homework. Periodically, students underwent oral and written evaluations. Students often marked each other's paper. Teachers made sure that students were informed in current events
and in matters of their local history. One alumna informed: “Before we could pass from the eighth grade to the ninth grade we had to learn the Constitution of the United States. We [also] had to learn the State Constitution, The Arizona Constitution.” A focus group interview revealed:

Interviewer:  What was the pedagogy at Dunbar like? What went on in the classroom that characterized what this teaching looked like?

Interviewee 1: Ninth Grade English, Dawson!

Interviewee 2: Hey... Dawson!

Interviewee 1: She did peer teaching, back in 1950s, she did not call it that. I am not sure if the school system called it, but uh...on our weekly exams the ones who made the first, second, third highest got the front seats and then the rest of the students were placed. I am sure that it was based on your grade, but she did not tell us that. We had to help our next door neighbor with their projects and explain it [sic] to them, which made it a little bit easier for them to understand. And we moved around. We did not sit in the same seat all the time. We moved around. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)
The philosophical belief of Dunbar teachers is best encapsulated in this statement by an alumna: “You can do better, you can do better, and always try to be the best you can” (Personal communication, December 11, 2003).

5. A Sense of Resilience That Fostered Excellence

Dunbar teachers were propelled by a sense of resilience that led students to produce academic excellence. Several scholars have addressed the subject of resiliency, particularly as it relates to the schooling process (Bernard, 1991; Finley, 1994; Henderson, 1998; Keogh, 2000; Krovetz, 1999; Noon, 1999; Pianta & Walsh, 1998). Krovetz (1999) states the following: “Resiliency theory is founded on the proposition that if members of one’s family, community and/or school care deeply about you, have high expectations and purposeful support for you and value your participation, you will maintain a faith in the future and can overcome almost any adversity” (pp. 28-29). This quotation encapsulates the motor that drove Dunbar teachers. One alumnus stated: “The dedication of the teachers at Dunbar was enough to encourage the young people who attended the school to persevere” (Lawson, 1988, p. 11). This sense of resilience was armor for Dunbar students. As they advanced academically, they also developed socially. They were encouraged to face challenges confidently, and to expect positive outcomes. Charles Todd, the Art teacher, commented:

It was an unwritten goal that this separate school down by the tracks (incidentally a typical location of schools for children of color) would prepare the graduates to meet their next level of
learning at Tucson High and beyond. (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997, p. 8).

Ultimately, many students did reach their goals.

Teachers were also motivated by the Dunbar experience itself. Marguerite Euell Sanchez stated: “One year of teaching at Dunbar taught me to persist, in spite of difficulties” (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997, p. 8). Finley (1994) states: “The presence of protective factors in family, school and community environments appears to alter or reserve predicted negative outcomes and foster the development, over time, resiliency” (p. 3).

Snowden and Gorton (2002) note the presence of external and internal demands placed on an organization. Externally, students experienced oppressive conditions. Internally, they faced demands from their teachers to perform well academically, and to become upright citizens of the school and the wider community. Teachers consistently unveiled their care by expecting students to do their best in whatever tasks they faced. Consequently, there was no need for students to conquer feelings of inadequacy simply because they were constantly nurtured and encouraged. Teachers aimed for excellence. They preached that anything less than students’ best was unacceptable. They “pushed” students to do well. Paradoxically, students perceived the “pushing” as a positive aspect of their educational experience. They were left with the perception that teachers wanted success badly enough for them as if it were for themselves. Teachers were so passionate about wanting students to succeed that the latter automatically accepted that they must get a good education to get ahead in life. Cressworth Lander of the Dunbar Coalition
reported to the *Tucson Citizen*: “Although we were not given the superior materials, we had superior teachers who said: ‘Hey, we’re going to make things better’ ” (Copenhaver, 2002, p. 2A). Siddle Walker (1996) hints at a sense of resilience as she recounts her findings at a North Carolina segregated school. She writes: “Teaching was more than the imparting of subject matter; it was the task of molding children to be successful. Theirs was a job of collective racial uplift” (Siddle Walker, 1996, p. 149).

Mildred Banks, a former teacher, wrote: “A strong desire to excel ran through the pupils” (Dunbar Sixth School Reunion, 1997, p. 7). Students exuded determination because their teachers preached this value to them. An interview with a former Dunbar teacher revealed:

*Interviewee*: Be the best, I still have that sign.

[Interviewee chuckles]. It was visible in every classroom.

*Interviewer*: *Did Dunbar teachers remind students that they should be the best?*

*Interviewee*: Yes. It was our slogan. Excellence was our goal.

We had speakers come into the school.

One was Marion Anderson and her message to the students was: Aim for the stars.

(Personal communication, July 22, 2004)

An alumnus stated:
Dunbar was very good for me. I think that the teachers at Dunbar were very good. They were very strong and they were involved with what they were doing. They made sure that the students made something out of themselves. Coming from the South, this was a different experience than it was back there. Another alumnus confessed: I hate to say this, but segregated schools were better because the teachers cared. Teachers pushed you and they took it personal. We were like one big happy family. If a teacher saw a parent in the grocery store, he would tell the parent, hey, your kid can be doing better or your kid should be doing better. It was the only way. (Personal communication, March 11, 2004)

Wallace (1996) posits that a positive organizational culture is established by adopting an "excellence agenda." This is achieved when stakeholders aim for excellence. Dunbar teachers were committed to excellence. They were determined that they themselves would fight the odds. The only jobs open to Blacks in Tucson during the years of segregation were domestic, construction, the military, medicine, preaching and teaching. The job possibilities were limited. During the segregated era, Dunbar was the only
school where Black teachers could be employed. Elgie Mike (Batteau), former Dunbar teacher, reported to Annie Sykes of the African American History Internship Project:

I went to school District One to apply for a job shortly before I graduated. Upon application I was told that the only school that Black teachers could teach was at Dunbar. I was upset because I wanted to be able to teach in any school in the district. (Lawson, 1988, p. 12)

With little choice and promise of acquiring a good job, particularly of their preference, Dunbar teachers themselves stood up against social pressures that would pin them into restricted occupations. Despite the limited availability of jobs, they still encouraged students to pursue higher education hoping that they would later acquire better jobs and encourage improved social conditions. However, within Dunbar was a faculty of Black educators who may have chosen other professions had there been more job choices open to them. Essentially, this meant that many of the Black intelligentsia, stifled by the job market, pursued teaching. What resulted was that the wealth of knowledge, talents and skills of African American was unleashed in Dunbar's classrooms. Students benefited. One alumnus reported:

When the school became integrated, the teachers did not push Black kids to go to college. But at Dunbar, and at segregated schools everywhere, Black teachers wanted you to go to college while white teachers [in other schools] wanted you to take up vocational training or to become a good janitor or they wanted a
girl to become a good maid, while the black segregated schools said, "No, college is the only way out." There wasn't the sports where you thought you could make it through sports. We had the best teachers. If you had a Ph.D. in Physics, you couldn't work at a lab, you couldn't work as a manager, or at a bank, or as an architect, or a nutritionist, or a professor, so we had the best teachers because there were no other jobs for them to do. [It was] teaching, preaching, medicine or the military. The military was the first choice of the Dunbar kids. I think if you do some research you will see that most of us went into the military. I went to [sic] the military. (Personal communication, March 11, 2004)

Students, therefore, resisted mainstream thinking and pressed towards higher goals. One alumna recalls a conversation she had with the counselor at Tucson High School:

A young woman... she called me in one day. I was a junior and she said, "I was looking over your transcript and looking at what you are taking and she said, "You're registered for all of the wrong classes." I said, "No." She said, "Well, I don't understand. Why are you taking Physics and why are you taking Chemistry and Algebra? You really should be taking Home Economics and something else," she said. I said, "No, I don't need that. All that I need for cooking and sewing I learned at home. I need the courses that I have signed up for and I am taking them because I am going
to the university.” “Oh, no, you can’t do that”, she said. I said, “Yes, I can.” “Well, you won’t be able to find work after you finish.” I said, “Well, I will just have to see if I can’t find work.” She said, “Well, I think you are doing the wrong thing.” “My mother doesn’t think I am doing the wrong thing.” [She laughs]. That’s the kind of thing that I faced in high school. (Personal communication, March 26, 2004)

The alumna went on to achieve her doctorate and local honors.

Another example that addresses students’ ability to resist the psyche of the mainstream is the following:

Now, the negatives of Tucson High. Because we were “minorities” and I remember that this was an experience. I cannot recall her name. She had counseled me and told me, “You know what, you ought to become a carpenter.” I knew I was good with my hands because I had been in wood shop. But my mom had always said, “I want you to go to college, you know.” And I was torn between the two. There was my counselor, on the one hand, who was telling me to become a carpenter and then I had my Biology teacher who wanted me to become a biochemist. His name was Dr. Cook, and uh… that was quite an experience. I did not do a lot of studying, but on every exam I would come in either
first, second or third. (Personal communication, December 2, 2003)

This alumnus earned a doctorate and became a school psychologist graduating from one of the top universities in the United States. All excerpts speak to the sense of resilience that was groomed in students, nurtured by the home, and validated by Dunbar.

Marable (2000) makes interesting observations as he discourses on the struggles of African Americans and the future of American education. He writes:

For any oppressed people, questions of culture and identity are linked to the structure of power and privilege within society. Culture is the textured pattern of collective memory, the critical consciousness and aspirations of a people. When culture is constructed in the context of oppression, it may become an act of resistance. (Marable, 2000, p. 25)

Undeniably, the difficulties that Dunbar students faced during segregation years built a silent resistance that catapulted students into their destinies. They were encouraged to fight against the odds. What resulted from the trust in their leaders was a strong sense of self worth that encouraged hope for the future. Bennis (1989) attests: “Followers need from their leaders three basic qualities: they want direction; they want trust; and they want hope” (p. xiii). Dunbar teachers exemplified these qualities and more. They provided direction. They instilled in students a sense of resilience. They provided hope.

Scholars have examined modern day schools, and have concluded that when teachers have articulated high expectations for students, together with a caring learning
environment that invokes student involvement and responsibility, that this constitutes a protective environment that produces student success (Bernard, 1991; Finley, 1994; Krovetz, 1999). A protective school community is synonymous with a positive school community. Krovetz (1999) adds: “More than any other single factor, it is the lack of a deeply held belief in every child’s ability that leads to students achieving at levels lower than their potential.” (Krovetz, 1999, p. 28). The belief of Dunbar teachers that all students can succeed is believed to be an ingredient that helped produce student success.

By some standards, Dunbar students should not have been successful. Why? Many students were poor. They belonged to a so-called “minority” group. They were marginalized from the dominant social culture equipped with more resources. It was perceived that they had a greater number of opposing social forces to defeat before that could claim success. When asked if Dunbar students were poor, the following responses emerged:

Interviewee: [She laughs]. We did not think about that because we thought that we were all poor. All of us were poor. We could name one or two families where they seemed to be fairly well off, but we just never thought of a big economic gap because we had a number of families where there were mothers and fathers and they were both present and the mothers did not work. The fathers worked. Many families owned their own homes, and we owned our home and that was accepted. So, you did not feel that you had to
have a lot of money to own a home because it was common for many families. There were many families where there was no father, just the mother and the mother would work, but the children were poor. So, I do not recall that we ever said, “Well, that person is rich or that person has a lot and we are poor.” We just accepted the fact, and maybe it was because it was during the Depression years and coming right out of the Depression, nobody had any money. Nobody had much of anything, so it was [to] help whoever needs help whenever they needed help.

*Interviewer:* It appears that today the assumption is that if you are a poor person, then that is going to automatically equal underperformance in school.

*Interviewee:* But it doesn’t. It does *not* and that’s why I was saying that I think that what the home promotes becomes an important factor in the performance of kids. I know in our home, my mother read to us all the time and she had copies of some of the great books. She would read those stories to us and she did not say, “Do you understand it?” She would read them, and we would look at pictures and [when] we got old enough to read ourselves, we did. Everyone in the house read all the time. Those are things
that enrich your life and they give you something that you
carry with you forever. (Personal communication, March 26, 2004)

Another interesting answer emerged when the question was posed about the social status
of Dunbar students:

Interviewer: Were the majority of children poor at Dunbar?

Interviewee: You know what? No, I wouldn’t say that they were
poor. I would say that they were rich. All the kids… their parents
loved them. They did the best that they could. This is what we
knew and it mostly would come through love. So, to us, we were
rich. We could make it. And at that time, people helped one
another and if I came to your house, I brought you something.
My momma always said, “Take what you got and make the best
out of it.” I think that we were rich. Being that we did not have
so much, it made us very appreciative of what we had.

Back then we took what we had, and we were happy.

(Personal communication, November 30, 2003).

For some scholars the relatively low socioeconomic status of Dunbar students would
have put them “at risk.” Finley (1994) explains that students labeled “at risk” are those
who acquiesce to significant stressful and adverse circumstances around them. However,
Dunbar students did not allow their social status to be injurious to their academic success.
Neither did they succumb to oppressive social pressures. Instead, they thrived.
Finley (1994) spotlights an interesting difference between the terms “at risk” and “resilient.” Students may be at risk due to factors directly inhibiting success, such as poverty, alcoholism, or drug abuse, for example. On the other hand, resilient students are those who may be exposed to elements that increase the level of adversity and stress in their lives, but who manage not to succumb to those pressures due to positive family, school or community influences in their lives (Finley, 1994). Resilience, therefore, is an attribute that students can acquire through a nurturing school environment. Scholars affirm that schools have the potential to foster resilience in children (Bernard, 1991; Krovetz, 1999; Noon, 1999).

The question that arises here is: Where did the spirit of resilience originate? Why were Dunbar teachers so confident that their approach to schooling would inevitably yield successful students?

Historical Comparison of Kansas and Arizona

It is interesting to note that nine of seventeen teachers who taught at Dunbar, including the Dunbar principal, hailed from Kansas. This research begs answers to the following questions: What qualities did Kansan teachers bring to the Dunbar experience? What historical factors may have impacted the Dunbar faculty? How does the West bind Arizona and Kansas together and strengthen the position of African Americans?

The history of a place says much about the people who shaped it. Arizona reached statehood in 1912 becoming the youngest of the continental states. Kansas, by contrast, was more than half a century old when nascent Arizona stood center stage for statehood.
Kansas became the 34th state in 1861 (Gruver, 1976). Arizona boasts the absence of slavery. Kansas, on the other hand, prides itself on being an active participant in the abolitionist movement in the 1850s. According to Taylor (1998), antebellum Kansas was the home of several anti-slavery proponents who defied White majority opinion, and successfully led bands of slaves from the non-free state of Missouri into Kansas free soil via Underground Railroad posts. Gruver (1976) informs that pro-slavery forces from Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina bucked heads with anti-slavery Northerners who were bent on making Kansas territory an anti-slavery state. Pro-slavery Kansas legislation aimed to stomp out anti-slavery efforts. Some Kansans embraced the federal Anti-Fugitive Act of 1850 that penalized slavery opponents and robbed slaves of their freedom, even if they lived in a free state. Unlike Arizona, which prided itself in having a relatively peaceful racial climate, Kansas vaunted the infamous Christmas night, John Brown anti-slavery massacre of 1858 that gained the support of thousands of Blacks and Whites (Gruver, 1976). Brown, the Nat Turner of the West, and resident in Kansas for a brief period, felt chosen by God to go into the slave territory of Pottawatomie Creek, Missouri and massacre five prominent slave holders, and rescue eleven slaves (Taylor, 1998). Kansas actively engaged in battle on the eve of its declaration of statehood and became known as “Bleeding Kansas” (Gruver, 1976). Arizona, on the other hand, quietly entered statehood, limping behind the rest of the nation. Although Kansas legislation outlawed slavery for the new territory, like Arizona, free Blacks were still excluded from much of mainstream life. The stark difference that separates Arizona from Kansas is the number of African Americans. Kansas acquired a swollen number of ex-slaves when the
newly formed state bravely entered into fierce battle with neighboring Missouri (Taylor, 1998). African American Kansans, together with the influx of rebellious slaves, fortified the position of Blacks in that state. The maxim applies here: In unity there is strength.

Scholars have examined the character profile of Black migrants who flocked to Kansas in the early nineteenth century. Taylor (1998) notes enticing advertisements promoting the promise of advancement and land ownership were the carrot that attracted many African Americans to the farmland state. They jumped at the invitation, fully aware that “whatever befalls them in Kansas they at least have a chance to rise and fall on their own merits” (p. 142). Black migrants were warned through the *Topeka Colored Citizen*, for example, that their passport to freedom came with a price. According to Taylor (1998), the *Citizen* wrote: “Remember that in Kansas everybody must work or starve. This is a great state for the energetic and industrious, but a fearful poor one for the idle or lazy man” (Taylor, 1998, p. 142).

Katz (1992) also digs into the lives of African Americans who made significant contributions to life in the West. Via an examination of personalities of people of color, Katz weaves a tapestry of African Americans who helped to build the West. He observes that early African American settlers in the West possessed specific attributes that include the following: (a) a relentless quest for freedom, defined by an escape from oppressive colonial rule; (b) devotion to hard work imposed by forced labor; (c) an entrepreneurial spirit, (d) readiness to confront the threat of liberty, (e) recognition that Blacks were a competing underrepresented group in the midst of Native Americans against a common
White enemy, (f) intelligence and cognizance of social inequality that tried to envelope them, and (g) artistic talents (Katz, 1992).

In discussing the mosaic of cultures that comprised the U.S., Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers (2003) point out that European immigrants flocked to both urban and rural areas in search of jobs. Katz (1992) notes, however, that Europeans in Arizona were fewer in number than other regions of the United States. By contrast, Kansas is listed among the cities where there was a large concentration of Germans, Scandinavians and Czechs who congregated there by the early twentieth century (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003). A spirit of competition prevailed between immigrant groups (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003). During the Reconstruction period, after the Civil War, many African Americans moved West in search of jobs, freer living and more opportunities (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003). These scholars note:

> It is has been estimated that between fifteen thousand and twenty thousand Black farmers settled in Kansas in the year 1880. Also, several entire black communities, such as the settlers at Nicodemus, Kansas, moved from the South to the West. (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003, p. 163)

African Americans, although not international immigrants, were new migrants to the Kansas region. They were brave and bold. They were industrious. Their devotion to work was unparalleled (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003). Their efforts yielded success. They could relate to struggle and having to go against the odds because they had migrated west to escape harsh racist practices of the South. It is believed that these
migratory communities of African Americans and Europeans had similar goals for success, and competed for the attention of mainstream America. They wanted their children to excel, and to acquire a sense of autonomy and self-sufficiency. They did. The fundamental difference between these groups was that African Americans faced double pressure. Not only did they have to fight for recognition and acceptance as an underrepresented group in the mainstream West, but they also had to battle with racial conflicts that led to prejudicial behavior indicated by property and voting restrictions (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003). However, these scholars also note: “These difficulties failed to halt their trek” (p. 163). It is believed that the trials and difficulties that forerunners to Dunbar experienced perpetuated a sense of resilience in African Americans of the West. It is also believed that this sense of resilience trickled down to migrants to Tucson who taught at the segregated school.

Research shows that social groups transplant their own cultural patterns of behavior, values and beliefs into new settings (Dinnerstein, Nichols & Reimers, 2003; Hofstede, 1991). Black Kansans brought with them a rich history of perseverance. Hofstede (1991) posits:

Regional, ethnic, and religious cultures account for differences within countries; ethnic and religious groups often transcend political country borders. Such groups form minorities at the crossroads between the dominant culture of the nation and their own traditional group culture. Some assimilate into the mainstream, although this may take a generation or more; others
continue to stick to their own ways. The USA, as the world’s most prominent example of people composed of immigrants, shows examples of assimilation (the ‘melting pot’) and retention of group identities over generations. (p. 16)

Kansan teachers at Dunbar retained their work ethics that they had developed before arriving in Arizona and implemented them at Dunbar. The proverb: “You can take the man out of the country, but not the country out of the man” seems appropriate here. The foundational values that were laid down in Kansas, through the power of history, strengthened the African American populace. Teachers were subconsciously aware that their history, culture and approach to education helped to shape the Dunbar experience. Yet, they consciously transplanted ethics from their former environment: the spirit of competition, quest for excellence, and a spirit of resilience. They were intrinsically motivated to be powerful assets as educators, and as such they were fiercely loyal to their values and beliefs. Hofstede (1991) affirms: “People in occupations demanding higher education tend to score intrinsic elements as more important” (p. 57). Kansan teachers at Dunbar were motivators who helped to propel student success.

Thus, teachers who came to Dunbar from Kansas brought with them a strong cultural heritage. They were confident and had the benefit of seeing successful Black schools in operation. Their foreknowledge of successful Blacks in Kansas was an impetus to bring Dunbar to its highest potential. They were well educated, schooled in cultural pedagogy, and confidently brought with them methods and ideas that were proven to work. Their historical and cultural experience of their Kansan forefathers was proof that they could
succeed. It must be remembered that it was Kansas that starred in the landmark Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education* that obliterated legalized segregation in U.S. It is believed that the resilient spirit of the Kansas teachers, coupled with their academic expertise, and their desire to see Black students excel were key contributors to Dunbar’s success. As stated earlier, all Dunbar teachers were not from Kansas. However, whether from Tucson, Kansas or elsewhere, Dunbar teachers worked together to ensure that students gained a solid education that allowed them to be a successful citizen and credit to their race.

6. *Cultural Pedagogy*

In this study the term “cultural pedagogy” is used to explain an aspect of pedagogy employed by Dunbar teachers. Cultural pedagogy has a dual dimension. First, it describes the utilization of Black heroes and heritage as an instructional tool. Second, it describes the use of one’s own cultural experience to improve oneself. Dunbar teachers had respect for African American culture. The late Willie Fears noted:

> We had African American teachers who were deeply motivated to teach us beyond our standard studies. They taught us about the great achievements of Paul Laurence Dunbar, an honor to our school name, and Langston Hughes, two famous poets and writers, as well as other distinguished African American writers. We learned about the scientific work of Dr. Charles Drew, pioneer in
blood preservation, and other scholars of his status. (Lawson, 1988, p. 4).

A focus group conversation revealed:

_Interviewer:_ So, school was not just about education, right?

Interviewee 1: Oh, no, it was about culture...that's where we learned about Black history.

Interviewee 2: I remember the history books, Carver and Booker T. Washington.

_Interviewer:_ Did they tell you about other success stories of Blacks?

Interviewee 2: They were part of our experience. They were part of our community. These people [heroes] were involved in the every day experiences of the child.

(Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Testimonials also indicate that giant personalities visited the segregated school. Jesse Owens, the 1936 four-time Olympic gold medalist for sprinting, and Larry Doby, who gained the spotlight in the baseball hall of fame for being the first Black to play in the American League with the Cleveland Indians in 1947 just months after Jackie Robinson had broken the color barrier, were guest speakers at Dunbar. Leroy “Satchel” Paige, “pronounced the greatest pitcher in the history of the Negro League” (Satchel Paige Biography, 2004, p. 1) also visited Dunbar. Joe Lewis, the undefeated heavyweight-boxing champion paid a visit to the segregated school. Marion Anderson, the famous
contralto Metropolitan Opera singer who earned over two dozen honorary degrees, and won numerous prestigious awards for her exceptional voice skills, left an indelible impression on Dunbar students. Her message to them was: “Reach for the stars.” Well-known B. B. King, the popular blues singer and recording artist dropped in at Dunbar to encourage and entertain the faculty and student body. Lionel Hampton’s famous dance band also entertained students, and encouraged them to strive for excellence. Notable African American writer, Langston Hughes, known for his extraordinary talents as a prolific poet, short story writer and playwright was an inspiration for students. Actress Hattie Mc Daniels, the 1939 Academy Award winner, who was the first African American to be nominated and to win an award, and who is best remembered for her supporting role in Gone with the Wind, also graced the halls of Dunbar. Mc Daniels also chose to be married at the segregated school (Personal communication, March 11, 2004). Thus, students had first-hand contact with successful, high profile African American personalities. The personal contact with African American super stars not only provided strong role models for students, but was a tremendous source of inspiration. It gave students a cultural connection because of the commonalities of race, struggle, and the quest for success, and simultaneously instilled in them a sense of racial pride. The cultural contact demonstrated to students that they could achieve anything if they possessed the determination to do so.

Because Blacks were restricted from staying in hotels and eating at restaurants, the Black community was host to the stars. Once again, Dunbar students benefited from the restrictions on social liberties. Special guests ended up staying in the homes of Dunbar
alumni. Many of them stayed in the home of Chester Willis, father of a Dunbar alumna, who owned property in Tucson. Students had the opportunity to interact closely with the famous personalities. This form of cultural pedagogy was memorable, meaningful and irreplaceable. It was second to none.

Pedagogy for Dunbar teachers also involved personal coaching. Some teachers believed in peer coaching as a means of perpetuating peer success. This was another form of cultural pedagogy. The message instilled in students was to support and encourage one another's efforts for the benefit of the collective whole. Students were also instructed to speak well, and to present themselves with pride. Their motto, "Be the Best" was a maxim that permeated every facet of school life. To be proud of one's culture meant to export a good image. A focus group interview revealed the following:

Interviewee 1: I remember the effect of Dawson. When I got to high school at Pueblo, she was the librarian. I remember her pulling me aside and she drilled me in articulation. She would not have me stuttering and murmuring. She made me speak clearly and articulately and I bless her to this day because I hear people talking, and even professionals on T.V. and they are not trained to articulate clearly. She gave me a gift with that.

Interviewee 2: Another thing in my ninth grade English class, Miss Jackson taught us how to do an outline and
how to do a paper. I was in the Black Women’s Task Force and we were planning our program for the next year and there was a lady writing things and so, we put them out on the background. I said, “You’ve got your program there and [you can] you put it in an outline form,” and Jackson-Dawson was there and said, “That’s very good, where did you learn that? “My ninth grade English taught me” [referring to Dawson]. She was surprised that I still remember and I said, “Of course I do,” and I use it all the time when I am writing something. Years ago, my brother was saying that his daughter taught him how to do an outline and gave him a book and I said, “We learned that at Dunbar,” and he said, “I didn’t.” Well, I said, “I did, why didn’t you?” [The group laughs] (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Scholars advocate culture-based education as a means of integrating race with culture (Leake & Faltz, 1993; Swartz, 1996). Swartz (1996) notes:

It is an approach to teaching students how to think, not what to think. Students are viewed as critical agents able to combine scholarship with personal and cultural knowledge of themselves
and others in order to liberate themselves from the control of social constructions or institutions whose ‘business as usual’ would inequitably affect their opportunities and life chances. (p. 399)

The invaluable cultural exposure that Dunbar students received empowered them to seek success.

7. **A Desire for Lifelong Learning and Professional Development**

Dunbar teachers instilled in students that learning is a never-ending process.

*Interviewer:* *In a sense, you are living up to Dunbar expectations because that was drilled into you.*

Interviewee 2: That’s right.

Interviewee 1: That was drilled into you.

Interviewee 2: I was the Dean of Students at the University of Arizona for about ten years. I have my doctorate in Educational Administration.

Interviewee 1: I have a Bachelor of Arts in Public Management.

Interviewee 3: I have a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Radio and Television.

Interviewee 2: She is President of the Tucson Black Chamber of Commerce. I am President of Church Women United in Arizona. That is a state organization for another church organization.
Interviewee 2: I work as a volunteer with my political candidate and I am on the Dunbar Coalition, the group that is working to restore the building.

Interviewer: I would imagine that this is not uncommon. Folks have multiple interests in different things, right?

Interviewee 1: [Yes]. The first thing I did after I retired was sign up for courses at Pima College. Somewhere along the way, it was instilled in me that you never stop learning. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Dunbar instilled in students and teachers that the quest for education and personal development was an unending process.

Analysis of Dunbar's Chief Espoused Values

Dunbar research revealed the aforementioned emergent themes drawn from outer and inner layers of the school's culture. Concrete scenarios as well as perceptions, assumptions, beliefs and values of former teachers and alumni helped to formulate a picture of what was important at the segregated school. Some layers of the school's cultural values were clear and tangible. Others were less clear and nebulous. However, all proved valuable in helping to decipher the school's organizational culture.

Upon examining characteristics of Dunbar's organizational culture, one is cognizant that the study leaves room for a deeper level of meaning to be sought. Scholars have
noted that there are levels of common meaning that are operative within culture (Carlson, 1996; Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1992). Thus, to get a sense of the core of the school's organizational culture, one must zoom in on what Schein calls "the functionality of assumptions" (Schein, 1992, p. 27). These are espoused values. Espoused values articulate deeper meaning, and metaphorically speaking, hit the nail on the head in terms of finding the core of Dunbar student success.

When given the opportunity to reflect on the chief value that Dunbar communicated to its students, participants selected a towering value. Seventy percent of interviewees chose "faith" as the value that characterized Dunbar's message to its membership. "Faith" was defined as "believing in yourself, a higher power and the goals of your organization." This was the chief espoused value for the majority of informants who participated in the study. "Security," defined as "having the essentials to live" and "advancement," defined as "growth, professional advancement, personal maturity" were tied for second place. Dunbar teachers and students felt that school provided students with foundational ingredients essential for success in life. Equally, they felt that their school emphasized growth and advancement. One interviewee likened the Dunbar experience to a high jumper who consistently aimed for better results as the bar is raised, hence the choice for advancement. Students esteemed their education, gained a sense of self worth, learned goal-setting and perseverance, and acquired a sense of community. These attributes were foundational values that helped to define for them a sense of purpose in life. One alumna articulated:
I was left with the desire to be something and not to sit back and complain, but to get up and do. I was left with the belief that I was a person of some substance and I wanted to prove to myself I could do that. It gave me that desire to go on. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

For many participants “security” embodied what Dunbar was all about. Like “advancement”, “security” was also the second highest selection. Students defined success in terms of obtaining from Dunbar what they needed to succeed in life. It seemed that material success was not heavily stressed.

It was also noted that Dunbar concurrently yielded twin levels of success: individual and collective. The school’s orientation was geared toward productivity and positive, successful outcomes. Consideration for the individual child weighed heavily as a priority. Uniqueness was accepted. Diversity of learning styles and personality were recognized and favored. There was individual pedagogy for those who had achieved both at Dunbar and in the wider community. There was simultaneously collective pedagogy in that there was a collective sense of kinship that students experienced when they came in contact with high-profile Blacks. Concurrently, this yielded twin levels of success: individual and collective. The school’s mission was to provide African American children with a quality education. This was the overarching collective mission. However, within that sense of collectivity, individuality was equally important.

On the individual level, participants were instilled with the belief that if they believed in themselves first; they could achieve anything. Belief in oneself was regarded
as a prerequisite for success. A sense of self-worth was therefore foundational to Dunbar student success. Individual success was a building block for the Black community. It was not a threat to the culture, but rather a compliment. If one student outshone the rest, students may have wanted the recognition for themselves, but individual success was ultimately a credit to the entire Dunbar community. Additionally, teachers operated from the foundational belief that every student was capable of success, not just a selected few. They articulated their belief to students. Because of their position of authority and influence, and the respect that the Dunbar community had for its teachers, teacher beliefs became a pivotal force that encouraged student success.

On a collective level, the school’s mission was to provide African American children with a quality education. This was the overarching collective mission of the school. Collective responsibility evolved through mutual effort, and precipitated individual responsibility that led back to collective responsibility. This cyclic pattern of beliefs and behaviors constituted collective kinship. The membership was not estranged. There was unity. Unity was fueled by cultural congruency. Harmony resulted because stakeholders moved in the same direction towards a common goal with a similar mind-set. The goal was to produce excellent students who possessed a strong cultural sense. There was no delineation of home-school values and beliefs. There was therefore no need for buy-in; stakeholders were in agreement. The sense of oneness was endorsed by demonstrable care and support shown from one group to the other. Students adopted teacher values because they knew they would be supported by the home and vice versa. Because home-school relationships were harmonious, parental input was welcomed. Consequently,
parents willingly supported the school. As one alumna noted, “It [Dunbar] was their school” (Personal communication, December 11, 2003). Previous testimonials revealed that Dunbar was not just an organization; it was a family. This network of relationships under girded with strong pedagogical beliefs, high expectations, and Judeo-Christian values led students to attainable goals. They were successful. The inner culture was fortified through strength and support from the membership.

Individual and collective success yielded collective pride. Simply put, the Dunbar membership adopted the axiom: “We’re in this together.” One scholar observes: “We Black Americans sometimes define our success through the accomplishments of individuals, but historically we also have demanded that success of our people be defined in collective terms. ..The struggle was for the entire group” (Fordham, 1988, p. 420). Thus, Dunbar’s cultural ethos embraced both individual and collective responsibility. The belief was: if one failed, all failed. Conversely, if one succeeded, it was a credit to the school and an incentive for all to succeed. Similarly, if injustice were done to one, it was an offense to all. (Fordham, 1988) also observes:

But while Black Americans historically have demanded the achievement of the group, we take pride in the accomplishments of individuals (and the reverse is also true – we are extremely offended when an injustice is done to one). I contend that the majority of Black Americans regardless of their age still display such pride. (p. 420)
In sum, individual success did not supercede the collective effort. Neither did collective success outshine individual merit. In essence, individual success and group success were practically synonymous.
Summary

The cultural milieu of Dunbar from 1940 – 1951 was strong. Caring, supportive, qualified teachers, who held high expectations under girded by Judeo-Christian values and beliefs, championed success. The sociopolitical climate in which the school operated was one that excluded Dunbar’s students from mainstream education and deprived them from quality educational resources. However, despite the marginalization and the assumed deprivation, the segregated school thrived. Propelled principally by a sense of resistance, cultural congruency, and a desire for excellence, the school produced students who were blessed with a solid, well-rounded educational experience. These ingredients among others laid a firm foundation that allowed students to develop a strong sense of self-worth. They were given the freedom to develop with careful guidance and firm discipline. Major contributing factors to Dunbar’s success include the following:

1. A potent care ethic
2. High expectations
3. Judeo-Christian values
4. Firm discipline
5. A sense of resilience that fostered excellence
6. Cultural pedagogy
7. Cultural congruency

Dunbar also yielded positive outcomes for students. The outputs from a Dunbar education were largely:
1. Quality performance
2. Strong sense of self
3. Community Involvement
4. Lifelong Learning

At Dunbar core subjects were taught. Spanish was a respected subject perhaps because Maxwell endorsed part of Washington’s ideology that advocated an emphasis on practical skills in the workplace. There is also a greater possibility, however, that Maxwell recognized the value of Spanish as a respected Romance Language that occupies a prominent place in academia. Further, it is more believable that Maxwell would have had the foresight to imbue this linguistic proficiency in his students knowing that it would serve them well, particularly at the tertiary level.

In addition, students were exposed to an array of extra curricula activities, and given multiple opportunities to showcase their talents, and to exercise their gifts both at school and in the public arena. Direct and indirect exposure to prominent, successful Black role models provided an added inspiration for students. Students were successful both at Dunbar and beyond their school days. They emerged from the segregated school as well-mannered, confident human beings endowed with the hope that whatever they endeavored to accomplish was within their reach. Dunbar encouraged students to select careers of their choice. They did. Beyond Tucson High, students became doctors, lawyers, nurses, educational leaders, professors, psychologists, dentists, administrators, assistant school superintendents, restaurant owners, real estate agents, vocational tradesmen, writers, businessmen, and community service directors for the federal
government. The list is endless. It is not known whether any students opted to become homemakers. The exact number of students who pursued careers is unknown, but by all accounts, Dunbar students became self-sufficient adults, and made meaningful contributions, not only to the Tucsonan community, but also to many communities across the U.S.

Success at Dunbar is noted on twin levels: individual and collective. Individually students thrived. Collectively, the school accomplished its mission to provide African American children with a quality education. It must be also noted that students who remained at Dunbar longer benefited in greater measure from the Afrocentric critical pedagogy fostered by the school. Dunbar’s mission to educate Black students was achieved, which put it on the map as a highly successful segregated school.
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Inputs and Outputs of Dunbar Students’ Success
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Chief Espoused Values of the Dunbar Schoolhouse

- Faith
- Security
- Advancement
Ms. Belle Miller-Carter’s Elementary Class
At Dunbar School Annex
Mr. Charles Todd’s Grade 7 Class, Circa 1950,
Dunbar School
“No man can be a great leader unless he takes genuine joy in the successes of those under him.”
~ W. A. Nance ~

CHAPTER 5

ACTA VIRUM PROBANT: THE DOING PROVES THE MAN – THE LEADERSHIP OF MORGAN MAXWELL SR. (1940-1951)

Morgan Maxwell Sr. (1902 – 1987)

Theoretical Overview

This chapter examines the leadership of Dunbar’s last principal, Morgan Maxwell Sr., 1940 -1951. When analyzing organizational effectiveness, a common approach is to examine leadership style as a variable. The leader impacts the organization. Likewise, the organization influences the leader. Indeed, there is a voluminous body of research
that has shown that the way an organization is managed reveals much about that organization and specifically a great deal about the leadership style of the individual at the helm (Carlson, 1996; Deal & Peterson, 1998; Hofstede, 1991; Marriott, 2001; Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1991). This section of the study, however, examines leadership in a cultural context. Rather than simply analyzing leadership style as a variable, leadership in cultural context is adopted as a paradigm for inquiry. Leadership in cultural context can be viewed as an implicit variable in that it seeks to uncover the leader’s assumptions, values and beliefs within a specific cultural setting (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996).

Hallinger & Leithwood (1996) acknowledge that the idea of examining leadership within a cultural context is not new. They also contend: “Most published theory and empirical research in administration assumes [sic] that leadership is being exercised in a Western cultural context” (p. 100). This historical analysis takes the paradigm of inquiry one step further. Morgan Maxwell Sr.’s leadership is examined within the Western cultural context of Black leadership in a segregated setting. Drawing from the research of Hallinger and Leithwood (1996), Maxwell’s leadership is scrutinized as a variable within the cultural milieu that influenced operations in the segregated school. Hallinger and Leithwood further charge: “Few scholars in educational administration have subsequently explored culture as a contextual determinant in understanding the exercise of educational leadership” (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996, p. 102). This research takes up that mantel. Herein lies the heart of analysis for this chapter.
Morgan Maxwell Sr. in Historical Context

Morgan Maxwell Sr. came to Tucson in 1939 and took the leadership reigns of Dunbar in January 1940. Born in Fort Scott, Kansas in 1902, Maxwell was the son of a Tennessee exoduster. According to Morgan Maxwell Jr.:

My grandfather was born a slave. Slavery ended around 1865. He was born in 1856. As a young man, he came to Fort Scott with a man called Pap Singleton. That was his name. He gave Singleton two dollars, I think, and he took them [other Black migrants] on the Mississippi River from Tennessee to Kansas and that is how my grandfather ended up in Fort Scott, Kansas. My father was born in Fort Scott in 1902. He did some research on the exodusters. We found out that my grandfather was an exoduster.

(Personal communication, March 11, 2004)

The exodusters were free blacks who, dissatisfied with the lack of freedom that the Reconstruction had promised after the Civil War, abandoned their homes in the South and headed West traversing large stretches of dusty terrain (Taylor, 1998). A multitude of African Americans was lured to the West in search of freer and fertile land. Benjamin "Pap" Singleton, an ex-slave, was the most famous leader of the Kansas Exoduster Movement. Founder of the Tennessee Real Estate and Homestead Association (Taylor, 1998), Singleton led Maxwell’s grandfather and many other Tennesseans, to Kansas. Upon their arrival, African Americans encountered continued voting inequities, exclusion
from the military, segregated busing and schooling, and prohibition to marry outside their race (Taylor, 1998).

Despite the limitations of civil liberties, there were many strong supporters of the Black cause in the farmland state. According to Taylor (1998), “Kansas carried a powerful abolitionist tradition” (p. 136). He adds: “Kansas became to the freedperson what the United States was to the European immigrant: a refuge from tyranny and oppression” (Taylor, 1998, p. 137). Several strong successful settlements emerged as a result of the influx of Blacks to the region. By the end of the nineteenth century Kansas held a bit of prestige and became a coveted state for African Americans due to the potent desire of some Blacks and Whites to right social ills (Taylor, 1998). Gruver (1976) highlights that Lawrence and Topeka were major “free-soil towns” in the nineteenth century (Gruver, 1976, p. 460). Lawrence was known as “the best advertised anti-slavery town in the world” (Taylor, p. 95). Taylor (1998) explains that in 1879 Topeka was a city bursting with Southern Blacks. It was the preferred destination of Kansas newcomers due to the growth of Black entrepreneurs and professionals. Fort Scott also played a central role in the settlement of early Kansas. James H. Lane, one of two U.S. senators appointed to the first legislature in the state, was a fiery abolitionist whose anti-slavery efforts fueled opposition to proslavery efforts in neighboring Missouri (Taylor, 1998). Lane mobilized 1,200 troops to scare off an invasion by Confederates during the Civil War (Taylor, 1998). Although the invasion never took place, Lane’s efforts garnered the support of fugitive slaves from Missouri, earned the respect of many African Americans in the West, and spotlighted Kansas as the home of the first Black troops who
were enlisted in the Union army during the Civil War (Taylor, 1998). The cultural milieu which encapsulates the Kansas story, and situates Morgan Maxwell Sr., forms the backdrop for an investigation into his leadership.

Leadership Rationale

One way of assessing the quality of a leader is to examine his/her personal characteristics in context. This approach is grounded in the Contingency Model of Leadership that acknowledges two strands for analysis. Hoy and Miskel (2001) write: “First, traits of the leaders and characteristics of the situation combine to produce leadership behavior and effectiveness. Second, situational factors have direct impacts on effectiveness” (p. 403). Research on Dunbar has shown that Morgan Maxwell Sr.’s personal attributes and approach to situations revealed much about his philosophical assumptions, values and beliefs as he executed his duties as principal. Typically, an organization’s philosophical beliefs are articulated in clearly written statements, which are then reinforced by the membership of the organization (Schein, 1992). However, Schein also states: “Leaders who have a clear philosophy and style often choose to embody that style in the visible manifestations of their organization” (p. 250). Schein often equates visible manifestations with artifacts – tangible elements that one “sees, hears, and feels when one encounters a new group with an unfamiliar culture” (p. 17). He also shares: “For the purpose of cultural analysis, this level also includes the visible behavior of the group and the organizational process into which such behavior is made routine” (Schein, 1992, p. 17). Thus, Maxwell’s personification of philosophical values
and beliefs as he carried out his role as principal of Dunbar are of interest to this study. The questions that arise are: What attributes did Maxwell develop as a result of his cultural background? What qualities did Maxwell embody as a Black leader within the cultural context of Dunbar? These questions are addressed in subsequent sections.

Leadership Characteristics

The dominant characteristics that emerged from research on Maxwell’s leadership are the following: (a) ardent supporter of academic pursuits, (b) respecter of the school community, (c) protector, (d) advocate of African American cultural pedagogy, (e) firm disciplinarian, (f) community participant, (g) cultivator of a sense of pride, (h) proactive leader, and (i) resilient leader.
Morgan Maxwell Sr. was an impassioned supporter of academic pursuits. His cultural background was a determinant in his philosophical approach to education. His father was born a slave. However, he was a son of free Kansas soil. It is believed that instilled in Maxwell was an attitude of determination and resilience that motivated him to succeed against the odds. As a free Black man, it is believable that he thought that the horizon of opportunity was open to him to make inroads into mainstream society. He did. Although there were limited job choices for African Americans during the 1920s and 30s when Maxwell was a young adult, the doors of academia were wide open. He stepped up to the plate and accepted academic challenges. Given the de jure prejudicial conditions, it is also believed that Maxwell’s cultural heritage catapulted him towards pursuing success.

Upon examining culture, Snowden and Gorton (2002) note that individuals bring characteristics to the life of an organization. Hofstede (1991) affirms:

Every person carries within him or herself patterns of thinking, feeling, and potential acting which were learned throughout their lifetime. Much of it has been acquired in early childhood, because at that time a person is most susceptible to learning and assimilating. (p. 4)

According to Hofstede, the way that adults think and feel is a result of socialization from an early age and often this impacts their behavior. Essentially, what individuals think and feel about issues is an indication of what they value. What individuals value is a
predictor of behavior (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Hofstede, 1976; Hofstede, 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1991). Hofstede (1976) also examined cross-cultural values and found that expectations of social behavior vary according to one's national and regional orientation. He concludes that the link between culture and administration must not be ignored.

In Maxwell's case, there was a nexus between culture and administration. It is believed that the Kansas-born principal brought to Dunbar values that were instilled in him as a child. His cultural environment shaped those values, and he in turn used them to impact his leadership. This reciprocal sense of culture served both the organization and its constituents well. Maxwell faced his leadership duties fully cognizant of the cultural struggles that those before him had encountered. He valued education. He was an educated man. One of nine brothers and sisters, he earned his Bachelor of Science Degree in Education from Kansas State Teachers College in Pittsburgh, Kansas. He went on to earn his Masters in School Administration from the University of Kansas. He was a teacher at Terrell High School in Fort Worth Texas from 1924-1926. Dunbar in Okmulgee, Oklahoma was the place of Maxwell's first principalship position. He served there until 1928. Following his leadership post at Oklahoma's Dunbar School, he returned to Kansas where he became principal of Topeka's Buchanan School. As fate would have it, Maxwell landed in Dunbar School once more, this time in Tucson, Arizona where he served as principal for eleven years at the segregated school. His track record of a strong educational background and proven experience as a leader were foundational building blocks in his Tucson leadership.
Maxwell was not only committed to pursuing academia for himself, but like any great leader, he also wanted success for his followers. He modeled his pursuit of academic excellence before both his staff and students, and he expected them to do likewise. One informant stated: “Education came first [for Maxwell] because that was the only way out for Blacks” (Personal communication, March 11, 2004). Maxwell was cognizant of the macro level sociopolitical limitations that were being placed on African American teachers and students. He knew that it was imperative that they overcome them. Anything short of success was unacceptable.

When Maxwell ascended the Dunbar stage as principal of the segregated school, he came on board at a time when the federal government of the United States was exerting its presence in the affairs of public education. Moehlman (1944) writes: “The federal government of the United States has discovered education and the progressive growth of federal controls over public education is a really serious postwar problem” (Moehlman, 1944, p. 15). Moehlman suggested that the solution to the postwar problem was to keep control in the hands of the people. He stated:

The power of education is so great in our democracy direct control over the total process should remain with the people and be delegated only in part to the states. Freedom of learning is so vital in the maintenance and improvement of democracy that education should never be permitted to become a monopoly of the states nor should its social direction ever be entrusted even to the organized teaching profession. Control over curricula content and conditions
of learning at all levels must be zealously safeguarded by the people. (Moehlman, 1944, p. 15)

Moehlman’s comments, although addressed to mainstream America, were timely and suitably describe a feature of Maxwell’s leadership. As captain of the segregated school, and although limited to some degree by the sanctions imposed by the wider society, Maxwell demonstrated that control of Black education at that time was indeed in the hands of the people. For the African American community, education was in the hands of Black people. While the mainstream may have taken its eyes off the powerful impact that teachers have in classrooms, African American teachers were quietly mobilizing a formidable force. They knew that if their children were going to acquire a solid education, it was going to be up to them. Recognizing that the era of segregation was fraught with inequality and injustice, the principal employed several strategies.

First, Maxwell proactively sought teachers. He took the initiative to find good teachers. It is assumed that his definition of a good teacher embraced zeal to work for the educational development of African American children. He actively pursued teachers through training schools and agencies and a few Tucson recruits responded (The Dunbar Project, 1995).

Secondly, Maxwell recruited the most qualified teachers he could find. They were required to have at the minimum, a Bachelors Degree. An interview with a former teacher informed:

*Interviewer:* What qualifications do you have?

*Interviewee:* I have a Master’s Degree. I ended up with
three Masters degrees. Well, I ended up with two Masters Degrees and then I ended up with an Ed. Specialist degree, but I did not finish my doctorate. Maybe you can help me with that? (Personal communication, July 22, 2004)

Another former teacher shared:

Mr. Maxwell. I always remember Mr. Maxwell. After I started working with him I could understand what he was doing... If you want to know why he was so particular, it was because he wanted the best. He wanted the best. After I got here and found the staff already arranged and the staff that was coming in, the teachers were very well qualified. Mr. Maxwell had come from schools out in that part of the country and he was a graduate of The University of Kansas himself, and Kansas State. He knew the caliber of work that teachers achieved coming from that university. (Personal communication, May 26, 2004)

A third teacher remarked:

The teachers at Dunbar were well selected and I think that they exemplified the kinds of teachers that were needed to make a success. We had some very good teachers over there. (Personal communication, November 29, 2003)
The interviewee continued:

He [Mr. Maxwell] brought a lot of people from Kansas – Evelyn Franks, Nancy Horn, Irene George. He seemed to think that the best educators were from Kansas in those days. [She laughs]. And they were excellent teachers. You could not have found a better teacher than Irene George anywhere. I mean, just wonderful. In fact, I remember Evelyn Franks when she was with the primary, just outstanding. Even the university and everyone recognized her.

We were just lucky to have wonderful, good teachers at Dunbar.

(Personal communication, Nov. 29, 2003)

Thus, academic qualifications were important to Maxwell. He knew that if Dunbar was to be a successful school, he needed to have a faculty of qualified teachers. He upheld the belief that Black teachers need to be academically equipped beyond normal requirements in order to compete with the dominant culture. This aspect of Maxwell’s educational philosophy closely paralleled that of W. E. B. Du Bois. He stressed ongoing professional development. One former teacher, upon reflecting on Maxwell’s leadership, stated: “One thing that he required was that his teachers continue [their] education. He wanted all of his teachers to have Masters Degrees or thirty hours above the Bachelors” (Personal communication, July 22, 2004). It is well known that Dunbar’s cultural context marginalized Blacks. They were separated from the public school mainstream system. Therefore, in order for Black teachers to be on par with the mainstream and to be recognized, they had to aim for excellence. The cultural environment was quick to limit
them. Maxwell's cognizance of the cultural environment precipitated his insistence on excellence.

Thirdly, Maxwell was aware of the need for commonality of purpose. Having "Kansas" on a teacher's resumé was an attractive feature to the Dunbar principal. Upon considering Kansas applicants, he knew that instantaneously there would be commonality of cultural experience, educational vision and expectations. Schein (1992) asserts:

For shared learning to occur, there must be a history of shared experience, which in turn implies some stability of membership in the group. Given such consistency, and shared history, the human need for parsimony, consistency, and meaning will cause the various shared elements to form into patterns that eventually can be called culture. (p. 10)

Maxwell recognized that the segregated school would function more cohesively, during segregated times, if its membership held similar assumptions, values, beliefs and patterns of cultural behavior. Recognition of this fact inevitably led to an absence of overt ambiguity within the school culture. In fact, what resulted was cultural congruency. This researcher has coined the term "cultural congruency" which answers the question: Are we on the same page, going in the productive directions and aiming for positive goals for the common good? Tacit assumptions, values and beliefs at Dunbar were an automatic given. The advantage of the school's cultural cocoon was that there was no need for cultural explanations. Hence, breaking through cultural barriers was not an issue. Time was not spent in having to assess cultural differences, uncover hidden agendas, or
investigating individual motives. Instead, time was spent on the task at hand: educating African American children for the common good. Barth (2002) calls this aspect of culture “nondiscussables” (p. 2). He concludes: “The health of a school is inversely proportional to the number of nondiscussables: the fewer the nondiscussables, the healthier the school” (Barth, 2002, p. 2). At Dunbar, cultural congruency was a facilitator of school success. Nine faculty members, including Maxwell, were from Kansas during his administration. It is noteworthy that cohesion among the Kansas cadre was not achieved at the expense of excluding other members of staff. Maxwell’s goal was unity. He sought it and for the most part, he achieved it. Unity was precipitated by parsimonious, taken-for-granted cultural assumptions, values and beliefs within the school’s culture. This facilitated a stable leadership that functioned smoothly and consistently for eleven years. Schein (1992) concludes: “The power of culture comes about through the fact that assumptions are shared and therefore mutually reinforced” (p. 25). Research confirms Maxwell’s efforts to create a strong school culture. He expressed equal interest in all members of staff. Perhaps the degree of intensity was not fully perceived, however, his passion for success was clear. His work was made easier due to a pervasive spirit of like-mindedness that infiltrated the segregated school. It cushioned his leadership. It is believed that this ingredient also contributed to Dunbar’s success.

Maxwell expected excellence from all of his followers. Students were therefore not exempt. He expected students to not only perform well in school, but to do so with excellence. After all, the school motto was, “Be the best.” Bennis (1989) notes:
"Leaders expect the best of the people around them" (p. 198). Wallace (1996) trumpets an excellence agenda for schools arguing that visionary leaders possess a clear vision supported by trust from the stakeholders. He suggests an educational recipe for excellence:

Put into operation, the concepts of excellence and vision, guide the content and processes of the desired future state of a school in its mission as a learning institution, imaging the best possible conditions for students to learn and for teachers to teach.

(Wallace, 1996, p. 4)

Maxwell was a visionary leader who saw beyond the walls of segregation. His visionary approach to leadership led him to expect the best from his followers. Their best interest guided his leadership. He believed that students had the potential. He also knew that they were being served well by competent, qualified teachers. He also recognized that if encouraged, students would do well. Former teacher, Sidney Dawson reported to the Arizona Daily Star: “Maxwell encouraged junior high school teachers to get their master’s degrees so they could become more proficient in teaching and motivating students” ("Principal Maxwell Dies," 1987, p. 10B). Dr. Laura Banks also reported: “He expected a lot from his teachers. He made us bring out the very best in ourselves” ("Principal Dies," 1987, p. 10B). Maxwell’s excellence agenda, coupled with trust from his followers, were ingredients for his success as an administrator. Maxwell did not expect from his followers what he was not prepared to do himself.
Maxwell’s philosophy of leadership was also grounded in what is known today as Expectancy Theory. Hoy and Miskel (2001) explain:

Expectancy theory rests on two fundamental premises. First, individuals make decisions about their own behavior in organizations using their abilities to think, reason and anticipate future events. Motivation is a conscious and cognitive process. People subjectively evaluate the expected value on outcomes or personal payoffs resulting from their actions, and then they choose how to behave. Second, individual values and attitudes interact with environmental components, such as role expectations and school culture, to influence behavior. (p. 145)

Hoy and Miskel (2001) also point out that Expectancy Theory embraces three components: expectancy, instrumentality and valence (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). In discussing expectancy, they write: “Expectancy is the extent to which an individual believes that hard work will lead to improved performance. The expectancy question is: If I work hard, will I be successful?” (p. 145). Clearly, Maxwell believed that if Dunbar teachers and students worked hard enough, their efforts would yield successful dividends.

Hoy and Miskel (2001) highlight that Expectancy Theory also embraces instrumentality. They explain:

Instrumentality is the perceived probability that good performance will be noticed and rewarded. Instrumentality
is high when individuals perceive a strong association between performance and being rewarded. The instrumentality question is: If I succeed, what will I receive in return?” (Hoy & Miskel, 2001, p. 146)

For Dunbar students the instrumentality stakes were high. Indisputably, the principal and the faculty were keenly interested in students’ performance and progress. One alumnus observed: “He [Maxwell] was very interested in the students and I remember him coming into the classrooms. I remember him coming [in] to check to see how things were going and [he would] even ask us questions in the classroom” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). Maxwell was not interested in students at a distance, but he zealously guarded students’ academic progress within close range. He took a personal interest in both his teachers and students. Sometimes he articulated his expectations. Other times he did not. A conversation with an alumna reveals:

Interviewee: He always wanted you to do your best even when you were just out doing stuff.

Interviewer: Did he actually say that?

Interviewee: It was what was expected. He should not have to say it; you just knew that when you did something, you did your best. (Personal communication, November 29, 2003)

In attempting to delve further into Dunbar’s leadership philosophy, the researcher posed the direct question as to whether Morgan Maxwell Sr. adopted Washington’s or Du
Bois’ perspectives more. The responses unanimously pointed to the latter. One teacher articulated her answer this way:

If you read what Booker T. Washington promoted, he was looking at having Negroes excel in those areas where they were accepted, and not go beyond that and saying that if you do those things, we can work effectively with the other people. Well, you could work with them as long as you stay in your place, and that is not what we should be trying to do. And Du Bois was saying you don’t have a place. You ought to get to the place where you can blend into the mainstream of society. (Personal communication, March 26, 2004)

It appears, therefore, that the ambivalence in Dunbar was that on the one hand success was promoted, but what was stressed more was that the success of Blacks was not to be restricted to a small, academically elite group. Instead, there was the belief that all students would be successful if they prepared themselves to compete academically with the mainstream and take their place in society.

Clearly, students knew Morgan Maxwell Sr.’s emphasis on academics. His support of Du Bois’ view, at least in modified form, is not debatable. This is the underlying message to which students still presently cling. Their school motto was “Be the Best.” This school motto was transplanted from North East Junior High, Kansas City, Kansas where a former Dunbar faculty member was both a student and teacher (Personal communication, July 22, 2004). She brought the motto to Dunbar and Mr. Maxwell
adopted it for the school. In order to “Be the Best,” one had to possess an acute sense of self. Without a grounded understanding of who one is, and what one’s abilities are, it would be difficult to go forth to “Be the best.” The teachers and principal recognized this. Students got the message. Thus, it appears that the aim at Dunbar was not to keep Blacks in their place, but rather to help them find a sense of place within themselves and in the broader society. Herein, lies the subtle distinction between the positions of Washington and Du Bois as they relate to Dunbar.

Because of Maxwell’s philosophical stance, teachers reciprocated and took a keen interest in students. His leadership influence had a positive domino effect on the Dunbar community. The combined principal and teacher interest communicated a belief to students: Principal Maxwell valued education, and in particular, he valued his students’ education. He also demonstrated the belief that all students can learn and that Dunbar students would be equipped with the foundational knowledge and skills to enable them to function efficiently in the wider world.

2. Respecter of School Community

Maxwell demonstrated that a strong school cultural environment was a requisite for school success. Schein (1992) notes:

Culture embedding in a young organization is essentially a socializing process, but one in which most of the socialization mechanisms are in the hands of the leaders. In more mature organizations, the socialization
process takes a different shape (for example, Schein, 1978; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979), but in young organizations one must focus primarily on leadership behavior to understand cultural growth. (Schein, 1992, p. 252)

Dunbar was a relatively young school. Maxwell, the fourth principal of the segregated school, maintained a high level of power and influence at Dunbar due to his eleven-year tenure. To a large degree, he cultivated the cultural climate at Dunbar. Interestingly, however, his philosophy of leadership was not characterized by an over exertion of power and authority observed in a micro management style. Testimonials reveal that Maxwell put confidence in his followers. One informant revealed: “He was gone a lot.” Perhaps by today’s standards the previous statement might be interpreted as negligence. Sergiovanni (1996) notes, however, that when leaders de-emphasize power and emphasize followership first, that this constitutes a healthier school environment. He writes:

Beyond a certain point, the more professionalism is emphasized, the less likely professionalism is to develop. The point is not to get rid of leadership. Leadership can add a measure of quality to the most professional of school settings. But leadership becomes less urgent and less intensive once the wheels of professionalism begin to turn by themselves. When this happens, superintendents and principals can spend less time trying to figure out how to push and pull teachers toward goals and more time dealing with the broad
issues of teaching and learning, on the one hand, and ensuring financial, moral and political, and managerial support for the school, on the other. (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 67)

It is not known whether Maxwell always attended to school business on the occasions when he was not on campus, however, it is known that he always had the business of Dunbar at heart. At a Saturday forum sponsored by the Conference on Human Relations held on April 15, 1950, Maxwell was in attendance. The conference was dedicated to discussing areas of interest to the Tucson community, which included the following: housing, civil rights, law enforcement, employment, health and recreation and education. Maxwell made a point of being included in the education group chaired by Raphael Brandes (Conference on Human Relations, 1950). Although his name was excluded from the list of discussants, his voice was still heard. His first concern reflected how cost was impacting Dunbar. Part of the discussion went this way:

Floor: I have a question as to what was meant by “fear of the Negro?”

Mrs. Haugh: I don’t know. I don’t have it. Maybe they don’t know – what they fear is the unknown.

Mr. Poahlman: Is there any Negro in your school, Mr. Brandes?

Mr. Brandes: We’ve had no applications.

Mr. Poahlman: Would the children’s parents object to a Negro attending your school?

Mr. Brandes: They would. I have the courage to have a Negro
child come. The staff is of all faiths. One handyman refused to work with a Negro. I fired him. But the tax-supported schools are a more important problem than the private ones. It is a larger field, and more profitable for us today. I know very well a Negro wouldn't apply for entrance into my school.

Mr. Phoahlman: I'm just trying to isolate points. You can speak as you have the information.

Mr. Brandes: I am converted. I abandon my stand on low education. I'm for legislation, to give us the weapons with which to fight. Then get education. In New York the FEPC law has had very good administration so that people are persuaded. A change in law is necessary.

Floor: I want to try it. If we had the courage, I think the cowardly would back down. If it were an economic situation, they would fight to survive. Have we a weapon as taxpayers on the cost of "separate but equal?" I realize we can't ask people to join us, often. But separate schools incur a heavy increase in cost. Can we get allies in the matter of taxes?
Mr. Maxwell: It would be nice if the government could have the attitude of fighting for survival. The segregated school is expensive, although I have no specific information. (Conference on Human Relations: Education Section, 1950, p. 2)

Clearly, Maxwell was very concerned about the cost of operating the segregated school. He knew that Dunbar was not receiving equitable funding, and wanted to bring this to the attention of those present.

In another part of the discussion, Maxwell raised a concern about the placement of African American teachers if desegregation were implemented. The discussion went this way:

Floor: Is it more important to desegregate the schools regardless of the teachers?

Rev. Sholin: This is my personal opinion. You can only solve a complex situation one step at a time. Desegregation is the first step. The suffering minority has to bear the brunt of the struggle. This 200 of the 120,000 in Tucson must bear the brunt.

A. Sterrit: Desegregation might not come if the colored teachers oppose it, realizing the danger to themselves.

M. Maxwell: We are not analyzing the problem properly. If the economic factor is important, a lot of people believe
the solution is economic. I believe the Negro teacher shouldn’t be neglected. What other employment can the Negro teacher get?

Mr. Morrow: No Dunbar teachers oppose segregation. Present teachers are all protected by tenure – none will lose jobs.

M. Maxwell: That is true.

Floor: Senority will help the teacher.

M. Maxwell: We have to think of our survival too, like Mr. Brandes. We have to think, the Negro teacher should be thought of.

Rev. Sholin: I’ve told my church if any family comes in and is refused membership on grounds of color, when they go out, I go too. That is to show you how strongly I personally feel. I go further than you do.

M. Maxwell: The two go together. Don’t misunderstand me.

Floor: Why can’t we have a stipulation on teacher seniority in the desegregation bill?

Mr. Morrow: If we did a good job of administration, we wouldn’t consider seniority. But we have a tenure bill which protects the Negro teacher in case of desegregation. If the teacher has been here three years, he is protected.

(Conference on Human Relations: Education Section, 1950, p. 6-7)
The previous discussion pointed to Maxwell's concern for his teachers. While he was for desegregation, he had hoped that the initiative would yield equitable consequences for African Americans. He was aware that Black teachers could lose their jobs in the face of desegregation. He was equally aware of the cost factor in maintaining separate schools. His concern for the welfare of his teachers spotlights his greatness as a leader. Maxwell's voice at the Tucson conference clearly indicated his concern for the Dunbar family even in their absence, reinforcing his belief in a sense of community.

Scholars have spent considerable time examining concepts of culture, climate and community. These ideas dominate literature on organizational culture. Equal emphasis is place on each. However, at the apex where each concept intercepts, is the agreement that culture is a pattern of shared assumptions, beliefs, traditions, expectations, customs and practices that prevail in an organization (Carlson, 1996; Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1991; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). These characteristics define what an organization is all about. Scholars say that responses of the membership of an organization, whether individually or as a body, hinge on what they call climate (Bennis, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Climate, therefore, falls within the realm of culture, and serves as a barometer for measuring school culture. Deal and Peterson (1999) point out:

Parents, teachers, principals, and students have always sensed something special, yet undefined about their schools – something extremely powerful but difficult to describe. ... For decades the terms climate and ethos have been used to try to capture this
powerful, pervasive, and notoriously elusive force. We believe the term culture provides a more accurate and intuitively appealing way to help school leaders better understand their school’s own unwritten rules and traditions, norms, and expectations that seem to permeate everything: the way people act, how they dress, what they talk about or avoid talking about, whether they seek out colleagues for help or don’t, and how teachers feel about their work and their students. (p. 3)

The above description is essentially the ingredients of school community. These are the elements that either allow an organization to stick together or become unglued. Thus, the litmus test is the feeling that emanates from a school as a direct result of interactions, patterns of behavior and norms of an organization’s membership. Hoy and Miskel (2001) in articulating similar characteristics, choose to label such as “climate.” They affirm: “Indeed, the climate of a school may roughly be conceived as the personality of a school – that is, personality is to the individual as climate to the organization” (p. 190). Thus, culture, climate and community in this sense are synonyms, and are intimately connected to the effective functioning of schools.

Maxwell’s leadership clearly demonstrated a respect for school climate as a tributary that flows into a sense of community. Deal and Peterson (1999) emphasize that school achievement flourishes when organizational culture favors a positive school climate characterized by care, compassion and intellectual challenge. Gagne, Yekovich and Yekovich (1993) note that if teachers treat students respectfully and believe that they are
capable achievers, that they will in fact produce favorable results. This observation puts a new twist on the cliché that says: “Attitude determines altitude.” At Dunbar this attitude created a positive school climate, and motivated students to become successful. It appears that the Dunbar community was loaded with positivity which motivated students to do their best, and to strive for excellence. The school rewarded academic excellence. Words of commendation, badges of honor, special privileges, and the promise of a bright future if they sought after educational goals crystallized the aspect of instrumentality in Maxwell’s leadership. Students, as a result of interacting with their principal, were left with the feeling that they were an addendum to the schooling progress, but rather that they were the reason for the school’s existence. Students felt valued. They knew that their teachers and principal were interested in their progress, and respected and supported their goals and aspirations. Furthermore, the principal’s interest in students served as a catalyst to student success and encouraged students to aggressively pursue success. Repetitively, students stated that their principal wanted them “to be somebody.” These levels of personal satisfaction became a source of strength and an impetus for students to continue their education. It is believed that this demonstrable respect also motivated students to do well.

The third aspect of the Expectancy Model is valence. Hoy and Miskel (2001) explain:

Valence is the perceived value or attractiveness of a reward. The concept of valence is similar to the concept of values – that is, what people consider or believe beneficial to their welfare or
important in its own right. It is the strength of a person’s desire for a particular reward. The valence question is: “How do I feel about the rewards of my efforts?” (Hoy & Miskel, 2001, p. 146)

Upon reflecting on Maxwell’s leadership, one former student commented:

Mr. Maxwell was tough on us, but in spite of that we all loved him because we knew that he loved us. Wayne Williams [pseudonym] and I were probably his biggest headache, but we turned out all right in the end. When I got my doctoral degree I sent him a letter stating that I had finally accomplished those things that he had always tried to instill in us. (Personal communication, December 1, 2003)

Thus, one can conclude that Maxwell was seriously committed to success for both teachers and students, and that his commitment embraced respect for the membership. He recognized that if students were to get ahead in life, it was going to be up to them to make a concerted effort to strive for excellence. They were guaranteed teacher expertise and they could count on teacher support. They only needed to be equally committed and exert the requisite energy in order to be successful.

3. Community Participant

Maxwell not only believed in a sense of community inside Dunbar, but he was also a community participant in the wider society. The African American community affectionately called Maxwell “prof.,” abbreviated for “professor.” One alumna
recounted: "I have a general memory of Mr. Maxwell, but it is not just in school. My
general impression of him [is] that he was accessible" (Personal communication, June 4,
2004). Another conversation revealed:

*Interviewer:* You mentioned the community. What kinds of things
was he involved in?

*Interviewee:* I think that his role as principal made him a community
leader because it was the only Black school and it was
the only place that you found that consolidation of
Black teachers and Black principal. I don’t think he
would have to do much of anything else to have the
kind of esteem because he was doing his job well. I
don’t know first hand of other community i
involvements. When Maxwell said something, he was
backed up by the whole community. (Personal
communication, June 4, 2004)

Another interviewee remarked: “We felt proud of Mr. Maxwell because we looked upon
him as being the leader. He was the leader in the community. Mr. Morgan Maxwell was
the man.” Another conversation also revealed Maxwell as a community participant.

*Interviewer:* Did he make home visits?

*Interviewee:* Oh yes he did. Oh yes. [She laughs]. He did make
visits for the students and he did make some visits
for the teachers. Yes, he did. My mother liked
Mr. Maxwell a lot. [She would say] "Any time you want to come over prof., come on over." He visited parents as well as his teachers. (Personal communication, November 30, 2004)

Another alumna informed:

Mr. Maxwell, eagle-eye, he did not miss a thing he knew everyone in the Black community and everyone knew him, and you knew if you did something wrong he was going to tell your parents. He demanded respect. He was quiet. He often looked and stood back. (Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Cochran and Dean (1991) state that home-school relationships are empowering for both sides of the equation. They quote Cornell University’s Empowerment Group definition which reads:

Empowerment is an intentional ongoing process centered in the local community, involving mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and group participation, through which people lacking in equal share of valued resources gain greater access to and control over those resources. (Cochran & Dean, 1991, p. 266-267)

Thus, Maxwell was cognizant of the importance of home-school relationships. He also built partnerships with organizations in the local community. The Arizona Daily Star revealed that he was actively involved either as a board member or as a volunteer in many local organizations. Among them are the following: “The YMCA, Big Brothers of
America, Boy Scouts of America, Camp Fire Girls, Pio Decimo Community Center, the Salvation Army, the Marshall Home for Men, the Urban League, the N.A.A.C.P., the American Red Cross and the Arizona Historical Society" ("Principal Maxwell Dies," 1987, p. 10B). Interviewees described Maxwell in a myriad of ways: wonderful, friendly, concerned, fair, dedicated, stern, visible, serious, accessible, fatherly, firm disciplinarian, and devoted. All accolades pointed to the fact that Morgan Maxwell Sr. was a well-respected member of the Tucson community.

4. Protector

Testimonials about Maxwell indicate that he displayed a protective nature towards both teachers and students. Students nicknamed him "eagle-eye" because he was always aware of what was going on in the lives of the Dunbar family. One teacher recruit from Kansas recounted her arrival in Tucson. She recalled that Maxwell had met her at the Southern Pacific Railroad Station, and took her to Dunbar to meet the school secretary, Mildred Banks, a lady who had "the nicest smile" (Personal communication, July 22, 2004). Maxwell’s manner made her feel very welcomed. Another teacher commented:

But getting back to Mr. Maxwell, he kinda acted like a father to us.

He would reprimand us if he thought we had been out doing...and you know.... [She laughs], it wasn’t his business really, [she laughs], but he said,[she laughs], “I just need you to stay on the straight and narrow path.” (Personal communication, November 30, 2004)
An alumnus recalled:

He [Maxwell] would say, “Now how you doin’ with your grades? You can’t go out there and play ball until one o’clock in the morning.” Yeah, it was a light out there [Esteban Park] and we would be out there until one o’clock in the morning playing basketball. He [Maxwell] would come out there at one o’clock in the morning, and run us away, but you wouldn’t get that from Hudson [the former principal].

Interviewer: You’re kidding! You mean he actually came out in the middle of the night?

Interviewee: Oh yeah…. He ran us away. (Personal communication, May 29, 2004)

Dunbar informants were asked: “What is your fondest memory of Dunbar?” to which one alumnus replied: “The students, my friends, the teachers and most of all, the principal, Mr. Maxwell” (Personal communication, Nov. 29, 2003). Another conversation with an alumnus revealed:

Interviewer: What made him [Maxwell] special to you?

Interviewee: I was a troublemaker. And he always wanted us to be somebody. (Personal communication, November 30, 2003)
Judging from the comments made, it appears that implicit in Maxwell’s leadership was the belief that he was not only an administrator hired by the Pima County District No. 1 Department of Education, but that his administrative duties extended to the role of protector of the Dunbar family. In a sense, he was a moral leader. Sergiovanni (1992) makes an interesting observation about moral leadership. He writes: “From sacred authority come such values as purposing, or building a covenant of shared values, that bonds people in a common cause and transforms a school from an organization into a community” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 15). Thus, Dunbar was not just a school. It was a community. Maxwell added a personal touch to his leadership which made him tower as a leader of teachers and students, and in the community.

Under Maxwell’s leadership, there was no official prayer in assemblies. There was no daily chapel. However, there is evidence that his leadership embodied Judeo-Christian values. At some school functions, such as the dedication service for the bust of Dr. George Washington Carver, several pastors were not only present, but were featured in the school’s program. The function opened in prayer. A conversation with another alumnus revealed:

Interviewer: How did the community perceive your school?

Interviewee: The community was proud of us because they knew about us. It was like a church, when you went to school, you went to church.

(Personal communication, November 29, 2003)
Sergiovanni (1992) comprehensively discusses moral authority and “follow me leadership.” Moral leadership, he explains, is the antithesis of “follow me leadership.” It is based on moral authority (Sergiovanni, 1992). Maxwell acted on what was in the best interest of his followers. Thus, following Sergiovanni’s definition, Maxwell exercised moral authority. A strand of Maxwell’s leadership also embraced servant leadership.

Regarding servant leadership, Sergiovanni (1992) writes:

> Such ideas as servant leadership bring with them a different kind of strength - one based on moral authority. When one places one’s leadership practice in service to ideas, and to others who also seek to serve these ideas, issues of leadership role and of leadership style become far less important. It matters less who is providing the leadership, and it matters even less whether the style of leadership is directive or not, involves others or not, and so on. These are issues of process; what matter are issues of substance. What are we about? Why? Are students being served? Is the school as learning community being served? What are our obligations to this community? With these questions in mind, how can we best get the job done? (pp. 128-129)

Maxwell was interested in getting the job done efficiently. The focus was not so much on him as a leader, but on those who followed. The aforementioned quote speaks to the sense of morality that emanated from Maxwell’s leadership.
5. **Advocate of African American Cultural Pedagogy**

In this study, the researcher defines cultural pedagogy as “the utilization of the Black experience to teach social values, to inspire, and to showcase success.” Undeniably, Maxwell was an advocate of cultural pedagogy. He provided students with a unique cultural window into the lives of successful African Americans. A string of interviewees recalled multiple visits to Dunbar by famous personalities. One former teacher remembered:

> We had speakers come into the school and one was Marion Anderson. Her message to the students was: Aim for the stars. We had other speakers come in, too, from the outer community. You know at one time, Tucson was the home of one of the major league baseball teams and there were players on the teams who were really heroes to the students. They really were. Such were Larry Doby who every year during spring training would be invited to the school to talk to the students. So they had heroes. Mr. Maxwell was able to bring in Jascha Heifetz, the famous violinist. See, so it wasn’t all athletic heroes. There were other heroes. He [Maxwell] was always bringing somebody in as models, showing them that they could be successful. What I am trying to say, that they could achieve, that they could achieve their dreams. (Personal communication, July 22, 2004)

Another conversation with an interviewee revealed:
Interviewer: *I know that they had speakers, high profile personalities.*

Interviewee: Whoever came to town! Whoever came to town! Mr. Maxwell would meet them and bring them to Dunbar.

Interviewer: *Why do you think he did that?*

Interviewee: He did it to expose us to everything outside. He brought [them] because he knew that many of the students would not be able to go to whatever public performance is being done and so this was a way in which we could at least [let the students see and hear those people. We might read about them in the paper. We might hear on the radio about what they had done, but it is a different thing to see and to shake hands with someone [sic] like that.

Interviewer: *Do you think it might be that he wanted the kids to strive to be like them?*

Interviewee: Oh yes, oh yes. When Marion Anderson was here she gave us a little poem. She said, “Have a star and try to reach its height” and he had that printed on a banner in the hallways, so every time you went down the hall you would see that, and it had under it “Marion Anderson.” (March 26, 2004)
Still another interview revealed:

*Interviewer:* Do you remember when Marion Anderson came to the school?

Interviewee: Yeah...

*Interviewer:* How did that visit impact you as a person?

Interviewee: Well, it was a very interesting gesture. She was a wonderful woman, very beautiful person. At that time we were not used to seeing stars. We thought about what she said. It wasn’t just a talk. It was nice. I really appreciated it.

*Interviewer:* The assembly on the day that she came, do you remember where you were?

Interviewee: No, I really don’t remember. I remember her though.

*Interviewer:* She sang for the school?

Interviewee: Yeah, it was really something, one of the few things that happened of history during that time.

(Personal communication, May 29, 2004)

Another interviewee provided information about the setting when special guests visited Dunbar:

Mr. Maxwell made it a point of bringing in noted Blacks. When Marion Anderson came, I was in elementary school. The old school was built East to West. When I entered Junior High School
it ran North to South, in a “T,” and whenever noted people came, we did not have an auditorium. Mr. Maxwell, the teachers and Marion Anderson and whoever was at the top of this “T.” We had the little kids sitting around on the floor and the older kids were standing in the back and that’s where we had our assembly. And, she sang to us and spoke to us and that’s all I remember. All the sports figures were there down the block: Larry Doby, he was the first one to come, Satchel Paige, Minnie Minosa, and several others. They would come over to the school, and we had an assembly and they interacted with the kids.

Interviewer: What did their visit do for you?

Interviewee: It meant a lot because when you went to the movies, all you saw was White people. We knew about sports, Joe Lewis, who was on everyone’s list, and then Larry Doby came and we got to see someone who was an athlete in major league baseball. That was wonderful.

Interviewer: Did it give you a sense of achievement?

Interviewee: Oh yeah!

Maxwell’s sensitivity to Black culture and history, in particular, was a prominent feature of his leadership style. His respect for culture extended beyond the accomplishments of Blacks. He also welcomed other distinguished guests. That too was
a form of cultural pedagogy. However, what stood out most in the minds of students were the visits by prominent African Americans. Former students still cling to fond memories of those occasions. Maxwell felt that it was important for students to feel a sense of connection with famous Blacks who had to endure similar sanctions on civil liberties. The message that students seemed to receive was: “If the role models could make it, so can we.” That message inspired tender-aged elementary and junior high students.


Swartz (1996) takes the notion of cultural pedagogy one step further. She posits that cultural pedagogy is really emancipatory pedagogy because it has the power to increase life chances for children. She defines emancipatory pedagogy:

Emancipatory pedagogy is a process of teaching and learning that involves the use of multiple ways of knowing, being and behaving that contest and reconstruct dominant patterns of knowledge formation, dissemination and perpetuation in schools by identifying them and demonstrating how to replace them with
patterns that are multiperspectival and antithetical to privileging relations of power. (Swartz, 1996, p. 399)

According to Swartz, emancipatory pedagogy is a form of praxis that allows ethnic groups to become agents of their own learning by creating narratives and activities that reflect their own heritage. She posits that this approach is the antithesis of Eurocentric pedagogy that assumes a dominant posture. Swartz argues that in Eurocentric pedagogy “supremacist codes” are rooted in “language, conduct and pedagogy” in schools (Swartz, 1996, p. 397). She is acutely aware that emancipatory pedagogy is “directly political” (Swartz, 1996, p. 410). However, she concludes: “As educators we either choose a form of cultural politics that seeks to rewrite the historicalizing of supremacy in school knowledge and pedagogy, or we choose a form of cultural politics that fuels its continuance” (Swartz, 1996, p. 410). Embedded in Swartz’s logic are the underpinnings of Bernstein’s code theory. Bernstein posits that code theory underscores “how the distribution of power and principles of control generates, distributes, reproduces and legitimates dominant and dominated principles regulating communication within and between social groups” (Bernstein, 1981, p. 327).

Praxis acknowledges the presence of paradoxical forces that can either inhibit or facilitate change (Carlson, 1996). During the segregated era, Tucson did not celebrate African American cultural heritage, but Dunbar celebrated it from within. Maxwell understood this duality, and sought to use it to advance African Americans at Dunbar. What is important to note is that the preservation of culture is vitally important in the lives of children, and should be shared by schools. Bennis (1989) wisely notes: “If you
lose perspective on yourself and your own roots, you have merely put on the garb of another culture” (p. 90). Thus, the preservation of Afrocentric culture is necessary so that Black children can feel a sense of connection with their roots. Morgan Maxwell Sr. was cognizant of this need, and zealously sought to promote cultural pedagogy, in particular, African American culture, as a means of catering to the well-rounded development of African American children.

6. Firm Disciplinarian

Maxwell believed in firm discipline. As previously noted, his deputy principal, Elmore Carrier was in charge of disciplining the boys. Corporal punishment at Dunbar was practiced if students violated school rules or teacher expectations. A conversation with an alumnus revealed:

*Interviewer:* So, Mr. Maxwell also smacked the boys if they needed it?

*Interviewee:* Oh yes… Oh yes. [He laughs] (Personal communication, November 29, 2003)

Another student informed:

*Interviewee:* If you were giving other teachers problems, he [Maxwell] would get on you. He would sit down and talk to you. And if you wouldn’t listen like he did one time, he got his belt and whipped my butt, and I was quiet! But I appreciate that now. I couldn’t see it then. (Personal communication, December 3, 2003)
Firm discipline was a characteristic of Maxwell’s leadership. His approach was in keeping with Arizona’s state statutes (Cooper, 1967) and with the disciplinary approach that was commonplace among many African Americans of that era. Students were expected to conform, and in the words of one alumnus, “We accepted it” (Personal communication, May 29, 2004).

7. Cultivator of a Sense of Pride

Maxwell’s leadership cultivated a sense of pride in Dunbar students. One alumna remarked: “There was such pride at the school and there was discipline, and there was no acceptance of less than your best. That’s my memory of Mr. Maxwell” (Personal communication, June 4, 2004). One example of his acceptance of cultural pride is he endorsed the Paul Laurence Dunbar name as being a propos for the segregated school. Generally, there was a tremendous sense of Afrocentric pride that the school’s name precipitated. When the school dismantled in 1951, there was much sadness. One student, Olivia Guess, presented a farewell speech on the eve of Dunbar’s closure in 1951. She wrote:

And now the time has come when we must say good-bye to Dunbar. The years that we have spent have been gainful and happy ones. Always, you have given us encouragement and inspiration. Dunbar Junior High School, your bells no longer will summon us to classrooms within your reverend walls, but the echo of their sound will always ring within our hearts and minds. They will remind us of the high standards of good citizenship that our principal, Mr. Maxwell and the teachers have taught us. No longer will we walk through your halls in search of the knowledge for which our souls have thirsted and found. For us no more will we experience from you the patience you have shown us, the courage you have given us, the love you have
fostered.

To Mr. Morrow and the Board of Education, as we the graduates of the Class of 1951 leave this auditorium tonight we shall carry with us an indelible memory, a glowing warmth and love for you. You have done much to inspire it.

To Mr. Maxwell, we say we shall never forget your leadership and profound devotion to Dunbar. We hate to leave you whom we love, but as our class motto implies, we must go forward ever, backward never. And so, with this parting backward glance and with sad hearts we bid you farewell, at the same time looking forward to high school days, to successful careers, and to all the good things you have taught us to respect.

Farewell, Dunbar, farewell to thee. Your undying love and devotion shall remain within our hearts and souls. We welcome you, John Springs Junior High School, and wish for you a glorious, glorious future! (Graduation Speech presented by student Olivia Guess, 1951)

The dismantling of Dunbar not only brought a feeling of sadness, but also one of controversy. Referring to the school’s name change, Morgan Maxwell Jr. stated in the Arizona Daily Star: “That’s one battle we lost” (Wagner, 2004, E3). The African American community was incensed that the name “Dunbar” had to be erased. Black students were expected to attend a school named by a White man, but according to Maxwell, “white students would never choose to attend a school named by a black man” (Wagner, 2004, E3). One group conversation revealed:

Interviewee 1: They took the name away and named it Spring.

Interviewee 2: It meant absolutely nothing.

Interviewee 1: It meant nothing. And they let it just sit there.

Seem [sic] to me, the whole purpose was breaking [us] up, ‘cause when Maxwell said something he was
backed up by the whole community.

Interviewee 2: That’s right. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Principal Maxwell acquiesced to the School Board’s pressure to surrender the Dunbar name in an effort to remove all vestiges of segregation. He did so reluctantly. Maxwell agreed to the change as a compromise for the integration process. This issue still remains a sore topic for Dunbar alumni and teachers. They feel robbed of an important part of their heritage. They appear to still have difficulty comprehending the rationale behind the School Board’s actions.

Another incident revealed Maxwell’s sense of cultural pride. One interviewee informed:

Interviewee: Now this is something interesting. A lot of people did not know Maxwell got into trouble over that.

Interviewer: Did he? Why?

Interviewee: Instead of singing the *Star Spangled Banner*, we would sing the Negro National Anthem. And they thought that was not the thing to do. So, when White people came, we would sing the *Star Spangled Banner* and then *Lift Every Voice and Sing*. I talked to my friends. It was done all over the country. At segregated schools they would sing the Negro National Anthem. I know the words to the Negro National Anthem, but I do not know the words
to the *Star Spangled Banner*. So, we would all sing
the Negro National Anthem. The superintendent did
not like that at all.

*Interviewer:* *What is it that brought out the emotion in you
When you talked about the Negro National Anthem?*

*Interviewee:* Well, I remember this. When the schools became
integrated, we said we would no longer sing the
Black National Anthem. We stopped singing it
when the schools became integrated.

(Personal communication, March 11, 2004)

The singing of the Negro National Anthem, *Lift Every Voice And Sing*, had tremendous
significance for the Dunbar family. The song was an Afrocentric, symbolical connection
for the Dunbar family. It fostered a sense of pride. Students were proud to be Black.
They were proud to have a special anthem to sing that reflected their culture and heritage.
There is something about the singing of a song. Singing is an activity that unites
individuals. It helps to create a sense of cohesion and unity. Dunbar teachers and
students felt a sense of oneness as they sang the Negro National Anthem together in
assemblies and on special occasions. One interviewee was visibly emotional as he
recalled the disappearance of the Negro National Anthem from Dunbar’s life, indicating
the degree of sensitivity and loss that the school membership felt. James Weldon
Johnson, the famous African American writer, penned the words to the Anthem in 1899.
They are as follows:
Lift Every Voice And Sing

Lift every voice and sing
‘Till earth and heaven ring,
Ring with the harmonies of Liberty,
Let our rejoice rise
High as the listening skies,
Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith
That the dark past has taught us,
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march till victory is won.

8. Proactive Leader

Maxwell was a proactive leader. As previously mentioned, he initiated the influx of a cadre of Kansas teachers to assist him in developing Dunbar.

Secondly, he initiated a hot lunch program for Dunbar students and hired a cook to oversee the operation. Thirdly, he organized in-service, professional development workshops for teachers. A former teacher commented: “He demanded a lot. He wanted us to be good teachers. The thing about it is, in demanding, we had a lot of good workshops and seminars and stuff” (Personal communication, November 29, 2003).

Thirdly, Maxwell encouraged Dunbar students to connect with other students outside Dunbar. One Dunbar alumna recalled:
Mr. Maxwell did reach out. When I was in junior high, they set up cultural exchange programs with other junior high schools. And we would go over and sing and dance. They would come over and then we had about an hour or half hour to socialize with those students and I found out later that he wanted us to do that in order to know the kids when we got to high school which was integrated, so we did [sic] not feel alienated or alone. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Deal and Peterson (1999) note: “Building a cohesive school community means shaping a culture that reaches out and touches everyone: students, teachers, staff, administrators, parents, and community” (p. 135). To a large degree, the mainstream community excluded Dunbar, yet Maxwell made the effort to bridge gaps.

Fourthly, Maxwell was known for introducing father-son banquets to Dunbar. This was a major school event held in the school’s basement, and brought a sense of cohesion to school life. This event was aimed at establishing a bond between boys and their fathers, and simultaneously the family with the school. Morgan Maxwell Jr. reported to the Arizona Daily Star: “We had good times. I remember when my father organized a father-son banquet. Every student had to have a man to bring to the banquet. My father said it was mandatory to come” (Copenhaver, 2002, pp. 1A, 2A). Mother-daughter days were also celebrated at Dunbar; Children’s Days were organized by the local churches (The Dunbar Project, 1995).
Researchers confirm that rituals and ceremonies are important features that strengthen organizational culture (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Carlson, 1996; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Deal and Peterson (1999) postulate:

Ritual and ceremony allow us to act out what otherwise is hard to touch and comprehend. ...Ritual and ceremony are to culture what the movie is to the script, the concert is to the score, or the dance is to values difficult to express in any other way. (p. 31)

Hoy and Miskel (2001) observe: “Rituals are the routine ceremonies and rites that signal what is important in organizations” (p. 186). They go on to say:

Much of the culture of a school can be constructed from artifacts, rites, rituals, and ceremonies related to assemblies, faculty meetings, athletic contests, community activities, cafeteria, report cards, awards and trophies, lesson plans, and the general décor of the school. (p. 186)

Researchers note that rituals and ceremonies help to build cohesion in school culture (Carlson, 1996; Peterson, 2002). Peterson (2002) writes:

Schools have rituals and ceremonies – communal events to celebrate success, to provide closure during collective transitions, and to recognize people’s contributions to the school. School cultures also include symbols and stories that communicate core values, reinforce the mission, and build a shared sense of commitment. Symbols are outward sign of inward values. Stories
are group representations of history and meaning. In positive cultures, these features reinforce learning, commitment, and motivation, and they are consistent with the school’s vision (p. 10).

One alumna recalled:

I remember we used to have school carnivals. I think it started on Friday and went to about mid-night, we had games and cake walks and all of things and families were there, the Black community descended on the school. We had dances and we had a good time.

(Personal communication, June 1, 2004)

Thus, it appears that routine ceremonial events suggest to observers that certain activities and observances are important to schools. Dunbar’s formal functions to honor fathers, mothers as well as graduation and dedication ceremonies were ceremonial cultural indicators that expressed the school’s core values. Such activities confirmed the values of the school, and simultaneously reaffirmed the organization’s goals and priorities (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Schein, 1992). At Dunbar, ceremonial events were a means of uniting the Dunbar family, and strengthening the school’s organizational culture.

9. Resilient Leader

Maxwell was a resilient school leader. He possessed the ability to remain strong in the face of challenging circumstances. One alumna stated: “I do remember him as a real strong leader. The teachers respected him and the kids respected him. He was a real
strong leader.” (November 30, 2003). Several incidents attest to Maxwell’s fortitude. First, his eleven-year tenure afforded him the benefit of experiencing multiple successes and learning from his leadership. Given the cultural context of his leadership, he had to be constantly aware of the broader political system under which Dunbar was operating. Hallinger and Leithwood (1996), drawing from the work of Bossert and his colleagues, write: “By institutional context, they were taking into account the structural policy system within which the school is embedded” (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996, p. 102). For Dunbar, its institutional context was a segregated system. There were policies and procedures to which the mainstream adhered. However, within Dunbar, the only Black school, Maxwell often had to defy the rules of political correctness, and act in the best interest of the Dunbar family. It is believed that time strengthened his resilience as a leader.

Despite strategies and innovative ideas that Maxwell implemented, as well as the accolades poured out about his leadership, like all influential leaders, sooner or later they encounter criticism. Maxwell did not escape. At one point during his leadership there were nine Kansans on the faculty at Dunbar: eight teachers and Maxwell. Maxwell hired teachers whom he knew, who were qualified, and who had a proven record of success. This move, however, did not win him overwhelming support from a faction of Tucson’s African American community. A couple of informants revealed that Maxwell was often the subject of criticism on a local Sunday night radio program hosted by an African American. Thus, in the face of attack, Maxwell had to make strategic leadership decisions. Deal and Peterson (1999) reveal:
Leaders need to build and maintain a shared purpose while encouraging creative diversity to ensure continued growth for students and staff. Shared purpose is key to quality schools, but it is equally important to nurture diverse views, be open to innovation, and encourage flexibility for the sake of progress.

Perhaps it would have been ideal to have more Tucsonan teachers at Dunbar. The truth of the matter is there were few qualified African American teachers available. Thus, Maxwell had to make a decision based on the availability of resources, and what was in the overall best interest of the school. Snowden & Gorton (2002) discuss the strategic decision making model. They state: “The strategic decision-making approach views decision choices as taking place in an environment made up of multiple interest groups, conflict, negotiation, limited resources, position authority, and informal power” (Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Maxwell was aware of the interest groups at Dunbar: teachers, students, and the wider African American community. He was also aware of conflict, power of influence, and the authority that he had. Although cognizant of the variables that were operating, the cultural environment forced him to make a strategic decision contrary to what the dissenting groups thought.

Snowden & Gorton (2002) also point out that the strategic decision making model recognizes internal and external controls. They assert: “The assumption governing this particular model is that choices the administrator makes are based on comprehensive knowledge and analysis of the internal and external environment” (Snowden & Gorton,
2002, p. 5). Thus, Maxwell assessed the conflicting situation and made prudent decisions. Despite opposing forces regarding his hire of a large number of teachers from his home state, he retained all of the Kansas staff.

A second example of Maxwell's resilience is characterized by his bravery in challenging the system. A conversation with Maxwell Jr. revealed:

*Interviewer:* You mentioned the article in *Time Magazine* in 1951.

*Interviewee:* Yes, in *Time Magazine*, Father Clinton, who was the Priest at St. Michael's Church in Tucson on Wilmot and Fifth Street, was my father's friend. The other schools had what they called a school resource officer or probation officer on the premises. All the schools had one, but Dunbar never had one.

My father would not let a police officer or probation officer come to the [Dunbar] campus without first checking in at the principal's office. Then a counselor or a teacher would stay with the cop for all the time that he was there. The cop could not ask me, "Where was your father last night?" It [the article] was entitled "No Cops in the Schools in March of 1951." When he had to let the cops there, a counselor or a teacher stayed with the cops and listened to the conversation and the cop had to get off the premises.

In fact, former Chief Wilkinson, who is still living in Tucson, reminded me of that one time at the airport. He said when you went to Dunbar you had two minutes. You went in and talked to the student and then got out. Then we found out later that hardly any of us had a record. Let's face it, justice wasn't fair back then, there was no 'ifs' or 'ands' about it. It [sic] was prejudice and they had a different value system for the White kids and the Black system.
The researcher searched in vain for the *Times* article. However, oral accounts indicate that Maxwell was brave to challenge the system. Interestingly, Irvine and Irvine (1983) make a similar observation about segregated schools. They write:

> The segregated black community was in some sense an imposed circumstance turned into a functional system. It demarcated its boundaries and acted as a protective mechanism to screen out the harmful effects of racial diatribes hurled at its members from the larger hostile society. It had governing and regulating norms; it constrained and sanctioned its members. (Irvine & Irvine, 1983, p. 416)

Clearly, Maxwell was the marker for Dunbar. External forces did not intimidate him. Perhaps by present-day standards he may have been charged with insubordination. Irvine & Irvine (1983) conclude: “Black schools were for all intent and purposes black-controlled – controlled in the sense that they were administered by black principals, staffed by black teachers, and served a black student population” (p. 416). Given the cultural context of Maxwell’s leadership, he opted to act once again in the best interest of the school. Maxwell was able to withstand bureaucratic pressures, act on his compelling convictions, and lead the school towards success. Bennis (1989) writes: “Listening to the inner voice – trusting the inner voice is one of the most important lessons of leadership” (p. 35). Maxwell mastered this quality.

A third example of Maxwell’s resilience is that he fought the system. He wanted equal conditions for Dunbar students and teachers as there were for Whites. He fought
for better supplies and working conditions. Maxwell’s tenacity resembles the resilience of W. E. B. Du Bois. One alumna stated:

Mr. Maxwell, I mean he really, really, I mean that was his school. He really, really did every thing he could, any thing he could. He fought for new books. He fought for new desks. You know we always got the hand-me-downs. I really don’t know how he did it and then put up with us too. [She laughs]. (Personal communication, December 11, 2003)

Until 1948, Dunbar was a non-airconditioned school. The situation had reached its peak when hot Arizona weather conditions coincided with Marion Anderson’s Dunbar visit. The school was so hot informants say that two students fainted during her visit to the school (Personal communication, March 11, 2004). The Pima County Number One School Board of Trustees, embarrassed by the situation, adhered to Maxwell’s request, and quickly remedied the situation.

A fourth example of Maxwell’s resilience is observed when he was taken to task by a group of African Americans three years into his principalship position. Eight members of the Tucson Civic League, headed by C. F. Wilson, approached the Tucson Board of Education in December 1949 requesting Maxwell’s dismissal. They charged that Maxwell was unfit as an administrator because he had hired a female teacher who had "danced in the nude at a Tucson club" ("Plan to Oust Morgan Maxwell Dies," 1950, p. 2A). An African American female who was a student at the University of Arizona at the time of the alleged incident, needed financial assistance to help to cover the cost of her
studies. Upon graduating from university, she was hired at Dunbar. Superintendent Morrow flatly denied the charges. He counter-argued: “Maxwell is doing a good job there and we have a fine school” ("Dunbar Principal’s Dismissal," 1949). The Superintendent shielded Maxwell accepting full responsibility for the hire of the teacher in question. Yet, multiple attempts were still made to oust the Dunbar principal. The Tucson Civic League presented a petition of 600 names attacking Maxwell’s leadership and morals. However, his outstanding performance and reputation in the community overshadowed the fiery criticism ("Plan to Oust Maxwell Dies," 1950). He retained his job as principal.

The Tucson School Board made the matter top priority at its meeting in January, 1950. The resolution to the Maxwell issue read as follows:

Whereas, the Board of Trustees, Tucson School District No. 1, Pima County, Arizona, has carefully investigated conditions at Dunbar school [sic] has found that the education program is very good and that it is comparable with the programs now being carried on in other elementary and junior high schools in the city of Tucson,

Whereas, upon careful investigation the board has also found that Mr. Morgan Maxwell, principal of Dunbar school [sic], is a man of good character, high ideals and that he has an excellent moral and ethical code; that he has had excellent training and experience; that the morale of the teachers and pupils at Dunbar is good; that his standing in professional circles is very high; and that Mr. Maxwell has been a good leader both in the school and in the community,

Now, therefore, the board goes on record as having complete confidence in Mr. Maxwell its wholehearted support in carrying on his work at Dunbar school [sic].

("Plan to Oust Maxwell Dies," 1950, p. 2A)
Scholars recognize the presence of politics in organizations and its inevitability in the life of a leader. Bolman and Deal (1992) contend: “Organizations are jungles full of predators and prey. Problems arise from political game playing and petty bickering. The only solution is to play the game better than your opponents” (p. 32). Carlson (1996) notes: “Politics affects our lives in organizations whether we choose to play or not. Some organizations are more benevolent than others; in these cases there is less motivation to get politically involved” (p. 63). Maxwell was politically astute, and he used this attribute as a resiliency tool. His belief of not becoming directly involved in the catfight, and allowing his character and track record to speak for him was a strategy that worked. Consequently, the darts of criticism subsided. His political acumen worked. Deal and Peterson (1999) observe paradoxes that leaders face. In discussing the paradox of people, they write:

Leaders must be caring and supportive of people who work in schools but also must champion and protect the integrity and common good of the institution. This is one of leadership’s deepest and most challenging paradoxes. As schools empower, motivate, and nurture staff and parents, it must be for the common good of students, the school, and society at large. (p. 138)

Maxwell’s actions reflected the common good of Dunbar. The African American woman was a qualified teacher. She would not have been able to teach elsewhere in Tucson. Maxwell was cognizant of this, and wanted to help. Whether he knew about her actions prior to the hire is unknown. The name of the “Tucson club” remains a mystery.
Morgan Maxwell Sr. made history as the first principal of an integrated school in the state of Arizona. John Spring Junior High operated from 1951 - 1968 under his leadership. Maxwell retired from the educational system in 1968 after nearly a half-century of dedicated service.
Summary

Morgan Maxwell Sr. was Dunbar’s fifth and final principal. Son of a former slave and Tennessee exoduster, he came to Tucson, Arizona from Fort Scott, Kansas in 1939. Maxwell took the leadership reigns of Dunbar in January 1940, and continued to lead the segregated school until 1951 when de jure desegregation policies ordered its closure. In 1951 Maxwell continued on as principal of the new John Spring Junior High School, becoming the first principal of an integrated school in the state of Arizona. He continued as principal until his retirement in 1968.

Maxwell’s cultural background and academic career were instrumental in propelling him and Dunbar towards success. Before coming to Arizona, he had taught in Fort Worth, Texas, Okmulgee, Oklahoma and Topeka, Kansas.

The Kansas-born principal was fiercely loyal to education. In particular, he was relentlessly dedicated to the intellectual and social development of African American children, an educational philosophy embodied by W. E. B. Du Bois. The segregated school, under Maxwell, did not completely reject Booker T. Washington’s views, but rather extracted from them a devotion to work, a commitment to excellence and a desire for self-sufficiency. However, Maxwell demonstrated a greater propensity towards the leadership philosophy of W. E. B. Du Bois. He emphasized and made known his thrust for academic excellence. Thus, Dunbar’s dedicated focus on academic excellence and sound commitment formed a strong lever that successfully propelled the school forward to create a legacy of historic recognition and notable purpose.
In addition to a strong philosophy emphasizing academic excellence, Maxwell’s leadership also embraced what is now known as Expectancy Theory, a belief that places high expectations on performance, reward and also adds value to the educational experience. Further, his leadership posture demonstrated a belief in the philosophy of moral leadership - that is, doing what is morally right in the best interest of the followers. Maxwell’s leadership principally embodied the following characteristics:

1. Ardent supporter of academic pursuits
2. Respecer of school community
3. Community participant
4. Protector
5. Advocate of African American cultural pedagogy
6. Firm disciplinarian
7. Cultivator of a sense of pride
8. Proactive Leader
9. Resilient Leader

At the heart of the principal’s leadership were strong personal attributes coupled with a determination to fight against the odds. The cultural congruency of his staff, strong community support, and an insatiable desire for success were salient characteristics that he emphasized. An examination of Maxwell’s attributes highlights his competence and effectiveness as a leader. He is an icon in the African American community in Tucson. Additionally, he put Dunbar on the map as a successful segregated school. Maxwell joins the list of outstanding principals who administered during an era of segregation.
~ Figure 3 ~

Components of the Leadership of Morgan Maxwell Sr.
at Segregated Dunbar School (1940-1951)
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CULTURAL HERITAGE
"Education is simply the soul of a society as it passes from one generation to another."
~ G. K. Chesterton ~

CHAPTER 6
IPSA SCIENTIA POTESTAS EST: KNOWLEDGE ITSELF IS POWER -
THE IMPACT OF DESEGREGATION ON
BLACK EDUCATION

Overview of *Brown v. Board of Education*

*Brown v. Board of Education*, Topeka, Kansas, 1954 was the landmark Supreme Court case that obliterated legalized school segregation in the United States. The case capped a succession of attempts to overturn the separate-but-equal ruling in *Plessey v. Ferguson* of 1896 that declared separation of Blacks and Whites in places of public accommodation as constitutionally sound (Alexander & Alexander, 2001). Plaintiffs in the *Brown* case were twelve African American parents who brought a class action suit against the Kansas Board of Education. As fate would have it, parents of Linda Brown, who were initially reluctant to take the case forward, alphabetically headed the plaintiff list, and carried the fame of the outcome. Fifty-eight years after the *Plessey* decision, *Brown*, using the Fourteenth Amendment as the yardstick, charged that separate-but-equal was inherently unequal. The Kansas Board of Education counter-argued that the separatist legislation prepared students for the broader segregated society (*Brown*, 1954). Thurgood Marshall, legal council for *Brown*, together with the N.A.A.C.P., maintained
that racial discrimination in public education was unconstitutional. They won. The Brown ruling was aimed at eradicating racial inequalities in the educational arena in the U.S.

Fifty years have passed since the high court decision was pronounced. Since then much water has gone under the proverbial bridge. Proponents and opponents of school desegregation have had time to reflect on the impact of Brown on public education. Analysts of the court ruling have drawn a line through the case to create two sides of the debate: Brown I, referring to the 1954 decision and Brown II, pointing to its implementation (Ladson-Billings, 2004). At the time of the judgment the promise of Brown was to provide equality in education for African American children. The decision sought to ameliorate conditions under which Black children were being schooled by providing them with access to better resources, equitable educational opportunities, as well as removing the perceived psychological damage for being forced to attend segregated schools (Brown, 1954). The quest for equality was right. The case was correctly decided. The walls of legal separation needed to be removed. However, what resulted on the educational stage was somewhat different than what was originally intended. The adage: “Hindsight is twenty-twenty” is applicable here. As in every decision, there are gains and losses. Still to be determined is whether the number of gains of school desegregation outweighs the number of losses.

The subject of desegregation can be tackled in voluminous ways. Issues such as bussing, magnet schools, the impact of desegregation on politics, its role in the
Civil Rights Movement, staffing, school privatization, international impact, and foreign policy are among the proliferation of topical ramifications addressed by scholars. The list is endless. For the purpose of this study, however, although some gains precipitated by the *Brown* decision are mentioned here, the aim is to spotlight losses that impacted Black education in order to widen the scope of understanding regarding segregated schools. Herein, lies the focus of this section.

**Gains and Losses of Desegregation**

The *Brown* decision opened the door to racial integration in classrooms across the U.S., and indeed in the wider society. Mandated segregation and Jim Crowism were outlawed as a result. Researchers also claim that psychological effects based on segregationist practices were eliminated (Orfield, 1996). In addition, the *Brown* legislation allowed Black students access to predominantly White institutions and embraced a multicultural focus (Wells, 1995). The opportunity to learn with students of different races is also deemed a positive result. Emphasis on diversity training and cultural celebration, practiced by some schools, are also by-products of the mandate. Further, the legislation better prepared students to live in a racially diverse society (Orfield, 1995).

A 1994 Gallup Poll recorded that 87% of Americans believe that the *Brown* decision was rightly decided (*Brown* Matters, 2003). Results from the same poll indicated that 62% of Americans felt that desegregation has improved race relations. Findings also revealed that 84% support further desegregation initiatives. In March 2003, the
Associated Press announced results indicating that 38% of those interviewed believe that the U.S. is either fairly close or very close to eliminating racial discrimination (Brown Matters, 2003). The same poll revealed that 80% of Americans favor racially diverse classrooms. Overall, the majority of Blacks and Whites agree that desegregation improved the face of education in the U.S., and prepared the races to better interact with each other in the wider world.

Despite laudable gains noted in the aforementioned section, there were also significant losses particularly for African Americans. Ten have been spotlighted for analysis. The goal here is not to paint a negative picture by lamenting the demolition of segregated schools. Rather, the aim is to pinpoint losses in order to embellish our understanding of the strength of the segregated school, and to enhance our understanding of the impact of desegregation on Black education in general, and in particular in Tucson, Arizona. Although the pueblo dismantled segregation three years earlier than the federal mandate, the outcomes of the ruling parallel those in other school jurisdictions across the U.S. Each loss is addressed in subsequent sections.

1. *Loss of Psychological Comfort*

   In the wake of the Tucson decision to desegregate, there was a loss of psychological comfort for the ordinary citizenry. Although the dismantling of institutionalized segregation was the coveted carrot after which Blacks sought, at the time of the educational shift many Black students were caught unprepared in the integration tide. Allport (1954) argues that the integration process across the U.S. was incorrectly
managed. There is evidence to suggest that the integration transition in Tucson, Arizona also caused anxiety for both Blacks and Whites in the local community. A conversation with a Dunbar alumna revealed characteristics about the implementation process in the southwest town:

Interviewee: My most vivid memory is the morning I woke up and went to school and I ended up in an integrated school. I mean, no notice, just... they put us on a bus and they took us.

Interviewer: You mean, let's see, they made the decision in March, and you went to school in September expecting to be there for the day and....

Interviewee: I was put on a bus and taken to Borton Elementary School, which is out on 22nd [Street]. Whatever memories are there, it is all over shadowed by that one experience.

Interviewer: What did that mean for you?

Interviewee: I handled it O.K., but it is [sic] disconcerting. I mean, there was no continuity, and very little explanation, at what...ten or eleven years old, you just don’t ask that many questions. (Personal communication, June 4, 2004)

Thus, this study has revealed that there is evidence that at least one family was unaware of the transition. Although the integration process in Tucson occurred without major drama, there is further evidence that indicates that the speedy manner in which it was
implemented caused an upset for parents, teachers and students. Some White parents removed their children from the school system in protest of the decision, while others made requests that their children not be taught by African American teachers (Morado, 2001). The Dunbar faculty expressed anxiety about the possible loss of jobs for Black teachers. Opponents of desegregation, believed to be Whites in the local community, hurled offensive names at the Superintendent (“A Pattern for Integration,” 1956). It appears, therefore, that the integration move in Tucson disallowed stakeholders the opportunity to have adequate time to mentally prepare for the change, even although it was labeled a success. Although the majority of Blacks, a segment of Whites, and prominent, civic organizations accepted desegregation believing it to be a way for African American children to achieve more equitable education, the process is believed to have inflicted some psychological damage on the Black community, which ironically was one of the reasons for the passage of Brown in the first place. One could surmise, therefore, that the Tucson community did not expect integration to occur so quickly.

Desegregation in Arizona was legally permitted in March 1951. By April 1951 the Tucson Board of Trustees had voted to integrate. By June 1951 Tucson’s desegregation legislation had been sealed. Barely three months later Black students in Tucson were placed into integrated, public classrooms. Indeed, the forced adjustment on parents, teachers and students caused some psychological discomfort for the Tucson community.

Despite concerns about the haste of the legislative implementation, there is evidence that shows that Superintendent Morrow did take some steps to inform the Tucson community of the inevitable. Morado (2001) notes Morrow’s words: “We had a lot of
meetings that spring [referring to Spring 1951] and summer with PTA groups, with church groups, with kids, and with parents, explaining what the situation was” (p. 97).

However, clearly findings indicate that all parents and students may not have been informed. This researcher believes, however, that the Superintendent aimed for a smooth transition that was intended to have an overall positive effect on the Tucsonan educational system. Morado (2001) cites a deposition dispatched from Morrow’s desk in which he writes:

We are confident that all of you will work together to make desegregation a reality rather than something superficial, and that all of you will continue to help us make the Tucson Schools among the best in the nation. Teachers as well as boys and girls will need to adjust to their new schools and new environments. With mutual understanding and respect, all of us should be able to work together more effectively. (p. 181)

Thus, it is noted that despite the intent for a smooth transition, the desegregation process in Tucson caused a loss of psychological comfort for segments of the Tucsonan community.

2. Loss of Continuity

The desegregation process created a loss of continuity in that the composition of school memberships in Tucson was significantly altered. Black, White and Hispanic students were suddenly placed side by side in classrooms. The problem was not the fact
that groups of students were being educated together, but rather the concern was the outcome of the move. Wells (1995) explains that one outcome of desegregation was "resegregation within segregated schools" (p. 691). Instead of having an all-embracing environment of unity, there was disunity. Dunbar informants revealed a sense of alienation that they felt in the new integrated environment. Further, African American teachers were forced to leave Dunbar behind, and were shuffled off to eight other school districts (Morado, 2001). At the time of the merger, 20 African American teachers were employed at Dunbar (Morado, 2001). Of that number 15 were dispersed to other school districts. The fate of the remaining five teachers is not known. Principal Maxwell remained at the Dunbar site as head of the integrated John Spring Junior High School. However, he was left without his previously accustomed, predominantly African American school community. The Superintendent requested that some White teachers transfer to schools where Black students would be in attendance, while others were asked to volunteer in schools where there was African American representation (Morado, 2001). Many teachers readily complied (Morado, 2001). It also appears that Superintendent Morrow was flexible and accepted the fact that some White teachers may not have been prepared to make the change. Upon analyzing the desegregation process in the aftermath of Brown, scholars have noted that forced desegregation did not equal true integration. Harris (1983) makes a poignant observation:

The mere mingling of pupils of different races must not be considered a sufficient condition for successful desegregation.

There are "other critical aspects of the school environment" that
must be altered also. "Successful desegregation" requires that all forms of discrimination against a particular group be eliminated. In situations where minority students receive discrimination within school environments in which they have been placed, desegregation cannot be considered a success. (p. 425)

Thus, desegregation created a loss of continuity that was previously enjoyed at the segregated school. A loss of continuity precipitated disunity and a pseudo form of integration within public schools in the aftermath of the legal decision.

3. *Loss of Afrocentric Symbolism and Cultural Emphasis*

The dismantling of Dunbar precipitated a loss of Afrocentric symbolism and cultural emphasis in the early stages of desegregation. Although the school building was not demolished like it was in some school jurisdictions, such as in the case of Trenholm High School in Tuscumbia, Alabama (Morris & Morris, 2002), there was still a sense of loss for the African American community in Tucson. The Dunbar name was obliterated. This was a sore spot for the school family. It remains a touchy subject even today for many Blacks who experienced the Dunbar era. One may ask: "What's in a name?" Dunbar symbolized African American culture. It epitomized Black pride. It exemplified excellence. It equaled success. Dunbar was the personification of personal growth, academic development and high achievement for Blacks in Tucson. Dunbar was a unifying, symbolic force not only for the school community, but for the African American community in Tucson as a whole. According to Morado (2001),
Superintendent Morrow argued: "We could not stop until all vestiges of segregation were removed" (p. 102). However, this study on Dunbar has confirmed that what was termed "vestiges of segregation" were really the vestiges of symbolic, Afrocentric cultural capital now known to be a catalyst for a strong school climate and culture that ultimately yielded success for African American children.

Researchers lament the loss of segregated schools recognizing that Afrocentric cultural input that celebrates Black heritage, insists on excellent performance, and incites maximum pride in students are ingredients for success (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993; Irvine & Irvine, 1983; Morris, 1999; Morris & Morris, 2002; Siddle Walker, 1996). In some settings there is little tolerance and appreciation for Afrocentric cultural traits and beliefs, and researchers charge that more pressure is placed on students to surrender their uniqueness to adopt patterns of behavior and beliefs of the dominant culture (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). This would naturally precipitate feelings of inferiority in African American children. It appears that what is culturally important within many public schools is often one-sided. Afrocentric views and cultural patterns are often subverted. According to Fordham and Ogbu (1986), students are forced to abandon their cultural idiosyncrasies for patterns of mainstream culture to gain acceptance. They also argue that the dominant culture is elevated as the only accepted cultural behavior.

Scott (1983) examined views of Black superintendents in the U.S. He found that 88.6% of Black superintendents surveyed either strongly agreed or agreed with the following statement: "School desegregation plans should preserve the cultural identity and dignity of black Americans" (Scott, 1983, p. 380). Thus, the dismantling of the
4. Loss of Communal Bonding

Desegregation precipitated a loss of communal bonding. At Dunbar there was a strong sense of community. Historical research studies on segregated schools across the U.S. have consistently shown that strong communal bonding was a salient characteristic that contributed to positive school culture and student success (Edwards, 1998; Morris, 1999; Siddle Walker, 1996; Ward, 1996). The segregated school environment was a safe cocoon for Black children with built-in protective factors that kept students under the mantel of a nurturing, supportive educational environment. The sense of communal bonding embraced the home, the school, and the wider society and was made visible through a strong school culture. The educational village concept was fully operative at Dunbar. Homegrown Afrocentric rituals and ceremonial practices, strong communal fellowship, Black autonomous control, vibrant cultural congruency and strong parental input all evaporated giving way to the arrival of integration. This observation is also consistent with findings on segregated schools across the U.S. (Edwards, 1998; Morris & Morris, 2002; Siddle Walker, 1996; Ward, 1996).

Harvard scholars Orfield and Eaton (1996) state:

Virtually no evidence exists that emphasis on culture can overcome the enormous problems facing schools of concentrated poverty or even that minority aspirations are low. Black students,
in any case, typically report aspirations as high or higher than whites. Their problem is unequal preparation (p. 344).

Yet, there is a voluminous body of research that trumpets the importance of having a strong organizational culture as a catalyst for successful outcomes. Schools are organizations. A strong school culture is a proven resiliency factor that helps students to overcome difficulties and feelings of inferiority that otherwise would cause them to fail. This study on Dunbar is only one of many studies that herald the success of the segregated school because a strong school culture.

Further, African American neighborhoods previously characterized by closeness, similar cultural patterns, values and beliefs were disrupted due to the removal of Black schools. Some Blacks have moved to more affluent neighborhoods because of individual success and upward mobility. This has had a rippling effect on Black neighborhoods, the Black family and on schools. Thus, desegregation has placed a mantel of fragmentation on Black communities across the U.S.

5. **Loss of Educational Opportunities**

The Dunbar study uncovered evidence that the new, integrated, educational setting bore signs of racial prejudice that contributed to some loss of educational opportunities for African American students, at least in the early stages of desegregation. Again, ironically this was not the intended outcome of the *Brown* ruling. Allport (1954) observed that prior prejudices deeply engrained in the minds of Blacks and Whites hampered the integration process. St. John (1975) notes: “Parents are assumed by many
researchers to be the primary source of racial attitudes in children” (p. 65). In the case of Dunbar, it is known that Superintendent Morrow received offensive phone calls and letters of protest from parents regarding the desegregation initiatives. There is clear indication that pockets of the wider Tucsonan community did not support Morrow’s desegregation efforts. Further, according to testimonials by former Dunbar students, it was evident to them that some teachers at the high school level likewise did not support desegregation. Thus, Allport’s (1954) observation that deeply embedded racial prejudice imposed its presence on society in the aftermath of desegregation is confirmed by this study.

Dunbar informants, upon reflecting on their Tucson High experience, recognized that there was some ingrained prejudice evidenced there, and recounted loss of opportunities. They charge that they were not permitted to fully assimilate into the educational experience that the school offered. An extended commentary provided by an alumna and former teacher encapsulates this allegation:

Now when I went to high school we had a homeroom. Tucson High was supposed to be an integrated high school, but it had so many configurations of prejudice and segregation because of all the Black kids. I don't care whether you were a freshman, junior, senior, whatever, you went to this one home room with Mrs. Hellam [pseudonym]. As our homeroom teacher she gave us all the announcements for the whole school and told us the activities that were going on, whereas the other students were sent to homerooms on a different basis.

All of us, the Black kids, during that era, had Mrs. Hellam [pseudonym], because she was the Home Room teacher for the Black kids. We were allowed to go to the assemblies. We were not allowed to participate completely in those assemblies. Mrs. Underwall, [pseudonym] from the Music Department did not have any Blacks in her music [class]. Those who were in the Drama -
there were very few of us. I believe that I was one of the first Blacks who was in the school play, but it was in a menial role. So, there were a lot of things that we did not participate in, even in sports. They only took our super stars. (Personal Communication, November 30, 2004)

2. Loss of a Deep Level of Care

Former Dunbar students illuminated that their integrated learning environment uncovered a conspicuous absence of care to the degree that they had experienced at the segregated school. When asked whether life was better for Dunbar students at integrated Tucson High, one alumnus replied:

Interviewee: Well, a lot better to this extent as far as resources as far as having the text books. The missing ingredient there was that love, the dedication and sincerity in your well being, and in making sure that you are going to be the best that you can be. When you got to high school, it was like you are here, but so what!

Interviewer: Did you see care demonstrated from the White teachers to the White students? Did you see a dynamic there? Or, was it just a different ball game?

Interviewee: It was a different ball game. I think the main problem was that we came from this close-knit loving situation in the segregated school to a situation where you became an invisible man. That was very devastating to many Black kids that went there and I am sure that that impacted on them dropping out early, and getting married and what have you. So, that cultural shock, and then going in there and being totally invisible, that was kinda the way it was.

Interviewer: What do you think was better? The integrated school experience or the all-Black school experience?

Interviewee: The Black experience. I wouldn’t give anything for it. That’s why I come back for the reunions. It
reminds me of who I am and what I was. This is part of my heritage. (Personal communication, December 1, 2003)

A well respected, high profile, former Dunbar teacher and administrator was asked: “Do you believe that our Black children today [referring to Black students in Tucson] are missing out?” She responded:

Interviewee: I don’t believe they are; I KNOW they are and although I am for integration if all things were equal, but I have just seen it so much in so many ways displayed that our children do not get the nurturing. They do not get the “push” to say that you are somebody and that you can do it. In front of the odds, you just don’t let that hold you back. Black teachers at that time, and I have seen some Black teachers in later years, as I have in other years, who have not been as caring as some of those teachers that we had in those earlier days. Our teachers said, “You are going to succeed.” “No” was not even in their vocabulary and they just knew that we could do it. …

Getting back to your question, I really know how relevant it is now, since I have gone through a Black school, and then I have been an administrator in a school that was a desegregated school, and that tells me that we have lost so much of what we had at Dunbar. (Personal communication, November 30, 2003)

Thus, it appears that in the integrated setting, in the wake of desegregation, Dunbar students lacked the “push” that they had previously experienced at the segregated school. They perceived that the lack of “push” coupled with a feeling of alienation equaled a lack of care. The sentiments expressed in the aforementioned quotes parallel those articulated by other alumni. Irvine and Irvine (1983) found: “Black teachers had significantly higher expectations for their students than white teachers in both low and high-achieving black
schools" (p. 414). They conclude: “The outcome seems to be that desegregation may have significantly altered the pupil-teacher relationship which has historically been the foundation for black student achievement” (Irvine & Irvine, 1983, p. 415).

Additionally, many public schools in the U.S. are conspicuously absent of professional, Black teachers who possess a deep sense of community on the level previously enjoyed by segregated schools, and they fail to instill in students a pervasive drive for excellence. Ladson-Billings (2004) notes Epps (2003) who estimates that 38,000 Black teachers and administrators lost jobs between 1954 and 1965. In the case of Tucson, the majority of teachers were placed in public schools after desegregation. However, what has resulted in the years following desegregation is that Blacks have opted for other professions due to the widening of options available to them (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). This has caused a serious repercussion for public schools in Tucson. Black teachers are noticeably rare in public schools. This lack is a grave loss for African American children and for students from the African Diaspora.

Further, there is a profound lack of demonstrable care in schools as well as an obvious absence of excellent Black teachers proportionate to the number of Black children in Tucsonan public schools. African American children and those from the African Diaspora who are currently in the public system in the pueblo are lacking the benefits of a rich, educational experience at the level that the segregated school offered. Hence, they are deprived of the proven ingredients for success - strong Afrocentric cultural capital and a deep level of care. Further, they are short-changed by an absence of “push” for excellence. These features of public education are noticeably absent in
Tucson, and yet were omnipresent in the segregated school. What is observed, instead, are racially imbalanced faculties, an obsession with standards without the basic understanding that with the acquisition of standards comes the necessity to cater to children’s basic psychological need for nurturing and encouragement. Such are missing ingredients in many public schools in the U.S. It appears that Tucson is no exception.

More recent studies have also concluded that desegregation policies have not yielded positive results for African American students (Schultz, Buck & Niesz, 2000; Dempsey & Noblit, 1993; Orfield & Eaton, 1996). A Wisconsin study uncovered that desegregation policies have not only failed to address the emotional needs of Black students, but have perpetuated a system of Black underachievement (Leake & Faltz, 1993). It is now known that a positive school climate characterized by strong relationships does affect student performance. It stands to reason therefore that the absence of a positive, encouraging climate hinders the learning process and students’ overall productivity. Dunbar students believed that the new, integrated, educational environment would offer them a more superior education. Research has confirmed this belief (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Schultz, Buck & Niesz, 2000). However, although students at Dunbar experienced a new learning environment, had newer texts, sat behind newer desks, and had access to better school supplies, still they experienced great loss in terms of connectedness with their teachers, with their fellow students, and the loss of educational opportunities. They sorely missed their caring teachers who had catered to their emotional needs, built solid relationships with them and their families, and who insisted on excellence of conduct and academic performance. Indisputably, the
desegregation initiative in Tucson did not yield the degree of positivity that African Americans experienced in the segregated setting. Hence, this constituted a critical loss.

7. Loss of Black Control

The dismantling of Dunbar signified a loss of Black control in public school arena. Black control acquiesced to more stringent district controls. Although Maxwell became the first Black principal of an integrated school in the state of Arizona and led John Spring School effectively, he did not have the degree of control that he had previously enjoyed at the segregated school. The singing of the Negro National Anthem to which the faculty and student body had become accustomed, ceased. Visits of prominent African American personalities to Dunbar that Maxwell had organized, stopped. Dedication ceremonies of prominent African American achievers evaporated. The power to evict governmental officials from the school was no longer a measure to which he was privy. Irvine and Irvine (1983) concluded: “Black schools were semi-autonomous organizations that were eventually dismantled” (p. 416). Thus, desegregation contributed to a loss of Black control that was evident in greater measure in segregated schools.

8. Loss of African American Collective Input

At the community level there was a loss of African American collective input that was previously channeled into Black schools. Irvine and Irvine (1983) notes that when desegregation arrived, emphasis in the Black community shifted from a collective emphasis to an individual emphasis. Irvine and Irvine (1983) write:
Desegregation has altered the concept of the collective whole, the collective struggle, and the collective will. There has been a transformation from the collective to the individual achievement value position whereby the individual is perceived as the entity who achieves success through merit and effort. (p. 420)

Interestingly, one Dunbar informant reiterated the findings of Irvine and Irvine (1983), expressed in true colloquial parlance. He stated:

What I would really like to see? Dunbar School was a stepping-stone for the Black peoples [sic] in this community. I would like to see more of the Black people step up and support it and keep it going. ... If the Black people in this town could stop thinkin’ about self, and would start workin’ together, and pullin’ together, and stickin’ together, we could get somewhere. But once one pull [sic] together for a while and start doin’ somethin’ else, and start kickin’ back they don’t want to support, and that’s what’s hurtin’ this town, and if we all come together... you know, they always say, “A house divided by itself cannot stand”... Dunbar, yeah. Dunbar had the right attitude. They always worked together. (Personal communication, March 29, 2004)

This finding is significant because the collective whole was the springboard from which Dunbar operated. Throughout the duration of the segregated school, the collective whole under girded the school’s success. When Dunbar dismantled, the power of the
collective whole fragmented. The backbone of the school was the African American community. When Dunbar dismantled, collective support also fragmented, thus constituting a general loss.

9. *Loss of Afrocentric Cultural Narratives*

Research has shown that the desegregation initiative constituted a significant loss of Afrocentric narratives in public schools. Dempsey and Noblit (1993) launch a stinging attack on the desegregation mandate. They lay blame at the feet of policy makers and proponents of desegregation who failed to see the value of African American culture as a requisite, integral part of the schooling process. They conclude that cultural ignorance predicated the desegregation move and state: “School desegregation was a classic case of educational policy accompanied by ignorance” (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993, p. 318). They further explain:

Desegregationalists were equally ignorant of the culture of African-Americans. In fact, school desegregation, in many ways, ignored the possibility that there could be desirable elements in African-American culture worthy of maintenance and celebration. In practice, desegregationalists seemed to ignore that there was an African-American culture at all. The result was that they could not even consider that school desegregation could have destructive consequences for African-Americans and that school desegregation
could actually destroy important elements of African-American culture. (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993, p. 319)

The scholars also contend that cultural ignorance denotes an ignorance that is presumptive – that is, based on a political agenda that continues full steam ahead even in the face of legitimate concerns raised in advance of its implementation. They write:

"Cultural ignorance is presumptive in that it devalues aspects of what is known so that we act as if it was not known. It is an ignorance based in intention – the intention to make something happen, regardless of reasonable concerns raised about the intention. (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993, p. 319)"

Thus, the absence of the Afrocentric cultural narratives in public education is regarded as a loss.

10. Loss of Institutional Integrity

Researchers note that desegregation precipitated a loss of institutional integrity (Irvine & Irvine, 1983). With families feeling estranged from the schooling process, the gap between the home and the school widened. The lack of cultural congruency in public schools bred disunity. The absence of familiarity aroused a sense of mistrust, and created individual and collective alienation. Consequently, parental involvement in many public schools also dwindled due to a loss of institutional integrity (Irvine & Irvine, 1983). Black parents no longer put trust in schools to the degree that they did during the segregated era. Not only were some teacher-student relations strained (White teachers,
Black students), but the Dunbar study also revealed that student-student relations were taxed as well. The decline in the quality of relationships has contributed to lower student performance in some settings (Irvine & Irvine, 1983). Schools have created an environment of estrangement and alienation that has created a loss of institutional integrity. This is a significant loss for Black families.

Further Analysis of Desegregation by Academic Scholars

- Fife (1996) argues that Brown, although well intentioned, did not distinguish between de jure and de facto segregation. He points out that many cities across the U.S. are still racially divided.

- Scott (1993) digs deeper, and uncovers through the perceptions of Black superintendents in the U.S., a myth that the Dunbar study has also refuted. He notes:

  In their efforts to improve the educational lot of black students, the black superintendents identified the need to counter the pervasive bias that a public school with a mainly black student body is, presumptively, a poor school. (Scott, 1983, p. 382)

- Schofield (1993) suggests that desegregation should be regarded as a continuous process, rather than a static, single event. His investigation of Black superintendents' views also uncovered educational myths. He suggests that desegregation should be regarded as "a vehicle for providing effective schooling" (p. 378).

- The Dunbar study unearthed that problems with desegregation are not solely attributable to race. Teachers on either side of the racial fence are caring, have a passion for teaching, are comfortably color blind, respect individuality, and succeed in building
successful relationships with students. Such teachers make a genuine effort to help students develop their highest potential, and are advocates of excellence. These are true educators. However, sadly, there are teachers on both sides of the racial fence who have no genuine interest in the cultural capital that students naturally possess. They fail to appreciate individual uniqueness tragically, in some cases deliberately. Some teachers display a callous approach to teaching and lack a caring spirit to the degree that students feel their care. Further, some administrators who are fully cognizant of the social climate in their schools adopt a spirit of nonchalance to cultural differences and have no interest in bridging the cultural gap. These factors create a pseudo learning environment that is poised to set students up for failure.

In conclusion, the segregation climate in the U.S. that marginalized, stigmatized and demoralized African Americans was clearly morally wrong. Institutionalized segregation needed to be dismantled. The demolition of Jim Crowism and its accompanying vices needed to be eradicated. The Brown decision of 1954 accomplished this goal. However, in the midst of the social brutality of racism emerged powerfully resilient, successful, segregated schools, albeit by force, that zealously fulfilled the commission to educate Black children who had fallen prey to the tentacles of a de jure segregationist, political system. Despite the odds, they excelled. The cliché “When life deals you a lemon, make lemonade” seems a propos here.

Many districts instituted desegregation quickly with little preparation for the shift. Others moved more slowly. Tucson, implemented an early desegregation move three years before the 1954 Supreme Court order, thanks to the leadership of Superintendent
Robert Morrow. He was named Tucson Citizen of the Year for his efforts ("The Nation's Schools," 1956). Whereas Tucson made a speedy shift, Phoenix, Arizona, for example, did not complete its efforts until the academic year 1957-1958 ("The Nation's Schools," 1956). There was considerable variance in the desegregation process throughout the U.S. Over time Blacks and Whites, parents, students, teachers, administrators and communities have all made adjustments, and continue to do so today. Findings clearly show that there were problems with segregation, and likewise there are challenges with integration. Despite the endless discussions on the pros and cons of the initiative, what is clear is that still to be determined is whether desegregation has fully served Black students in the U.S. The controversial debate continues.
Summary

_Brown v. Board of Education_ of Topeka, Kansas, 1954 is the landmark Supreme Court case that wiped segregation from classrooms, and forever changed the face of education in the U.S. Plaintiffs in the case argued for equal educational opportunities for African American children and won. The outcome has had a rippling affect on schools and families in the U.S. Desegregation was eliminated; integration was introduced. Integration opened the door for diverse classrooms, increased social contact between the races, and made some improvements in interracial relations.

Desegregation policies simultaneously precipitated loss. This study has uncovered ten losses that resulted. They are as follows:

1. Loss of psychological comfort
2. Loss of continuity
3. Loss of Afrocentric symbolism and cultural emphasis
4. Loss of communal bonding
5. Loss of educational opportunities
6. Loss of a deep level of care
7. Loss of Black control
8. Loss of African American collective input
9. Loss of Afrocentric cultural narratives
10. Loss of institutional integrity

Highlights of the failure of desegregation in some settings are: a decline in teacher-student relationships, decreased academic performance, the dismantling of cohesive,
Black neighborhoods where high performing Black schools were previously featured, a loss of cultural sensitivity, and a conspicuous absence of care. There is also evidence today that individuals on both sides of the color line who lack a sense of care may also be contributing to student underperformance. The debate to determine the number of gains of desegregation continues.
CHAPTER 7
CODA: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study on Dunbar’s organizational culture was aimed at uncovering reasons for the school’s success. Teachers and the school’s leadership played key roles. The investigation of perceptions of former teachers and students revealed that Dunbar teachers possessed the following salient characteristics: (1) a potent care ethic, (2) high expectations, (3) Judeo-Christian values, (4) firm discipline characterized by tough love, (5) cultural pedagogy, (6) cultural congruency, and (7) a sense of resilience. These inputs yielded the following in students: (1) quality school performance, (2) a strong sense of self, (3) community involvement, and (4) a desire for lifelong learning. The overarching outcome was student success.

An investigation of Morgan Maxwell Sr.’s leadership revealed that he possessed the following characteristics: (1) ardent supporter of academic pursuits, (2) respecter of school community, (3) community participant, (4) protector, (5) advocate of African American pedagogy, (6) firm disciplinarian, (7) cultivator of pride, (8) proactive leader, and (9) resilient leader. Maxwell’s educational philosophy was a hybrid of the educational ideologies of W. E. B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington. Maxwell endorsed Washington’s devotion to work, and it seemed that he encouraged economic independence for Blacks. Although he did not frown on boys taking Shop, and even encouraged girls to take classes, he possessed a firm belief that students must be academically equipped in order to compete in the mainstream society. Maxwell’s zeal
for the pursuit of knowledge via the route of academia indicates that his educational leadership philosophy leaned more in the direction of Du Bois. His leadership characteristics, a firm educational philosophy, positive teacher inputs and strong parental support produced an excellent school.

It is important, however, to consider Dunbar’s strengths within the de jure sociopolitical and cultural climate. Because segregation practices of that era dominated social behavior, stigmatized, and in some respects demoralized African Americans, the success of the school has particular relevance. Not only did segregation impact daily life, but it also impacted the educational experience for Blacks, Whites and Hispanics. However, despite limitations of resources, social prohibitions, legal sanctions and in some cases, sub standard housing, Dunbar shone as a successful, segregated school in the southwest.

The strength of the segregated school was also derived from a close-knit African American community. Dunbar was a safe community both ecologically and psychologically. It operated at a time when Black families in Tucson lived in close proximity to one another. They supported one another. They socialized together. Some married each other. In some cases they worshipped together. They fought social injustices together. However, despite the relatively harmonious social climate, there were some noted differences among the Black community. Some articulated. Others silenced. The method of achieving success was sometimes a seat of conflict. However, overall the differences did not hamper Black progress. The underlying goal of Dunbar’s membership was anchored in the desire for a better society for African Americans. The
Black community relished in both individual and collective success, and was stabilized by commonalities of Judeo-Christian values, African American culture, and a similar description of success.

In an attempt to uncover the fundamental value that was instilled in Dunbar students, participants in this study chose from a random list of values and definitions. Details of this process are explained in the methodology section of this study. "Faith" was the towering value selected. "Faith" was defined as "believing in yourself, a higher power, the goodness of life, the goals of your organization." "Security" and "advancement" were the second most popular values chosen. "Security" was defined as "having the essentials to live," while "advancement" was defined as "growth, professional advancement and personal maturity." Despite the variance in choice, both teachers and students agreed that the core values instilled by Dunbar were so embedded that former students and teachers still cling to them today. In addition to acquiring a solid education, students learned success nuggets that they not only choose to incorporate into their daily lives, but they also passed on to their offspring.

Participants defined "success" as having the following ingredients: a strong sense of self, adherence to positive social values, possessing a strong sense of cultural pride, and making a positive contribution to society. The segregated Dunbar experience did not limit or retard personal growth and development for African American children. Instead, it catapulted them into their destinies with confidence, and it appears that it yielded great success. Upon finishing their academic training at various levels, students entered a
catalogue of professions, became community contributors, and enjoyed a measure of personal and professional success.

Schools are microcosms of the wider society. Dunbar mirrored characteristics of the wider African American community. Teachers felt free to intervene in students’ lives, to act and advocate in their best interest. They were comfortable discussing students’ successes and shortcomings with them, and with their parents. There was a pervasive spirit of trust that characterized home-school relationships. The church also played its part. The proverbial dictum, “It takes a whole village to raise a child” was operative at Dunbar, and was accepted. Despite limited job choice, sanctions on civil liberties, in some cases substandard housing, and a pervasive, negative, psychological stigma, the segregated school thrived. Students, teachers, parents, the leadership and the wider African American community pressed their way through, and enjoyed both individual and collective success. The overarching message gleaned from this study is that Dunbar’s organizational culture played a vital role in both individual and collective outcomes. The second major message is that cultural congruency was a stabilizer for the segregated school, and contributed to its success. This was a critical element because Dunbar’s membership was in close agreement, and the stakeholders supported one another. This built trust. Trust propelled individual and collective action, which also ultimately helped to yield success.

Times have changed. Legalized segregation is gone. Integration has come. There is a new social order. Diversity in public, desegregated classrooms across the U.S. is more commonplace. Yet, scholars have found that complete integration, in the vein that the
Brown ruling intended, has not occurred. What appears to have happened is that the
desire to honor a legislative ruling has overshadowed the needs of the very individuals for
whom the legislation was intended to serve. The paradoxical irony is that Black students
are still being marginalized in some classrooms under the guise of integration. Studies
indicate that interpersonal bonds are not being established to the degree that they yield
positive outcomes. Scholars find this trend disturbing.

Because schools continue to reflect the real world, they also experience dynamics of
the wider societal realm. Today traditional values have been eroded to the point of near
evaporation. Society is less safe. Fragmentation of families, increased demands in the
workplace and a rollercoaster lifestyle have added to the burden of parenting and
schooling. Just as decadent social patterns threaten the broader society, and impose their
influences to create loss, schools likewise are experiencing loss. Teachers are no longer
completely free to act within their best judgment, even if it is in the best interest of
students. Oftentimes, teachers and administrators are more enamored with the power of
position, and operate perfunctorily in office. Consequently, genuine care for students is
lost in the process. Schools miss the mark. Administrators are often handcuffed by
choking, bureaucratic controls, and the educational network is often threatened with
legislative tyranny. Thus, schools cry out for caring, visionary, innovative, resilient
leaders who are willing and able to withstand the pressures of daily life while
successfully executing their duties. Yet, in an attempt to genuinely advance educational
goals leaders are often caught between a rock and a hard place. They are forced to
perform to satisfy external demands. Sometimes they must disobey their intuitive,
altruistic sense in the name of being politically correct. However, schools are still charged with the duty of educating children. Parents still want the best education for their children. Although strategically positioned to help students develop, schools are frequently guilty of hindering student growth and perpetuating academic retardation. It is the view of this researcher that many public schools are too caught up in the revolving door of schooling that they have forgotten about educating the whole child. In the process, students have suffered simply because schools have failed to care.

Because the proverbial dictum: “It takes a whole village to raise a child” is not outdated in some settings, it must be recognized that schools are the village in the educational arena. Teachers, students and parents are members of that educational village. Going the extra mile, taking time to listen to students, extending oneself, working side by side with parents, being student advocates, in sum, demonstrating care are all attributes that students still need to see practiced. It has been proven that these behaviors contribute to student success. Some schools today have become detached foreign agents. Trust in schools has waned. In order to counteract the cultural warfare that seems to characterize many schools today, care must be injected into the every-day educational experience for the sake of, and for the future of society. The establishment of early schools in the U.S. was predicated on the belief that they would equip students to become upright citizens and meaningful contributors to society. Although students today contribute to society, their contribution is often without the ingrained, positive values and a standard of excellence in both character and performance that they should possess.
Although times have changed, ideally principles should remain; they are not
governed by time. Principles are the bedrock on which individuals and institutions can
gain stability. Education is about catering to students, leading them, appropriately
correcting them, sometimes “pushing them” to perform at their maximum potential to
ensure that they become successful, confident, contributing citizens. Teachers and
principals are the members of the educational village. They are poised as custodial
parents within the school setting, and it is their duty to protect, nurture, lead and help
students actualize their full potential in life; in sum, to educate. Anything short of this
has the potential to set students up for failure, and can become a miscarriage of purpose
and destiny.

Rather than simply lamenting the disappearance of successful, segregated schools
and the state of current schools, educational leaders must be proactive and move forward
to ensure that all students acquire an excellent education. It is expedient to maintain the
goal post – success – but more prudent to alter the rules of the game, especially since the
current ones, in some cases, are not working effectively. It is now known that many
students in the U.S. are being short-changed. Although this study has focused on the
African American experience, it is also known that children of other cultures in U.S.
schools are sorely lacking a complete education (Nieto, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999). In the
light of this current scenario, the following questions arise: Where do we go from here?
What must be done to ensure that all students are successful? A few suggestions are
offered.
The Brown decision is responsible for the current legal status of schools in the U.S. Many ideas have surfaced to try and address problems caused by desegregation. These problems may be regarded as systemic, thus, a matter for policy makers to address. Stringent, district boundary barriers may also precipitate problems. Thus, the removal of those barriers and a shift toward more individual choice in schooling districts may be a viable solution. Similarly, the establishment of culturally-based schools in which cultural congruency of mission, purpose and cultural outlook flow freely. This, too, may be a feasible consideration.

There is a new social order today. However, the cost for success need not come with a large dollar tag attached. A simpler route is proposed. In this day of increased diversity in all spheres of public life, perhaps the issue should be not whether there is a Black school, White school or Hispanic school, but rather the emphasis should be placed on developing schools of excellence where caring, competent, progressive, culturally sensitive teachers and administrators are employed.

First, on a practical level teachers must care for students' well-being. The Dunbar study has revealed the importance of demonstrable care. Although teachers never articulated the words "I care," still students heard words of commendation and articulated expectations of excellence. Most importantly, they felt the passion of their teachers' concern for their wellbeing. One teacher can make a significant difference in the life of a student. Thus, the message purported here is that teachers must make a difference. They must decide individually to positively impact students' lives. Individual efforts will yield collective dividends. Principles of care, compassion, and concern are not governed by
time and transcend racial barriers. When teachers extend themselves, students feel positive effects, and produce excellent results. It is imperative that genuine relationships be established if students are to reach their maximum potential in schools today. Student alienation and aloneness must be eradicated if schools are serious about meeting the needs of our youth. This suggestion points to the dire need for regular professional development workshops within schools to ensure that all teachers are equipped with the requisite skills to empower students, and to build strong, positive relationships.

Secondly, teachers must be well qualified in their area of instruction. One would think this would be an automatic given. However, testimonials indicate that this is not always the case in the state of Arizona. Being qualified to teach naturally equips teachers to properly deliver instruction that enables students to reach their highest potential. Further, it is believed that this will eliminate unnecessary classroom problems that hinder meaningful learning. This suggestion draws attention to the need for greater scrutiny in hiring practices for teachers, especially in the state of Arizona.

Thirdly, schools must respect the cultural differences of students. This is a clarion call for cultural sensitivity. During times of segregation, negative social codes of language and conduct stigmatized and demoralized Blacks. However, Dunbar was characterized by a positivism that invested in cultural capital, and added value to the school community. Teachers, students, parents and its leadership possessed such strong cultural capital that it drove the school to be successful. This capital was predicated on congruent cultural values. Schools need to recognize the cultural capital that all students naturally possess, and then capitalize on it so that the school community is enriched.
Parents are not aliens to the school process, and must also be regarded as respected members of the school community. Rather than marginalize and stigmatize, it would be more prudent to embrace cultural differences with genuine interest in order to build strong, healthy school environments, and to produce well-rounded, respectable students.

Fourthly, this study has illuminated the need for cultural congruency as a ticket for more productive schools. As previously stated, cultural congruency answers the question: Are we on the same page, going in productive directions, and aiming for positive goals for the common good? Cultural congruency assumes harmony of mission and purpose, and need not be bound by race. Schools should aim for a membership that supports the mission and purpose of the school. Collaboration between leaders and followers charts a direction that is positively proactive. Further, the absence of cultural congruency can become a setup for failure. When cultural congruency is operative, schools can work harmoniously toward success. On a secondary level, the desire for greater cultural congruency within schools may yield a greater preponderance of individuals in one educational setting who share a similar educational outlook. Further, cultural congruency does not mean an absence of diversity, but rather commonality of vision for the greater good. Again, this notion calls attention to the need for greater scrutiny in hiring practices in order to bring forth cultural congruency.

It is the belief of this researcher that positive action can start with language that is inclusive and not divisive, and with attitudes that promote racial unity and social harmony. Additionally, the respectability of the teaching profession in Arizona needs to be raised. Teachers who are keen to do extras to improve the learning experience for
children need additional resources to do so. Extras are costly. Salary increases would raise the level of respectability for the profession.

Wisdom must prevail. Schools are positioned to serve students. Therefore, students must be given top priority. Their needs for personal growth and academic development need to be considered first. Dunbar was an exceptional school that embodied positive characteristics, many of which are easily transferable to today's educational setting. The Dunbar Project (1995) aptly observes: "If schools today could duplicate the nurturing environment of Dunbar, without functioning in a segregated or pseudo-segregated experience for newcomers in the schools, then we will have a much better educational system" (p. 120). It must be remembered that Dunbar students pointed to faith and a sense of security as keys to successful lives. Faith is the fuel that allows students to function well even in the absence of tangible support. Thus, teachers play a critical role because they have the power to activate the inner locus of control in students, so that in their absence students can still be productive, successful citizens.

During the Dunbar era Moehlman (1944) pointed out that mid-twentieth century education was in the hands of the people. Education is still in the hands of the people. The public needs to continue to raise its voice when there are legitimate concerns. However, teachers are on the front line of the educational process. They are the ones who can make a significant difference in the daily lives of students. Teachers can consciously choose to help, or they can opt for benign neglect, and hinder real learning. Administrators must not turn a blind eye. Instead, they should be conscious of the social climate within their schools. They must be equally caring and supportive to all students.
under their charge, and to their families. African American Princeton scholar, Cornell West focuses on Black America and notes:

The major tragedy of black America in the past decade or so is the low quality of black leadership and the relative inattention to the deep crisis of black youth. To put it bluntly, we simply do not have enough black leaders who love and respect black people enough to tell them the truth – and trust them with the truth. We have too many black leaders who give in too quickly and sell out too easily. (West, 2000, p. xviii)

Thus, West makes a clarion call for proactive, resilient, Black leadership to do all it can in the spirit of excellence to ensure that students perform to their maxim potential. This researcher extends the call to all leaders, regardless of race, color, creed, social status, culture or national origin. At the end of the day, all students are important. Color is merely cosmetic. What really matters are matters of the heart.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FUTURE RESEARCH

The Dunbar study precipitated several ideas. One possibility for additional research might be the notion of cultural congruency. This idea adds another dimension to organizational culture. The data revealed that cultural stakeholders in the Dunbar experience were parents, teachers, students and the broader African American community who had a near identical outlook on how the school should have operated. The findings seem to suggest that the greater the cultural commonalities, the smaller the cultural gap. This is not to suggest that schools should function with a cloned approach, and an absence of diversity. However, within the realm of diversity, there seems to be some merit in having players metaphorically “on the same page” in an attempt to gain a cohesive school environment. Thus, a possible area of study might be the congruency of cultural patterns and its impact on school performance.

Another possibility for exploration is the relationship between the church and the segregated school. It is believed that such a study would directly compliment this research on Dunbar. The church played a pivotal role in the life of the African American community during segregation. It still does. However, the extent of its impact on the segregated school might shed more light on that era.

Another area for consideration might be positive codes embedded in the Black educational experience. It is generally known that labeling categorizes, stigmatizes and often demoralizes individuals. However, there may have been positive codes of the
Black experience during segregation that fostered success. Those codes may not be
directly transferable to today, but may prove useful in widening our understanding of the
segregated era. Further, a contemporary study on positivistic codes that yield success
may also prove useful in uncovering reasons for student success today.

It is unknown whether scholars have applied the resiliency construct to successful
segregated schools. At the heart of the segregated school was an embedded, insatiable
sense of resilience. Schools across the U.S. undoubtedly would have encountered
different obstacles that threatened their struggle to survive. Thus, uncovering negative
forces that threatened school survival would broaden our knowledge, and enhance our
understanding and appreciation for the success of segregated schools.
APPENDIX B

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

This dissertation takes an unconventional route to uncover Dunbar’s school culture. In an effort to broaden one’s understanding of the segregated school experience, links are drawn between the school’s inside culture and the turbulent, de jure, sociopolitical conditions. The study draws from the underpinnings of four bodies of literature as theoretical frameworks: organizational culture, resiliency, code and leadership theories.

1. Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is first introduced in this dissertation in Chapter 4 where its characteristics are revealed. This section provides additional information on the nature of this concept and its relevance to this study.

As previously stated, organizational culture is a relatively modern term that spotlights dynamic elements that coexist within an organization. It has a complex nature. It is tangible, yet intangible. It is defined, yet undefined. It is parsimonious, yet powerfully pervasive. Despite its nebulous characteristic, it is precisely this idiosyncratic nature that defines the pulse of an organization, and determines its success or failure.

Anthropologists, social scientists, historians and educators have all expressed an understanding of culture. However, the term culture in isolation is a deceptive term that can be easily misunderstood. Gregory (1983) states: “The notion of culture is often associated with exotic, distant peoples and places, with myths, rites, foreign languages
and practices” (p. 359). Perhaps this is the understanding of some observers of culture. However, there is a proliferation of researchers who have recognized that culture is not limited to the “exotic, distant peoples and places.” Scholars have noted that organizations engage in practices that constitute and formulate a culture of their own (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Gregory, 1983; Hofstede, 1991; Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1991). Organizations are unique. Leaders are different. Further, the membership within organizations is often laden with individuals from diverse backgrounds. Some organizations are vibrant and robust, and thrive on social interaction as a necessary way of increasing productivity and performance while others are low-key and maintain a quiet, directed focus towards organizational goals (Marriott, 2001). Still others are austere, autocratic and controlling, and mandate organizational goals in a top-down fashion (Marriott, 2001).

Upon examining the idiosyncratic nature of organizational culture, researchers have revealed additional ambiguous qualities. Schein (1992) labels it as “incomprehensible and irrational” (p. 15). Carlson (1996) observes: “Organizational culture can be both omnipresent and ambiguous at the same time” (p. 34). It is, however, this mysterious nature of organizational culture that commands attention. Added to the explicitly vague aspect of the definitions is another interesting and vital part of the puzzle. Mirvis (1985) highlights that culture researchers themselves add to the difficulty and subsequent ambiguity of organizational culture. He writes:

Culture researchers are a diverse group; some work in academia.

Others in consulting, and many are employed in both. They come
from different intellectual heritages and have had varying degrees of exposure to and socialization in ethics of research traditions. In practice, they may be called upon to be anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, and erstwhile management practitioners... This situation sends mixed messages to organizations as to what culture researchers define as standards of practice and what the investigation is really all about. (Mirvis, 1985, p. 205)

Notwithstanding the complexity of the definitions and the multiplicity of perspectives, what is abundantly clear is that sapient and discerning researchers avow that having an understanding of organizational culture is of paramount importance in deciphering patterns within an organization.

Thus, given the critical role that organizational culture plays in the life of an institution, it was important that it not be overlooked in assessing Dunbar. The challenge in this study was to put a finger on the pulse of Dunbar's success. The organizational culture framework provided a suitable paradigm for inquiry to assess the school's operations.

2. Resiliency Theory

This study views the inner workings of Dunbar through the lens of resiliency theory. There is a plethora of researchers who recognize the power of resiliency skills to succeed
against the odds (Bernard, 1991; Krovetz, 1999; Lewis, 2000; Masten, 2001; Masten, Best, Garmezy, 1991; Noon, 1999; Pianta & Walsh, 1998).

Masten (1991) characterizes resilience as one’s successful ability to overcome despite risk. Lewis (2000) confirms that effective schools promote a sense of resilience through oriented school culture, effective curriculum, pedagogical strategies and through the ethos of the school community. Lewis also promotes resilience as a means of enhancing the learning environment. There are underpinnings of resiliency throughout this study. Because the African American educational experience is examined within the context of oppression, research on resilience opens a window for understanding the success of the segregated school. Resilience was a key characteristic of teachers and the leadership that propelled Dunbar’s success.

3. Code Theory

This study views Dunbar through the lens of code theory, an ideology that springs from the broader construct of conflict theory. Conflict theory is identified by the field of sociology of education as a framework that helps to explain the constant struggle of groups as they compete for power and resources within social systems (Sadovnik, 2003). The pioneer of conflict theory, Karl Marx, sought to assess the nature of conflict in society by showing congruence between conflict and social class. Marx believed that the delineations within the class social structure served to alienate the lower class proletariat from the upper class power holder, and that consequently those on the lower rung of society would rise up and overthrow the upper class. According to Sadovnik (2003),
conflict theorists who have studied educational patterns believe that there is congruence between the organization of societies and the organization of schools. They claim that there will be no genuine school reform unless there is a fundamental change in societal structure. Sadovnik (2003) also says: “There are other sociologists of education who argue that traditional Marxism is too deterministic and overlooks the power of culture and human agency in promoting change” (p. 11). Upon examining the levels of power within the field of sociology, Emile Durkheim (1858–1917) was the first to make the connection between sociological theory and education.

From the origins of Marxism has come the work of British sociologist Basil Bernstein (1924–2000) who widened our understanding of social conflict by exploring social, political and economic levels of power on a macro-level of society. Bernstein (1981) proposes code theory, which embraces the underpinnings of conflict theory. Bernstein posits that code theory underscores “how the distribution of power and principles of control generates, distributes, reproduces and legitimates dominant and dominated principles regulating communication within and between social groups” (Bernstein, 1981, p. 327). In a later study Bernstein categorically states: “I have pointed out on a number of occasions that code meanings are translations of social relations, within and between social groups” (Bernstein, 1995, p. 5). What sets Bernstein’s research apart is the emphasis on context-dependent functions within organizations, which places his research in a highly social realm. Bernstein concludes: “Codes arise out of different modes of social solidarity, oppositionally positioned in the process of production, and differentially acquired in the process of education” (Bernstein, 1995, p.
4. The location of codes lies in the class regulation of forms of social relationships and distribution of activities. Codes within society are symbols that serve as indicators for social identity. For example, such codes might be language, dress, mannerisms, etc.

Pierre Bourdieu (1931 – 2002), French sociologist, made a contribution to the understanding of conflict theory by showing how culture is embedded in a political struggle. According to Bourdieu, this type of power can be identified in schools. Further, he believed that schools possess cultural capital through its adoption of symbolic representations. These symbolic representations can also be identified as codes. Both Bernstein and Bourdieu view such representations as a means of class domination. This study embraces aspects of code theory as a lens for understanding patterns of social behavior during the Dunbar era.

4. Leadership Theories

(A) Expectancy Theory

Expectancy theory embraces the views of Victor Vroom (1964), and fits the Organizational Behavior Movement. Expectancy is the degree to which an individual believes that hard work will pay off and lead to improved importance (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Expectancy theory as an operative in schools, rests on the fundamental premise that if students believe that they will do well, they will work hard. Role expectations and school culture also influence one's behavior. Individual values and attitudes interact with environmental components. Motivation is a conscious process. Motivation of team members is correlated to job satisfaction and overall productivity (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).
This theoretical construct helps to define the philosophical approach of Dunbar’s teachers and leadership.

(B) **Moral Leadership**

Moral leadership is also identified as value added leadership. Sergiovanni (1996) believes that a sense of community and culture is best achieved in schools through the practice of “shared followership.” His view is built “not on who to follow, but on what to follow” (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 83). He also stresses the need for schools to adopt a common virtue in attempting to serve the common good for all. Sergiovanni believes that “shared followership” is a means of sharing the power of the school with stakeholders, such as students and parents. Moral aspects of school leadership are embedded in this approach because schools function as extensions of families. As such, principals and teachers are stewards, who by virtue of their position in schools, accept responsibility for students on behalf of parents (Sergiovanni, 1996).

Sergiovanni’s notion of “shared followership” creates a school climate in which teachers and students demonstrate mutual care, respect and trust. Moral leadership creates a school culture in such a way that the membership is not ostracized. This type of leadership adds value to participants within the culture. The moral leader acts on one’s convictions, and stands by those convictions even when those convictions are not politically correct (Sergiovanni, 1996). This style of administering under girds the heart of Dunbar’s leadership.
This study is an historic, ethnographical case study. Cohen and Manion (1994) recognize the uniqueness of historical research and define it as “an act of reconstruction undertaken in a spirit of critical inquiry designed to achieve a faithful representation of a previous age” (p. 45). The reconstruction of Dunbar’s operations was achieved principally via the medium of in-depth interviews. Perceptions of former teachers and students were gathered by utilizing open-ended and semi-structured questioning. Published and unpublished archival documentation, such as newspaper articles, pamphlets, reports, legislative accounts, school board minutes, as well as Dunbar alumni bulletins and reports, provided historical information. Texts and scholarly articles of the period under review were also used to fill in historical gaps.

Interviews were a principal source that allowed the researcher the opportunity to gain a first-hand account of operations at Dunbar. A combination of snowball and purposive sampling methodologies was utilized to gain a variety of perspectives (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Also, informants fit a range of backgrounds, occupations and professions. Cohen and Minion (1994) affirm the value of triangulation as a multi-method approach to data collection. Multiple perspectives provided a rounded picture of Dunbar.

Interviews were conducted over two different time periods. Permission was granted to conduct a pilot study in the fall of 2003 at the time of Dunbar’s bi-annual reunion.
This study yielded 7 interviews. The major study, which began in the spring of 2004, involved 19 interviews. A total of 26 interviews were conducted. Of the 26 interviews, 22 were individual; one was a focus group consisting of 4 people. The focus group interview allowed informants the opportunity to rekindle relevant memories that may have otherwise been forgotten. The focus group session also afforded the researcher the opportunity to probe perceptions on a deeper level. Of the list of participants 17 were female; 9 were male. Five were former teachers; 21 were former students. Two participants were both Dunbar teachers and students. Four participants were originally from Kansas. Nineteen informants are current residents of Tucson, while 7 live in cities across the U.S. The age range of the interviewees spanned 60s–80s. Interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Twenty-three subjects participated in the values activity aimed to uncover Dunbar’s chief values. For three sessions, value cards were not available. At the end of the interviewing session, participants were given 10 cards randomly selected from a pack of value cards. On each card there was a value and an accompanying definition. First, participants were asked to eliminate 5 cards that did not exemplify Dunbar’s chief values. Second, from the remaining 5 values, participants were asked to select 3 key values that they believed Dunbar stressed the most. Third, participants were asked to select from the 3 cards, the 1 value that overshadowed the others. This method uncovered Dunbar’s chief espoused values. Participants made selections from the following: (1) dedication, (2) justice, (3) power, (4) success, (5) advancement, (6) patience, (7) faith, (8) wealth, (9)
recognition, and (10) security. Faith was the most popular choice. Both advancement and security scored second.

Topics covered during interview sessions included teacher and student perceptions about Dunbar, Tucson’s social climate, pedagogy, parental involvement, academic performance, school climate, teacher characteristics, leadership, school traditions, rituals and assumptions.

Data were analyzed by locating common themes. Once the categories were determined, descriptors provided a greater understanding of the categories. Coding descriptors facilitated comparisons across interviews. Themes that emerged from the data formed the basis for analysis. This investigative analysis was descriptive and simultaneously analytical because it was aimed to describe and interpret events and activities. It also aimed to extract practical evidence against the backdrop of history. At the completion of the interviews, selected interviewees were consulted to confirm and clarify information (Seidman, 1998). This was an important consideration because this research sought to recreate an honest picture of Dunbar’s operations. According to Best (1970), descriptive research explores:

- Conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing. At times, descriptive research is concerned with how what is or what exists is related to some preceding event that has influenced or affected a present condition or event. (p. 30)
~ Figure 4 ~

Dunbar Interviewee Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Profile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants who completed high school</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female participants</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Male participants</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dunbar teachers interviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants who were both Dunbar teachers and students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participants who hold doctoral degrees</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educational leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Psychologists</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dentists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participants who hold/held professional occupations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total number of participants in study</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Values Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values and Definitions</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DEDICATION: Passionate belief in something.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JUSTICE: Ability to lead, direct, persuade, control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POWER: Ability to lead, direct, persuade, control.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SUCCESS: Attainment of wealth, favor or eminence, achieving your goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ADVANCEMENT: Growth, professional advancement, personal maturity.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PATIENCE: Bearing pains or trials calmly, steadfastness in suffering or crisis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FAITH: Believing in yourself, a higher power, the goodness of life, the goals of your organization.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WEALTH: Material income.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RECOGNITION: To receive special attention, to feel important.&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SECURITY: Having the essentials to live.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

Siddle Walker (1996) quotes Robert Thompson who claims that “euphoric recall” is the most serious threat to story reconstruction (p. 224). Informants in this study may have had a tendency to recall with fondness only the “goodness” of the Dunbar experience. The researcher made every effort to uncover the truth. In most cases comments were candid. On a couple of occasions, answers from participants appeared to be guarded. Overall, all research questions were answered, and a true portrait of Dunbar was revealed.

In response to the value cards activity, one informant made a pointed observation. She stated: “In choosing these value cards, I am choosing on the basis of more maturity now than I would have at an earlier age. [At an earlier age], I may have chosen different things. Out of living life longer, I choose more wisely.” Perhaps the sentiment expressed here also reflects the mind of other participants. Additionally, if the number of interviewees were larger, perhaps there may have been some variation in the selection of values. However, when assessing the reasons for the choice given, there was congruence in the sentiments expressed. Further, the use of triangulation was used as means of mitigating this problem.
APPENDIX E

POSITIONALITY

For this study, I assume the role of an outsider. Schein (1992) defines the role of the outsider this way:

The outsider cannot experience the categories of meaning that the insider uses because she or he has not lived long enough in the culture to learn the semantic nuances, how one set of categories relates to other sets of categories, how means are translated into behavior, and how such behavioral rules apply situationally” (p. 170).

Although I am a Black female who is part of the African Diaspora, and one who is acquainted with both U.S. and international systems of education, and even although I am well acquainted with an all-Black educational experience for my primary and secondary levels of my academic career, still I am not akin to the African American experience, and much less within a segregated school setting. As an international researcher and educator from Bermuda, I participated in this study as an “historic ethnographer” (Siddle Walker, 1996, p. 221). This dissertation is historical because it reconstructs history. It is simultaneously an ethnographic study because it opens a window, and provides an understanding of a segregated, educational and cultural setting.

I have been in the educational field for 24 years. Prior to coming to the U.S. to pursue doctoral studies in Educational Leadership, I taught in Bermuda’s educational system at the middle, secondary and college levels. I was Department Head for Spanish,
English and Social Studies at the high school level. For the Department of Education I served as Chair of the Bermuda Spanish Secondary School Certificate Program for several years. At the college level I was promoted to Senior Spanish lecturer and coordinator of the Spanish program for Bermuda College.

I earned my Bachelor of Arts degree at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. My Bachelor of Education and Master of Arts degrees were earned at the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada. In addition, I spent cumulatively two years of tertiary level training in Valencia, Spain and London, England, respectively.

My academic background, professional training and experience as an international educator afforded me the opportunity to analyze the Dunbar experience via an eclectic lens.

Cultural pedagogy, multiculturalism and leadership are among my main research interests. I am the author of Light the Spark: The Life and Times of Bermudian Sparky Lightbourne, published in May 2000. This study, Shining Through the Clouds, is currently under review for publication.
APPENDIX F

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA.
TUCSON ARIZONA

24 November 2003

Andrea Lightbourne, M.A.
Department of Educational Leadership
P.O. Box 245064

RE: BSC B03.214 INVESTIGATION OF DUNBAR SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL SCHOLARS

Dear Ms. Lightbourne;

We received your research proposal as cited above. The procedures to be followed in this study pose no more than minimal risk to participating subjects. Regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [45 CFR Part 46.110(b)(1)] based on their inclusion under research category 7. Although full Committee review is not required, a brief summary of the project procedures is submitted to the Committee for their endorsement and/or comment, if any, after administrative approval is granted. This project is approved with an expiration date of 24 November 2004.

The Human Subjects Committee (Institutional Review Board) of the University of Arizona has a current Federal Wide Assurance of compliance, number FWA00004218, which is on file with the Department of Health and Human Services and covers this activity.

Approval is granted with the understanding that no further changes or additions will be made either to the procedures followed or to the consent form(s) used (copies of which we have on file) without the knowledge and approval of the Human Subjects Committee and your College or Departmental Review Committee. Any research related physical or psychological harm to any subject must also be reported to each committee.

A university policy requires that all signed subject consent forms be kept in a permanent file in an area designated for that purpose by the Department Head or comparable authority. This will assure their accessibility in the event that university officials require the information and the principal investigator is unavailable for some reason.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore J. Gifford, Ph.D.
Chair
Social and Behavioral Sciences Human Subjects Committee

TJG:pm

cc: Departmental/College Review Committee
24 November 2003

Andrea Lightbourne, M.A.
Department of Educational Leadership
P.O. Box 245064

RE: BSC B03.214 INVESTIGATION OF DUNBAR SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL SCHOLARS

Dear Ms. Lightbourne;

We received your research proposal as cited above. The procedures to be followed in this study pose no more than minimal risk to participating subjects. Regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [45 CFR Part 46.110(b)(1)] based on their inclusion under research category 7. Although full Committee review is not required, a brief summary of the project procedures is submitted to the Committee for their endorsement and/or comment, if any, after administrative approval is granted. This project is approved with an expiration date of 24 November 2004.

The Human Subjects Committee (Institutional Review Board) of the University of Arizona has a current Federal Wide Assurance of compliance, number FWA00004218, which is on file with the Department of Health and Human Services and covers this activity.

Approval is granted with the understanding that no further changes or additions will be made either to the procedures followed or to the consent form(s) used (copies of which we have on file) without the knowledge and approval of the Human Subjects Committee and your College or Departmental Review Committee. Any research related physical or psychological harm to any subject must also be reported to each committee.

A university policy requires that all signed subject consent forms be kept in a permanent file in an area designated for that purpose by the Department Head or comparable authority. This will assure their accessibility in the event that university officials require the information and the principal investigator is unavailable for some reason.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore J. Glatzke, Ph.D.
Chair
Social and Behavioral Sciences Human Subjects Committee

TJG:pm

cc: Departmental/College Review Committee
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