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ABSTRACT

THE UNDERBELLY OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION, BUSSING TO INTEGRATE AND THE EDUCATIONAL RAMIFICATIONS: A CASE STUDY OF LOUISVILLE KENTUCKY

Camara Douglas

December 23, 2021

Integration of the American public school system is often examined to figure out if integration worked. This dissertation examined busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky. Busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky took place during that 1975-1976 school year. Louisville’s case is somewhat different, not only did they finally follow federal mandates to integrate, they had to mix two totally separate school systems, one for the county (White) and one from the city (African American). The objectives are: (1) what were the experiences and perceptions of African American students in high school who lived in the West Louisville hyper-segregated neighborhoods and were part of the first wave of busing that sought to integrate the public schools within Jefferson County, KY in 1975; (2) what did the residential segregation (hyper-segregated neighborhoods) and busing of African Americans from their urban communities to White suburban schools look like geographically; and (3) what were some of the decision-makers on the school board’s apprehensions and rationale for busing to integrate.

Triangulation was used to answer the research objectives, including open response interviews of African Americans who participated in the first wave of busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky, GIS mapping detailing the racial residential segregation during that era in Louisville, Kentucky, and archival research the school board that absolved the city district within its own. Research was conducted using race-based epistemology, critical race theory and a participatory approach with theoretical perspectives on structural racism, ideological racism, and color-blind racism. Detailing the explanation of forced racial residential segregation and the economic and social impact outcomes resulting from said forced segregation.

Results show that the White superiority ideals of the Jefferson County school district enabled the White teachers to operate from their White ideals and disfavor their African American students. These results lead to the conclusion that busing to integrate did not work. The situation that the African American students were placed in did them more harm psychologically than it did to provide them with a better education.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1975, Louisville, Kentucky, implemented a Federal court-ordered school integration policy through forced busing. Like other cities such as Little Rock, Boston, and Detroit, Louisville saw massive resistance to the practice of using school assignments and transportation to desegregate classrooms. Different from the other cities mentioned, Louisville, Kentucky, already attempted an integration plan prior. The earlier integration span lasted three years, 1957-1960 (McConahay, 1978). The 1975-1976 school year integration plan forced the City of Louisville (predominantly African American public school district) to integrate into the Jefferson County Kentucky public school district (predominately White public school district). During the previous attempt to integrate Louisville's public school system, a massive amount of White parents chose to move out of the city limits and place their children within the surrounding county's school district. This earlier outcry of White resistance from 1957-1960 should have laid a foreseeable framework for handling racial adjustment. This was not the case, and the anticipated response for the later federally mandated integration of schools laid the way for yet another massive display of White resentment. During the 1957-1960 school years, White parents were willing and able to sacrifice their neighborhood and social networks based on those neighborhoods -- all to keep their children from attending city integrated public schools.
Around the time of the Federally mandated busing to integrate plan (about 1974), approximately 98 percent of White parents were against desegregation and were concerned about its impact on educational quality and freedom, which they complained about to the then-mayor of Louisville, Mayor Harvey Sloane. Many again chose to leave their homes in their White communities of the City of Louisville and move out into Jefferson County, move to other surrounding counties, or switch their child from public to private school to avoid the possibility of integration.

Forced busing of the 1975-1976 school year was met with many forms of violence, riots, and boycotts. In Louisville, African American kids bused from their urban West End Black neighborhoods to White suburban communities were met with thrown bricks and other missiles, racial slurs, disparaging shouts, and threats. While other cities slowly reverted to segregated schools over time, Louisville held steadfast to its commitment to desegregate schools through school assignments and busing. In contrast, this research intends to show a failed attempt with public school integration. While Louisville held on to its commitment on paper, the result was not consistent with its announced intention as evinced through enacted school policies.

In 2007, the Supreme Court declared it was unconstitutional to use race as a student assignment factor. The Louisville community was determined to keep its integration plan and, in response, created an alternative plan that emphasized both socio-economic and minority status to ensure that all students had equal access to quality education. While

integration was initially implemented to mix African Americans and White students of Louisville, Kentucky, the plan was racially biased. The original policy called for the busing of White students for no more than two years and the busing of African Americans for at least eight years. Additionally, there were several opportunities for White parents to roll back efforts of continuous integration. White students were also increasingly allowed to attend schools in their neighborhoods, while many African American West End schools were defunded and/or closed.

Today, Louisville's Jefferson County Public School (JCPS) district is thought to be one of the most integrated in the nation. Because of its unique history and practice in school integration, Louisville has become a crucible to examine integrated schools and the "busing" project, although, over the years, the practice has been whittled away. Louisville's notoriety comes from its percentage of integration being viewed in terms of the totality of its overall diversity. If the numbers Louisville showed on integration were produced on a school level ratio, the praise that JCPS receives would be non-existent. The current assignment plan for Louisville is a skeleton of the mandatory court-ordered busing during the 1975-1976 school year. The initial plan was dwindled through policy changes and court decisions, frequently in response to White families and neighborhoods' concerns rather than because of the neglect of the schools and neighborhoods of African Americans. Currently, less than 7% of students from the Louisville district are assigned to schools for diversity purposes, and nearly all such students are African American.
Did "busing" Work?

The Courier-Journal (CJ), the lead newspaper in Louisville, ran an article entitled "Did “busing” work?" (February 8, 2021). This question, along with a rethinking of the policy and how well it worked or is working for African Americans, is, in part, a response to the spotlight on Louisville's racial injustices. More than 180 days of protests against the killing of Louisville resident Breanna Taylor and in general, police racial profiling and violence against African Americans made the headlines of virtually every news outlet in the country.

Moreover, Louisville remains one of the most racially segregated cities, and although Louisville's schools are more racially integrated (throughout all JCPS schools -- not at an individual school level) because of the 1975 policy, the question remains whether the vast majority of African American and impoverished kids who still live in segregated neighborhoods, bused or not, receive an equitable education. The CJ article alluded that the answer to the question "Did busing work?" depends on who is asked and how one would define success. Further, the article raised the question of whether school assignments and busing to desegregate classroom plans have "become increasingly racist". Marty Pollio, the district's superintendent, is quoted saying, "What we have come to," .... is "a real racial equity issue".

Drive for such Research

While Louisville and its pursuits of integration have consistently made headway in national news, some have begun to examine the shifts within the structural changes of Louisville's integration policies through a more critical lens. In particular, this new
"busing" project to redraw the lines of integration within Louisville's public school system has been subjected to these critical racial justice lenses. The plan's original intent to integrate schools is now questioned from the perspective of equity for African American students. If passed, the proposal could end Louisville's decades-long desegregation plan -- one of the few still standing nationally. According to an article released at chalkbeat.org (Belsha, & Darville, 2020), more than 20 plus of the largest public-school districts have decided that their school assignment plans need to shift back to one that supports desegregation. Louisville is at a crossroads as it holds on to a plan that seemingly supports desegregation, with a history where White ideologies have always supported the separation of neighborhoods and efforts to re-segregate schools. A return to neighborhood schools, according to school board Chairwoman Diane Porter, a retired African American educator in the West End, is "still in the hearts of many, and sometimes in the hearts of those that may have had to get on the bus and go west" (Krauth, & McLaren, 2021 Courier-Journal).

Busing to integrate schools brings several interrelated socio-economic variables together in an intricate network involving neighborhood segregation and stratification, school desegregation, education disparity, racial equity, and race relations. Prior studies, including those on Louisville, have focused on the relationship between and among many of these factors, including the experiences and racial climate of students, teachers, school staff, and other individuals across racial groups who had a direct connection to the start of busing in the 1975-1976 school year (Fosl, 2013; K'Meyer & Salley, 2013). Nevertheless, the 'elephant in the room', that is, the racial, structural and ideological determinants that inform and shape these relationships, intentions, and results over time, often remain understudied. Race and racism are discussed but not strongly linked to the government's
direct role, its officials, laws and constitutions, policies and guidelines. Also, the direct impact of private corporations' racial structures and ideologies, including financial and real estate agencies and residential organizations and individual citizens, in maintaining racial inequities and educational disparities is not well developed. An examination of how these components fair over time in a singular city is all but obsolete.

This study draws on prior literature to spotlight the elephant in the room as it specifically examines how race and racism were linked to the governments and private corporations' direct roles in residential segregation, the disparity in school funding and educational outcomes. The literature is used to interrogate the domination of White privilege and preferences in governmental laws, policies, community/individual beliefs and practices in establishing and maintaining hyper-segregated neighborhoods by race and social class. It is within this contextual background that this dissertation research is framed. The City of Louisville was selected as a case study because of the city’s historical importance of the busing-to-integrate school project, which started in 1975-1976 as an experiment not to fully address the educational disparity and social relations based on race, but was rather forced on the city and county school districts by the federal government, as the county’s White district had sided stepped the issue of school integration since the 1957-1960 integration debacle. The purpose of the dissertation research is to investigate whether the intent of Louisville’s busing to integrate plan was realized based on the experiences and perceptions of African American participants in the first class of students bused from Black neighborhoods into newly integrated schools in White neighborhoods.

To untangle the layered intricacies of the racial encounters of those bused and their experiences on the bus and in the integrated schools, the study adopted a qualitative
research methodology consisting of open response qualitative interviews with six African American former school students of the first class bused to integrate during the 1975-1976 school year. There were two to three interviews per participant. The extent of the interviews was reflective of the number of redirect questions needed. In addition, a geographic information system (GIS mapping) was used as a creative tool to provide a visualization of the racial structure of the city, the neighborhoods that the students lived in, and the neighborhood in which the schools they were bused to were located. Further, to provide an insight into the racial environment when the participants were bused, archival materials from the Jefferson County School Board's meetings were analyzed around the rationale of the decision-makers that initiated the busing project.

The study assumed an epistemological position of those most affected, that is, African Americans. As such, interviews were conducted only with African Americans who experienced the first wave of busing and are an essential part of building the case study of the City of Louisville. It adds the experiential layer and the neglected voices of those most affected and contextualizes the lived experiences of the decisions made through the Jefferson County School Board busing-to-integrate initiative. The findings from the interviews supported by the geographic data and the understandings from the archival materials are used to show how personal experiences and outcomes are linked to the parameters of policies and actions and vice versa (Avins, 1966), that is, the dialectical relationship between individual life chances and racial structures and ideologies.
Prior Research

Residential Segregation

Prior to the city and the county school systems’ merger through busing, the racial make-up of neighborhoods in the City of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky (the county that Louisville, Kentucky rests in) was deeply rooted in segregation (Fosl, 2013; K'Meyer & Salley, 2013). This segregation was thought to be initially based on the locality of forced employment of African Americans during slavery and also the location of free African Americans before the Civil War. After emancipation, there were still instances where freed African Americans lived in close proximity to their White employers. A study from 1845 stated that freed African Americans lived in neighborhoods that were only 14% African American (Massey & Denton, 1993).

As Reconstruction ended and Jim Crow began to have a stronghold over White ideologies and practices, segregation became the desired normality for living and social interactions. Like other Southern cities, Louisville, Kentucky was taken over openly by the White superiority ideals of segregation. In 2003, the city of Louisville and Jefferson County completed a full city/county fiscal merger. This consolidated landmass and all financial aspects of the City and County government. However, racial segregation remained with new economic repercussions. The old city limits allowed for voting power with its heavily populated African American core. The new merger stripped that base from its ability to control any potential economic policies or gains. According to HUFFPOST (2015), Louisville ranked number four among America's most racially segregated cities. Further, according to Wright (1980), Louisville's history of residential segregation impacted national trends and is well documented in the landmark Supreme Court case of
Buchanan v. Warley (1917), known for arguments to dismantle cities through legally established residential segregation laws.

The history of racial segregation of neighborhoods is not unique to Louisville, Kentucky. Nationally, housing segregation between African Americans and Whites has been an American issue since freed Africans into White American space. Although, such occurrences of segregation were not as prevalent during slavery as they are now. Both enslaved and free African Americans were segregated to living quarters outside of the space of the general White population. Moreover, after enslaved Africans were freed from servitude, the same stipulations, racial formation, and racial stereotypes used to keep them in bondage were used to regulate their residential locality. While segregation was at this early point due to racial ideologies and beliefs of African Americans being inferior, these ideas quickly became written into local policies and state constitutions and were expanded by federal agencies and guidelines (Ely, 1998; Gotham, 1998; Leachman, Mitchell, Johnson & Williams, 2018; Ross & Leigh, 2000; Wright, 1980).

Over time, these racially charged ideologies and policies on residential segregation created what eventually became known as a color line, and concerning housing, these ideologies and policies are known as redlining. This color line was fueled by beliefs developed during slavery and included (i) the conceptual understanding of the relationships between African Americans and Whites based on stereotypes and assumptions that supported the social hierarchy of slavery (Carrol, 2017), and (ii) a structural framework whereby conceptual and ideological beliefs of African Americans’ inferiority informed and created policies, laws, and regulated actions (Williams & Land, 2006) regarding all aspects
of American life including on residential logistics based on demographics – race and income.

As the country became more seemingly progressive, these ideas and structural aspects that created a color line sought a deeper anchor to root the racial division. Over time, policies once seen as racist, antagonistic, and embedded in White superiority beliefs became normalized within American society (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; James, 2008; Williams & Land, 2006). For example, it is now a common assumption by many White Americans that racial residential segregation occurs due to individual choice or because "they" belong there. This idea of racial spaces has resulted in frequent practice by White Americans to call the police when they see African Americans occupying a space considered a "White space".

While not often examined, residential segregation is a complex social phenomenon that encompasses social interactions between races and public policy (Noah, 2017). With all of its complexities, residential segregation needs to be fully examined through a lens that seeks to understand the degree to which different races live in separate geographical spaces. Using a laymen's understanding of residential segregation would not allow incorporating all aspects of racial arrangements affected through residential segregation. Noah (2017) elaborates on what Massey and Denton (1988) suggest as the five dimensions of residential segregation: evenness, exposure, clustering, centralization, and concentration.

Evenness reflects the unequal distribution of grouped races throughout an area, commonly used to measure various levels of residential segregation. Exposure reflects the potential physical contact between different races within one’s neighborhood. Clustering
reflects the concentration of one race living within a single neighborhood. *Centralization* reflects the measurement of one race living in the centrality of a neighborhood. *Concentration* reflects the proportion of one race living in a single portion of a neighborhood.

While these five dimensions seek to measure different aspects of residential segregation, they can and are used to measure residential segregation for neighborhoods that may seem to be diverse on the surface based on the demographic make-up, but elements of segregation still exist. This research identifies what is now called hyper-segregated neighborhoods, that is, neighborhoods encompassing several of the five dimensions of residential segregation mentioned above. (Williams & Land, 2006).

*Residential Stratification*

In response to the Jefferson County School district in Louisville, Kentucky's consideration of a proposal to change the busing to integrate school plan, Marty Pollio, the district's school superintendent, was quoted in the CJ (Krauth & McLaren, 2021) that "What we are saying is, families in west Louisville still have the choice to leave their neighborhood, but for the first time in 36 years, they would also have the opportunity to attend a school in their community like every other child in Jefferson County.” However, while residential segregation is a product of one's location, the individual's ability to choose their location is affected by their social mobility, race, life cycle, and socio-economic status (Fisher, Stockmayer, Stiles, & Hout, 2004). Structural discrimination from institutions can heighten residential segregation through prejudiced practices, resulting in self-selection...
segregation from the minority group or avoidance of segregation from the majority group (Massey & Denton, 1993) based on race and social class.

This idea of self-selection and avoidance of the majority group has been examined from two different perspectives (Massey & Denton, 1993). The first is the stratification perspective, which asserts that institutions and individuals discriminate against minorities and encourage self-segregation and/or forced segregation that invariably has negative consequences. The second is the ethnic enclave perspective, which suggests that segregation can yield positive social outcomes. This perspective identifies with non-African American ethnic groups such as Hispanics, Asians, and early European immigrants (around the turn of the 20th century). The argument is made that segregation among these ethnic groups can potentially yield solidarity and amplify their ability to create their own socially productive space or assimilate if they so choose. Assimilation, however, occurs if individuals within an ethnic group are exposed to little institutional discrimination, and/or their demographic status as assimilated Americans can be achieved within one or two generations.

Carrol (2017) details how the idea of the need for residential segregation was conceptualized. She states that America was founded upon the principle of manifest destiny for Whites. The claim here is that residential segregation materialized because of the White race's self-proclaimed superiority and their belief in the need to dominate and conquer all American people of color, particularly African Americans and Native Americans in the US. This idea of manifest destiny coupled with racial superiority was used to justify domination and discrimination against people of color and can be observed by Whites (i) preference for excluding non-Whites from their residential space, (ii) desire
to own land, and (iii) desire to control and reap social and economic rewards as they see fit. Whites' preferences and practices to control racial segregation in residential opportunities, financial and educational achievements, and in all other areas were supported through individual and group practices as well as local and federal government laws and policies.

**Educational Disparities**

While the issue of deliberate residential segregation and stratification is hard to overstate, it is also hard to detect, especially after school desegregation (Pearcy, 2015). Several studies have examined the social history of the nation's segregated housing (Haynes, 2008; Venkatesh, 2000) and the educational attributes of those neighborhoods (Kozol, 1991). This dissertation focuses on structural factors associated with racial segregation and educational disparities, a range of scope that is researched less. A more popular range of scope to research African American disparities adopts a color-blind approach and the theory of choice. These perspectives suggest that the students from segregated, low-income, predominantly African American neighborhoods are themselves to blame for their dissimilar educational performance (Ogbo, 2008) or associate educational barriers with poverty and the poor (Vaisey, 2010).

According to Vaisey (2010), the theory of choice perspective is a recent cultural shift from the traditional views of sociology that base human actions on mores. It is similar to a norm that a society holds, but mores include acknowledging folklore being assumed by a society as it is normal and becomes a norm. It is used here to highlight how the falsities of black inferiority have been heightened through white folklore about African Americans, which turn into mores and become norms accepted in their society.
here is that no longer can individuals be judged based solely on societal mores and factors which existed before their consciousness. On the surface, this idea seems non-harmful to some, and it aligns with the field of psychology, basing human social interactions on one's personal choices and not on historical or learned methods to cope or adjust to social interaction. This assertion damages society's historical effect on individuals and is based on White middle and upper-class normative ideals.

This new mode of viewing social interactions purports color-blind rhetoric, which assumes that there is no longer any need to talk about race due to various advances in civil rights. It also negates structural antecedents of racial discrimination and White superiority ideals which support the policies and actions that created residential segregation and educational and socio-economic disparities based on race. Instead, the focus is on individuals' ability to make choices that align with their best possible position.

The problem with this argument presented by Vaisey (2010) is that it assumes that each individual has the same ability, resources, and opportunity to make the same choice and reach the same goal. There is no consideration of how an individual’s socio-economic situation can limit their choices (Massey & Hajnal, 1995; Pearcy, 2015). Concerning education, this idea that Vaisey (2010) speaks of will blame low levels of educational attainment on the individual child and/or the parents -- as if someone would consciously choose certain situations that limit their educational attainment. In this viewpoint, the
significance of America's racial history in creating racial disparities, including in educational attainment, is displaced with a color-blind lens.

This color-blind rhetoric and its effect on African American education are further explained by Williams and Land (2006), who claim that color-blind ideology is believed to produce race-neutral policies and laws, enhance White domination, and sustain African American subordination. They assert that color-blind policies hold African Americans to what is now normalized White standards. Within this color-blind lens, there is an obvious overlook of the racist undertones of American society that impact all aspects of African Americans' life chances. Color-blind rhetoric is expressed as racial priming, a concept that enables Whites to become numb to race matters. This concept has been fueled by years of internalized racist jokes, attitudes, stereotypes, assumptions, folklore, resentment, and fears – all of which are false: or as Rothstein (2000) would claim; they suffer from "collective memory". Color-blind ideology is passed on through an elitist discourse that aligns Whites' thoughts with the assumption that there is no racism in post-civil rights America and secures White dominance (Williams & Land, 2006). These color-blind ideologies have been shaped into various policies and practices within education, including the pedagogy taught in classrooms.

Racism in the educational system and inside schools takes various structural and ideological forms, including standardizing testing, tracking of students; teacher expectations; access to resources; blaming families for lack of parental involvement, and disproportionate punishments. Williams and Land (2006) examine those various issues related to the color-blind rhetoric within education. They found that disparities in African American education can be tied to color-blind rhetoric and its use in subordinating African
American students. Educational institutions that follow color-blind rhetoric used these morphed post-Civil rights era ideologies to perpetuate the idea that racism and discrimination were written away by signing the 1965 Civil Rights Act. Lack of contact with African Americans and the bias that comes with the lack of interactions can heighten one's use of color-blind rhetoric to subordinate African Americans. These disparities are amplified when the African American student comes from hyper-segregated areas or a White teacher from a hyper-segregated White area.

Linked to the theory of choice and the color-blind approach to educational policies and practices in the theory of social mobility. According to Vaisey (2010), choosing where one resides is key to choosing children's educational path. However, coming from an area that is residentially segregated limits the ability of parents to make an actual choice. Rather they have to pick from what has been offered to them. Lareau (2014), Pattillo, Delale-O'Connor & Butts (2014), and Rhodes & DeLuca (2014) all examined educational choices as they relate to student outcomes. Each study examined choice through parental interviews to untangle how location and social status influence choice.

Rhodes and DeLuca (2014) interviewed low-income families in Mobile, Alabama, looking at their ability to move. Their premise was to examine the social changes of a low-income family having the choice to move and the ability to move into a potentially better school district/zone. While they found that low-income families did have the ability to move, they could not move outside of other poverty-stricken neighborhoods. On the other hand, Lareau (2014) examined parental choice to move based on a desire for school change among low-income, middle, and upper-class individuals. The results suggested that each class of families moved to different school zones based on the social knowledge accessible
to them. Since individuals in low-income arenas only have the social knowledge of those in the same social class, they tend to move to a zone with the same type of low educational outcomes as their prior residence. Further, in low-income zones historically inhabited by African Americans, Lareau (2014) suggests that African Americans are the ones who suffer most due to their limited choice to relocate for school purposes.

Pattillo et al. (2014) examined school choices of different classes rather than Lareau's study on the choice of neighborhoods for school preferences. Their study looked at how the influx of charter schools, education vouchers, and choices of schools that are considered "good" come into play with individuals' school choices from different races and social classes. Their results were similar to Lareau's in that choice is impacted by class accessibility to the knowledge of possible options. Again, an individual's choice of schools will more likely align them with a school similar to their prior situation. As such, low-income African Americans who live in hyper-segregated residences historically continue to reside in devalued and educationally deprived neighborhoods.

The theories of choice and color-blind rationale tend to be subjective and dismissive of historical structural precursors. This dissertation investigates race as one factor important to residential segregation and educational attainment. It also addresses the historical and pervasive systemic barriers that link racial segregation of neighborhoods to social mobility and the intergenerational effect on low-income African Americans.

**Intergenerational Impact**

The intergenerational social impact on African Americans forced into residential segregation is phenomenal. The racial structures and racial ideology that have historically
and continually created racially segregated neighborhoods also resulted in unequal funding support for public schools and a disparity in education for African Americans. Further, generations of unequal funding to the public schools in highly populated African American neighborhoods created massive pockets of African Americans relegated to a quality of life that seeks to keep them in low-income and/or manual jobs. The question arises as to whether this occurrence was deliberate and planned?

The basis for suggesting that the public educational system in America has at the inception a plan to separate the races by color, or by a caste system of workers and laborers has been documented in Coleman's (1968) article, which was a synopsis of his larger 1966, 700-page report on "Equality of Educational Opportunity". In the report, Coleman discussed the development of the American and English public-school systems and the policies that were used at the turn of the 20th century. Each system had at its inception the need to create two forms of public education. In the US, public education was developed for Whites and African Americans in the South and England for the serfs and the middle and upper-class English. The distinction and reasoning behind separate public schools were made clear. In the American South, it was to keep African American children separate from the White students and allow outside educational interventions through parental knowledge, tutors, or other factors that enhanced the educational attainment of White children. Since the turn of the twentieth century, the South was filled with newly freed slaves who were not allowed to be previously educated. Their ability to garner outside educational resources beyond school was limited. The same was not true for their White counterparts.
When public education was created in England, the public necessity was more exclusively based on the need to maintain a status quo of the laboring class in one school and the middle and upper classes in another school system. In England, those in the laboring school system did not graduate with the credentials necessary to attend college (Coleman, 1968). In the US, the same outcome of educating one group to be manual or skilled labor and the other to be the ruling class was accomplished by racial segregation of the public school and control of funding resources, curriculum, and pedagogy. Thus, in the history of the American school system, African Americans, once they were able to attend school, were not given the same quality of education as their White counterparts since its inception. It is not far-fetched to assert that the American government played a key role in the public school system, which channeled generations of African Americans into the same work status as their parents and grandparents -- destined to remain a worker dependent on money from a White master.

There is additional evidence supporting the continued educational disadvantages of the African American public-school student leading up to the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education 1954. While there were certain educational advances made as a result of the civil rights and African Americans going to college and coming back to teach their youth (Morris, 2001; Walker, 2000; Walker 2001), those advancements were short-lived once integration and busing began (Morris, 2001; Wilkinson, 1996). Both Wilkinson and Morris detail the experiences of African American teachers who grew up and taught in the South before Brown v. Board 1954. Both authors warned that with the new experience of switching over from African Americans being taught by African Americans to an
integrated school system where Whites would teach them, positive outcomes should be considered delusional.

Morris (2001) discusses how the African American student being taught by African American teachers is the best way to ensure the right enrichment of African American school-age children. He argues that the ability of a child to see a teacher who resembles him or her benefits the child beyond their educational understanding of the world. Wilkinson (1996) goes a step beyond the effects of a student having a teacher who resembles him or her by discussing the ramifications of what happens to children when bused. His findings show that African Americans bused from inner-city hyper-segregated areas in the first wave of busing had trouble participating in extracurricular activities due to traveling time and could not participate in school clubs due to lack of transportation to and from the school. Additionally, parents could not make it out to the new school, causing a disconnect in the relationship between the child, parent, teacher, and school. Also, Wilkinson found that once the African American children got to these newly integrated schools, they often looked for kids who looked like them but experienced racial isolation, which they did not have before busing.

**Busing**

Beyond the Little Rock Nine busing in 1957 to attempt to integrate Little Rock Central High School (Coleman, 1968), the busing of African American students to White schools was all but absolute. The rationale for busing was, in part, due to the 1966 report of James Coleman and his findings on comparative educational attainment between Southern African Americans and Whites. Coleman found that while levels of educational
attainment for African Americans in the Northeast were better than those in the South, they were still much lower than the levels for Whites. He also observed that the trajectory for African Americans in both regions was similar, but the educational attainment levels for African Americans in the South trended downward as they matured through secondary school. There were various mixed-race integrated schools in the Northeast, but the majority of the public education throughout America was segregated, pre-Brown v. Board.

The findings in the 1966 Coleman report did infer that while there were similar educational opportunities for segregated African Americans and Whites in the South, integrating the races would be advantageous for African Americans. He further explained in his 1968 article suggesting that the additional educational experiences gained by White students from outside school sources, which heightened their educational attainment, perhaps, may "rub off" on the African American students with whom they now share a class. Coleman, with his assumption, seems to believe that racial tension and White collective memory will somehow alleviate their individual interest. In doing so, White students would somehow forget about their White supremacist home rhetoric and share their secrets with their African American counterparts, whom they have been taught to keep at bay. Coleman did not consider the potential backlash from White students, parents, communities, and a racist society.

Had there been more extensive research on the potential societal effects of integration along with the potential accumulative generations of African Americans being under-educated in a system of busing that was supposed to elevate the problem of educational disparities, these issues of busing and miseducation may not have materialized. Morris (2001) and Wilkinson (1996), although late, describe the damaging effects that
occurred during "forced busing." Missing from the research was a detailed, comprehensive plan or any inclination of forethought by the government regarding all the possibilities associated with its forced integration. Such measures would have detailed ways of intermixing Whites with African Americans. With whose advancements in busing to integrate, there should have been an understanding of the normative White mindsets. For centuries those mindsets have included overt racial antagonism and macroaggressions. Why would the government expect those to cease with forced integration?

Specific to Louisville and busing to integrate schools, the Courier-Journal analysis of the district's student assignment plan reported in its February 8, 2021, issue found that:

- Schools are re-segregating, meaning the West End's youngest learners are about 90 times as likely as a child in the East End to attend a school at least 80% poor and Black.
- West End kids who attend schools outside their neighborhood score higher on state tests than those who stay in the West End — but not enough to catch up to their classmates.
- Black students are less likely than their White peers to feel like they belong — and those feelings often intensify for those assigned to schools to increase diversity.

The article concluded that Louisville's public schools are re-segregating and that three-fourths of the schools in the district are not diverse and have too many Black and poor students — which desegregation sought to avoid. The bigger question of whether busing worked is why there are persistent disparities in the educational attainment of the vast majority of African American students living in highly desegregated and highly socially stratified communities in Louisville and other major cities in the U.S.? Why have
governmental interventions failed? Furthermore, is this an anomaly or intentional? What role do racism and White privilege play in continued racial inequality?

Research Design

Literature Review

This dissertation research is situated within three bodies of literature: (i) the intersectional and cumulative effect of the U.S. Constitution, Laws, policies, regulations, and practices on the racial segregation of neighborhoods, Pre and Post Federal government involvement;\(^4\) (ii) how racial segregation of neighborhoods creates disproportionate funding for schools in neighborhoods with predominantly low-income African American students; and (iii) the extent to which unequal funding impacts the achievement gap for African Americans. Collectively, they track the historic, legal, political, social and economic factors that limit or cap African Americans' potential life chances/experiences for social mobility through educational attainment and residency. This is specifically examined through six case studies of African American Louisville, Kentucky residents who lived in the segregated West End and who also were part of the first groups of busing to integrate in the 1975 – 1976 school year.

The literature explores local and state policies that allowed for segregation before introducing actions by federal agencies and the enactment of certain federal regulations. It examines property and sales tax systems that were used to regulate the locality of African Americans; explores the use of segregation policies and urban planning used to allocate African Americans' residences; and examines the involvement of the federal government

\(^4\) Designation of Pre and Post Federal involvement will be explained below within the context of the discussion.
via the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) in 1933 and the Federal Housing Administration. Lastly, the literature discusses the correlates of educational funding to neighborhood property values and residential tax-based funding for education.

Specific attention is paid to busing, housing policies/ordinances/laws in the city of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky. While there is currently a strict school funding plan in Kentucky that states that each district receives the same monies across the said district, the school district of Jefferson County Kentucky (JCPS: Jefferson County Public Schools) currently shows starkly different funding within the same district. The current policy allows for a minimum base price per school, but there is no cap on how much a school can gain access, depending on neighborhood property values. While this current school policy used to fund school is not reflective of the school funding policy that existed during the 1975 - 1976 school year, it has progressed from earlier decisions on school funding. For that reason, it is plausible that the funding allocations during the time frame in question were even less equitable than the current funding allocations.

Over time, segregation that was designed to keep African Americans in particular social strata in society morphed from a color line based on Blackness to one associated with green, the color of money. While historical research shows that there has been systematic exploitation of African Americans that has regulated them to hyper-segregated residential localities, the current dissertation research aims to explain how the progression of segregation in America, the color line was turned into a line that is regulated based on the intersection of race with wealth, assets, economic accessibility, social mobility, and educational attainment; with a specific focus on the stories of six African Americans from Louisville, Kentucky who were subjected to the afford mention. With property or the
ability to purchase a home in America being the easiest way to acquire wealth, the lack of that ability is a circumstance that sets a family’s trajectory on a path that will not allow for wealth to be gained (Chasin, 2017). Coupled with the ability to purchase a home is also the ability to acquire a home in certain areas of town that would allow your school-age children to attend a school whose funding is based on high valued properties.

Study Purpose and Research Questions

Prior research on the city of Louisville reveals how racial structures and racial ideologies have historically and continually created racially segregated neighborhoods that result in the unequal funding of public schools and disparities in educational attainment based on race (Atkinson, 2006; Gills, 2010; McConahay, 1978). The busing-to-integrate project in Louisville was introduced in the 1975-1976 school year to address the federally mandated busing to integrate. The federal mandate was pushed to improve the situation of African American education by providing enhanced education experiences for African American students who would be bused and improve race relations. This dissertation research investigates whether the intended outcomes of the busing-to-integrate project were realized from the experiences and perceptions of the African American students who were bused from their Black neighborhood schools to majority-White schools and neighborhoods. Participants were all African American students in high school who lived in the West Louisville hyper-segregated neighborhoods and were part of the first wave of busing that sought to integrate the public schools within Jefferson County, KY. Research questions centered on the participants: (1) relationships with White peers, teachers and school administrators, (2) educational experiences and relationships compared to their
Black neighborhood schools prior to integration, and (3) impact on their social experiences then and as adults. The participants living and school arrangements are illustrated on demographic maps created from GIS mapping tools that show their residential hyper-segregated urban neighborhoods and the White suburban neighborhoods in which the schools they were bused to were located. The socio-political educational environment, including the apprehensions and rationale of the decision-makers on the school board for busing-to-integrate schools that impacted the participants' experiences, is also examined through archival research of the JCPS board meeting for the same period.

**Methodology**

Given the historical setting of the research and its focus on racial structures and ideologies, the research adopted a decolonization approach and a race-based epistemology representing the least powerful groups in society (Rajack-Talley, 2018). In this case, the race-based epistemology adopted was specific to African Americans, the paradigms used for data collection and interpretation were not grounded in ethnocentric biases (McDougal, 2017; Stanfield, 2011). Critical race theory formed the lens for analyses and understanding of racial power, privilege, and oppression within this framework. Theoretical perspectives on structural racism, ideological racism, and color-blind racism were used to explain forced racial residential segregation and its economic and social impacts (Bonilla-Silva, 2008; Lewis, 1998; McConahay & Hough, 1976). The epistemological framework, critical race theory, and participatory approach facilitated the incorporation of the concepts of power, privilege, and oppression when examining the structural and ideological racial dimensions of redlining, educational disparities, and the participants' educational experiences.
The main data collection method used to construct the case study of Louisville's busing project was open-ended participatory interviews. The Participatory approach (see Lincoln, Lyham & Guba, 2018) was used in organizing the interviews to ensure that the information reported was based on the reality of the participants and that knowledge gained was through the co-creation of researcher and participant(s). Such knowledge is achieved through democratic dialogue where the participant's voice and experience lead the research and are the main focus of the research. The focus on the racial experiences of the participants also contributes to an oral history of the racial tensions that existed during that time.

Quantitative data from the Population Census of 1970 was used to construct GIS maps that show the original residential neighborhood of the participants, the transportation distance to the integrated schools, and the racial make-up of the residential census tract and school bused to the census tract. Archived minutes of the Jefferson County School District board from the full year leading up to the start of the 1975 - 1976 school year were used alongside the GIS mapping to corroborate the research participants' recollections, perceptions, and narratives.

**Significance of Study**

To examine the racial structures and ideologies that shaped neighborhood segregation, neighborhood stratification, support for and resistance to school integration, and educational equity through busing involves an analysis of the intersectionality of race with social class. Gotham (1998), building on the work of Massey (1990), suggested that residential segregation is based on intersectional and reciprocal reinforcing characteristics
of class and race. Examining the intersectionality of race and class pertaining to residential segregation allows for a detachment from examining them as separate variables and identifies current urban poverty and residential segregation as compounded entities. Further, current residential segregation can be examined through systematic racial discrimination (institutional racism)\(^5\), large-scale macroeconomic and demographic changes (spatial mismatch), and local and federal laws and policies (housing administrations, policies, ordinances, laws, and deregulation). This is important because although the argument is seldom made in introductory courses in the departments of Education and Urban and Public Planning, a growing body of literature on educational disparities suggests that educational disparities are directly linked to residential segregation. Furthermore, educational disparities lead to a cycle of poverty, forcing the student's children to return to the same socioeconomic positions as their parents (Bechtold, 2017; Carrol, 2017; Farida & Milner, 2017; Milner, 2012; Smear, Honey & Williams, 2017). This phenomenon brings into question whether busing changed this cycle for the participants' racial outcomes and experiences, positively or negatively, economically or socially – structurally and ideologically.

\(^5\) While systemic, institutional & structural racism are used interchangeably, they do have their own definition. For discrimination to be systematic, it has to first be structured within institutions. Mentioning systematic racism within this text, speaks to how racism has been structuralized and institutionalized.
Limitations of the Study

Due to the research being primarily a case study, the findings are not generalizable. Further, if this study is to be replicated, the city under investigation would be required to have: a similar African American to White ratio; the same types of historic residential segregation efforts; an experience involving the merger of two distinctive racially separate school systems, and one school district covering the entire city. Beyond the generalizable limitations, this research also has internal validity issues as the main source of the interview-information was collected from individuals aged 59 - 62 towards the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020. It is conceivable that they may be interpreting or remembering the events and experiences with certain inconsistencies – aged memories (Conforti, Ross, Hess, Lynn, & Holmboe, 2008).

While the open response interviews were the main tool used for gathering information, the number of participants could have plausibly caused the generalizability issue with this research. To offset limitations possibly created by the number of participants, additional measures were utilized. Each of the open response interviewees also shared knowledge about the experiences of other African Americans who lived in the hyper-segregated West End of Louisville, Kentucky, and the negative or positive experiences they encountered. While the findings were drawn from only the participants, the conclusionary information provided within this dissertation utilizes experiences of non-participatory individuals that were shared by participants. The inclusion of non-primary participant stories adds an additional layer that speaks closer to a full spectrum of experiences had by those African American students who were part of the first group to be
bused to integrate during the 1975-1976 school year in the newly formed integrated school district.

Organization of Dissertation

Chapter two focuses on the national trends in residential segregation, how such trends came about, attempts to ratify such trends and the social implications for African Americans. It also focuses on a discussion on how housing segregation has affected the educational experiences of African Americans on a national level. It examines the quality of schools’ African American students have been “forced” to attend due to their residential locality and their life chances for social mobility based on the type of education they received. Literature that discusses the experiences of African Americans within majority White public schools is discussed to enable the reader an understanding of general experiences that take shape within that environment.

Chapter three describes segregation trends in Louisville, Kentucky. Here, the various housing policies Louisville, Kentucky, used to create residential segregation. These trends are only discussed within the time frame surrounding the 1975-1976 school year. The chapter ends with a discussion of how residential segregation and the schools located in these segregated neighborhoods affected African Americans' educational experiences and life chances on a national scale. Detail is given to both national and local accounts, funding based on property taxes, and how this affected the funding of schools, including targeted communities that had lower property values and underfunded schools heavily populated with African Americans.
Chapter four is the methodology chapter. It describes the research purpose and specific research questions. The methodology used is further elaborated, including the epistemological framework, theoretical perspectives, and data collection methods. Urban planning perspectives are included to support the structural nature of city make-up and how that too affects the racial make-up and educational disparities. The research population, the sampling procedure, and the research participants are also described.

Chapter five presents a summary of the findings. The six case studies of Louisville African American residents are first described through the open response qualitative interviews. These interviews give first-hand perspectives on the experience of being bused, experiences on the bus, and experiences in the schools. Secondly, a GIS map was constructed and summarized concerning where the case study participants lived, their travel distance to school, and the racial make-up of the residential neighborhood and school bused to. Thirdly, the archival materials collected from JCPS board meetings leading up to busing in Louisville, Kentucky, are described and analyzed to give context to those contemplating, planning, and/or resisting the idea of desegregating schools and their racial implications.

The last section of Chapter five is a contextual discussion and analysis. This section links the discussion surrounding the interviews to the GIS map, archival data, and the literature that was used. Detailing historical antecedents to persist or change emergent trends in racial disparity in education and the socio-economic implications for African Americans. Participants' perception of how housing segregation and stratification and disparities in education within the larger social justice movement for racial equality and anti-Black racism is also discussed.
Chapter six is the conclusion chapter and will answer the question "Did busing work?" within the context of the six case study responses. It will address the original concerns addressed to ignite busing to integrate in America and see if those concerns were met or if the concerns that were addressed were actually concerns of the people that integration affected the most.
CHAPTER 2

RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION BASED ON FEDERAL AND LOCAL POLICIES: THE FORMULATION OF AMERICA'S UNDERFUNDED "HOOD" AND INNER CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Residential segregation in America has a historical and current stronghold in the fabric of American society. This stronghold is such that it is present in all aspects of social life and America's institutions' structural fabric. As it exists in North America, racial segregation can be linked to the emergence of shared group beliefs and ideologies that inform policies, laws, and regulations. When enacted, these policies, laws, and regulations proved beneficial to one racial group (originally elite Whites, and now the majority of Whites not poverty-stricken) and simultaneously negatively affected the "other" (non-White and African Americans).

This chapter examines the overt and covert involvement of the U.S. Federal government in residential segregation. The focus of residential segregation that separated Whites from African Americans and other minorities is used here to heighten the importance of its impact on economic and educational disparities based on race. This dissertation is based on the understanding that residential segregation separates races from the physical locality and economic opportunities and resources that disproportionately benefit neighborhoods with upper-end housing and schools in predominantly White neighborhoods.

Trends or shifts in residential segregation have been explored throughout American history, including in Louisville, Kentucky. For heuristic purposes, the federal
government's involvement in residential segregation is examined in two periods, (i) before the creation by Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) economic risk redlining maps which identified communities of supposed economic risks (Pre-Federal Involvement) and (ii) after the creation of economic risk redlining maps by HOLC (Post-Federal Involvement). Various mechanisms used for residential segregation by race in the Pre-Federal Government Involvement period included state tax laws, regional and neighborhood zoning laws, and ordinances. Additionally, residential covenants drawn up by White homeowners were also adopted. Although neighborhood covenants were not directly linked to the Federal Government, the Federal Government played a key role in maintaining the division of neighborhoods by race by allowing neighborhood covenants' establishment and practice.

After the Federal Government's direct involvement, residential segregation is linked to redlining maps' legal construction and lasting effects. The redlining maps were constructed by the Home Owners Loan Cooperation (HOLC) and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). These policies, practices, and enactments collectively gave rise to spatial mismatch, which remains current and negatively affects predominantly African American communities. Direct federal involvement in residential segregation is thought to have started in 1933 with the construction of the neighborhood economic risk redlining maps. However, there are cases found in the Supreme Court that indicate direct federal government involvement in residential segregation before 1933, including the Buchanan v. Warley (1917) housing ordinance case of Louisville, Kentucky (Ely, 1998; Gobillon, Selod & Zenou, 2007; Hirt, 2015). However, for this research, direct federal involvement is examined in association with the 1933 redlining maps. The federal involvement with
the Buchanan v. Warley (1917) case was through the federal Supreme Court, and its involvement played against the dominant White ideology surrounding residential segregation of that time. In that case, the federal Supreme Court struck down a Louisville, Kentucky housing ordinance that called for racialized residential segregation. Since the court's action, in this case, cannot be construed as constructing a policy or housing law that encouraged or directly called for residential segregation, the HOLC maps of 1933 will serve as the historic start of direct federal government involvement in housing discrimination for purposes of this dissertation.

**Direct Pre-Federal Government Involvement**

In America's racial history, policies, laws, and other forms of regulations were effective tools in conjunction with physical pressure and intimidation to create and maintain racial segregation. Before 1933, although the federal government was not directly enforcing residential segregation and financial disparities, local states and neighborhoods were emboldened to do so. One mechanism of residential segregation was tax laws linked to the supermajority right of landholding Whites to vote and make decisions. This was partly done through the 1890 Southern State Tax, the 1901 property tax limits, and the 1932 sales tax initiation, which individually and collectively limited African Americans' civil rights and freedom through structurally formatted financial disadvantages (Leachman et al., 2018). Additionally, the 1908 zoning policy, the early 20th-century restrictive covenants, the 1900-1920 housing ordinances, and the 1924 National Association of Real Estate Brokers' (NAREB) (Chasin, 2017) requirements were all instrumental in establishing and accepting residential segregation by race as socially normative.
Property & Sales State Tax Laws

Before incorporating residential segregation ordinances, policies, and practices, various adjustments to state tax laws (1890 Southern State Tax, 1901 property tax limits, and the 1932 sales tax) were disadvantageous for African Americans. These adjustments forced African Americans into a socio-economic class grouping with a slim to no chance of acquiring the resources, the opportunity to buy property, and the ability to accumulate wealth. Shortly after the end of the reconstruction era, around 1890, there were various changes to Southern States' Tax laws, many of which are still on several states' law books. These changes, however, did not improve the economic situation nor the civil liberties that come with wealth accumulation for African Americans as they did for Whites. Instead, Leachman et al. (2018) argue that the state tax laws created a supermajority political class whereby wealthy White landowners had three-fifths of the vote in both houses, giving them control of state taxes, property taxes, and later the sale taxes. These same state tax laws stripped freed African Americans of their voting powers acquired during the reconstruction era when one man equaled one vote and included a clause suggesting African Americans could not overturn the law.

The new supermajority group of wealthy White landowners controlled the majority voting power and how state tax monies would be spent on public goods and services. This included the number of funds allotted to African American communities and public schools. According to Leachman et al. (2018), these laws' primary goal was to re-establish White dominance after reconstruction through controlling voting rights and financial control of tax dollars. This included having property tax limits to cap the amount of taxes wealthy White landowners were to pay and the mechanism for anyone to demand
otherwise. Thus, in Alabama, attempts by African Americans to request an increase in tax dollars from Whites were not successful. The Alabama decision hindered increased financial assistance to African Americans, including African American students' public education.

State and property taxes supported Whites' wealth accumulation by capping how much they paid taxes to the state. To increase the state budget and further marginalize African Americans economically, a sales tax was established (Leachman et al., 2018). Sales tax was therefore initiated in order to further lighten the load on White property owners' state tax contributions. Before the initiation of sales tax, only the property owners were taxed. With the overwhelming number of property owners being wealthy Whites, they sought a different way to accumulate state revenue. Instead of supplying the bulk of the tax dollars, they sought to tax those who wanted to purchase any item within the state. This new state tax called for the poorest, which included most African Americans, to pay state sale tax, even if they owned no property.

The initiation of these tax and voting laws, adopted by several Southern states in post-Reconstruction America, was one of the first attempts post-slavery to use government regulations to create an African American underclass. An underclass lacked the economic and political ability to acquire and/or fight for equal or fair housing. It was, in essence, a state mechanism based on the ideologies of Whites' desire to enforce the separation of races by residency and economic opportunities. During that time, the majority of African Americans were at the bottom rungs of a property-holding society and could not financially contribute much to property taxes. However, with the introduction of a sales tax, they now had to pay public good taxes on items purchased for everyday living. While African
Americans paid a fair portion of all sale taxes, they still did not influence how their money was spent as monies collected from sales tax were controlled by the same group of Whites that regulated property taxes. In essence, African Americans who paid sales taxes essentially funded the White agenda and public goods, including White schools, while simultaneously having their own continuously defunded.

In summary, the introduction of property and sales taxes are examples of White supremacy and control of the American legal system. While one cannot assume that all landholding Whites were fully invested in the ideals of White superiority, there is no doubt that all landholding Whites benefited from it. Belonging to a system of paying taxes created a need for regulations and policies to ensure that Whites' interests and needs were being funded. Although taxes were "supposed" to go to public funding, the landholding Whites orchestrated and controlled where and who received public funding. Since most of those paying property taxes were subscribers to White superiority ideals, then it is plausible to correlate the acquisition and accumulation of wealth with a White superiority agenda and a shared ideological interest.

Zoning, Ordinances & Covenants

Zoning was another mechanism used to ensure the continuance of racial residential segregation and the accompanying financial and educational impacts. Ross and Leigh's (2000) discussions on residential segregation practices before the Federal Government's involvement show how racial ideologies influence institutional decision-making. For example, city planners used zoning to "protect" certain residential areas from industrial expansion and prevent the overhauling of residential space. The earliest zoning laws
originated with the Los Angeles zoning ordinances of 1908 and the New York City zoning resolution of 1916. State governments allowed municipalities to adjust the physical details of any buildings within city limits. These zoning laws also allowed overt racial zoning practices as a tool to exclude "undesirable groups" from residing within certain communities based on the fear that slums (neighborhoods comprised of "undesirables") could bleed into so-called upscale White neighborhoods. Thus, racialized zoning was enacted.

When zoning practices were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1917 in Buchanan v. Warley (1917, 245 U.S. 60), municipalities became creative and developed subtle ways to legally exclude "undesirable" groups from their neighborhoods. These included the development of planning ordinances and the use of restrictive covenants. Thus, while most associate residential segregation around the turn of the 20th century with the Great Migration from the Confederate South, planning ordinances were adopted in the North to keep newly migrated African Americans from entering Northern White neighborhoods (Chasin, 2017). These ordinances were developed around the same time Southern and Eastern Europeans were immigrating to North America. Chasin (2017) notes that the immigrated Europeans' lived experiences were much different from African Americans. Though they were subjected to ethnic enclaves and isolated from mainstream White society, their stay in these European immigrant "ghettos" was short-lived. Massey and Denton (1993) further explain that although European ghettos offered a space for ethnic separation, full assimilation into White American society was possible. Many European immigrants took advantage of their ability to assimilate. African Americans, on the other hand, because of the color of their skin and the racialized stigma attached to it,
could not assimilate into mainstream White America. An increasingly impervious color line trapped African Americans.

Similarly, in various mid-Western and Northern American cities during the first two decades of the 20th-century, housing ordinances were developed which labeled certain areas as White and non-White (Wright, 1980). Many of these ordinances were struck down swiftly after they were put into practice, but not all. The case of Buchanan v. Warley (1917) examines one of the longest existing residential ordinances, located in Louisville, Kentucky, and was the first such ordinance to be successfully defeated. This historic case was used to stop similar ordinances in comparable cities from expanding and aided in striking down ones enacted at the time.

In several areas of the country, while newly freed African Americans were facing these residential challenges and employment barriers, some still managed to accumulate enough money to purchase homes. However, they were still bounded within certain neighborhoods due to White segregationist ideals, which created restrictive covenants (Chasin, 2017; Ely, 1998; Wright, 1980). Restrictive covenants were documents drawn up by White residents in certain neighborhoods. Typically, 75 percent of the community members signed a legal document that stated they would not sell their property to anyone non-White. If a White resident did not want to sign the covenant, they were still bound to the practice because of the pressures of the majority of White residents' acceptance within their neighborhood of residency. Bechtold (2017) further explains that the restrictive covenants were added to houses' deeds and were thus labeled as a private contract between the seller and buyer. Restrictive covenant clauses in deeds now replaced the once rampant unconstitutionally explicit zoning laws. Making the restrictive covenants a private contract
originally excluded any governmental expungement. During the 1920s, 30s, and 40s, it was commonplace to see racially infused restrictive covenant clauses imposed along with the signing of deeds.

This new mechanism of restricting the race of new home buyers was monumental because neighborhood councils and sellers supported it. For example, The National Association of Real Estate Brokers (NAREB) informed its members that they should not process any application to purchase a home in a community if the buyer's race or origin was not common to that neighborhood. A 1924 statement issued by the NAREB suggested that introducing a non-White resident into a neighborhood would automatically lower that neighborhood's property values (Chasin, 2017). The common use of ordinances and covenants across the country to keep neighborhoods racially and economically segregated occurred because the American federal government did not disallow them but indirectly supported the practices.

**Direct Post-Federal Government Involvement**

Neighborhood, city, and state-infused racial segregation practices were eventually transformed and adapted into direct Federal Governmental practices. While there were many direct federal involvement instances, this section will cover the instances that had the greatest impact and everlasting prominence. These Federal injunctions include (i) the 1933 Redlining Maps of Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC); (ii) the Federal Housing Administration and National Housing Act of 1934; the 1940-1950 contract Busting (supported by HOLC); (iii) the 1946 Federal Home Loan Bank Board (leading to exacerbation of slums and White flight); and (iv) the 1968 Fair Housing Act. These
interventions into residential segregation, like those prior, were based on popular White societal beliefs, which were part of the National fabric of America. They revolved around the assumption that African Americans were unworthy and should be kept out of White spaces.

Woods (2012) notes that while African American income had tripled between 1940 and 1950, they were still relegated to separate residential areas. Communities comprised mainly of African Americans were also becoming increasingly impoverished (Galster & Carr, 1991). They lacked financial resources and the opportunities to accumulate wealth. Financial institutions moved out of once White communities as African Americans moved in, and Whites relocated to other locales. Deliberate economic marginalization and residential segregation through redlining are interrelated and exacerbate the intersectionality of race and social class for a vast majority of African Americans.

Redlining & the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC)

As it is known today, Redlining was uncovered by Kenneth Jackson in the late 1970s during his research for his book Crabgrass Frontier (Hillier, 2003, a). Jackson discovered maps drawn up by the (HOLC) which had various areas outlined in red. The red lines signified areas as financially undesirable and were then labeled as economically risky areas. After further review of the maps, it became apparent that the areas labeled as undesirable and deemed a financial risk were also inhabited by a majority African American population (Hillier, 2003, a). Based on these economic risk maps, an association was made with those living within these financially risky areas. African American residents who lived in these financially risky redlined areas were also perceived as at-risk
individuals. The perception was that if the at-risk resident moved outside the redlined area to a new location, that new location would likely become a financially risky neighborhood too (Ashton, 2012). Consequently, racial tensions emerged linked to the belief that personal property devaluation would result from the interracial mixing of neighborhoods.

As developed by HOLC, redlining was designed to keep neighborhoods racially divided and limit the exposure of federal mortgage insurance and banks' risks of property devaluation (Ashton, 2012). The earlier overt forms of racism manifested in zoning, ordinances and covenants were now through redlining. This new form was now an established act of covert racist discrimination. African Americans who resided in or attempted to move out of redlined neighborhoods were designated financially risky individuals. There were fewer mortgage loans available, lower opportunities for homeownership, and increased rates of poverty in redlined African American neighborhoods (Ashton, 2012).

As HOLC's measures became standard practice, the National Housing Act of 1934 was passed and led to the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). The FHA's purpose was to aid in providing home loans and home revitalization loans to homeowners whose property was regarded as having some value. The FHA assured homeowners and potential homeowners that loan funds could be secured for home purchases or renovation projects. They were available only if the area was deemed low financial risk or thought of as having some value. Thus, homeowners or potential homeowners within the redlining areas did not qualify. Since these were predominantly African Americans, race became a distinguishing factor that negatively impacted one's ability to acquire a mortgage through the FHA (Bischoff, 2008). While this form of
continued redlining practices of the FHA was going on, suburbs were growing, and cities expanded outward. Therefore, the ramifications of institutional redlining had a tremendous impact on the racial distinctions or make-up of urban and suburban communities (Bischoff, 2008). Because of redlining and financial marginalization based on race, urban areas began to fill up with dilapidated housing. By 1950, while the income for some African Americans tripled, the majority of African Americans in the nation lived in the worst urban dwellings (Woods, 2012).

Hillier (2003, b) states that while some may praise the HOLC as a savior to the homeowners and mortgage institutions, under the right scrutiny, it is evident that the HOLC's lending record lacked any critical research or reference about the race of the borrower. There is no empirical evidence on whether the cooperative was indeed racially discriminating in lending. The available reports show areas by racial population and number of mortgages, but there is no recorded information to link approved mortgages to a particular racial group. Hillier (2003, b) suggests that, due to no detail of the race of the buyer and the evidence that low numbers of home loans were given to African Americans, it is plausible the Whites could have potentially been buying properties in African American neighborhoods. This action of Whites purchasing homes in African American communities with the intent to resale to African Americans is what Pearcy (2015) terms contract busting. Contract busting is the process whereby those who are not members of the majority race in the community buy property in that community and sublet to an individual whose race matches the majority race within that community. It was common practice to sublet for a higher rate than the market rate.
Some argue that the HOLC was not solely responsible for the racially biased results in lending practices. Those prescribing to this assumption do so because private lending practices also occurred during this period of redlining (Hillier, 2003, b). It is their belief that private lenders need to accept blame for the racially charged mis-lending as well. Nevertheless, if the HOLC existed to ensure equal lending, why is the HOLC not responsible for the racial disparity in lending and homeownership during its tenure?

Based on the research surrounding this issue, there are three plausible responses to this question. One that claims since the practice existed prior to initial records of governmental involvement, that the government was not responsible for the practice. Woods (2012) suggests that while the HOLC did not directly start racially and or socioeconomically biased lending, they expanded on the practice. Others assert that the government was, in fact, involved and responsible because their role was to interject pertinent information regarding the damaging effects of this socially acceptable practice rather than to write policies that aided in the practice of residential exclusion (Hillier, 2003, a). Some assert that the HOLC documents were designed only to affect individuals and not groups. This perception lacks a sufficient understanding of group formation. A group is a collection of individuals with similar characteristics -- which would suggest that these individualized practices would, in turn, affect a group (Hillier, 2003, a). Regardless of differences in arguments on the direct or indirect role of the government in the racial disparity of homeownership, Henricks (2015) argues that the racialized housing criteria of HOLC assisted Whites in accumulating wealth through housing, maintained homogenous neighborhoods and sustained their position as the dominant racial group in America.
The Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB)

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) was yet another government agency that played a key role in continuing the largely approved social agenda of racial neighborhood division and social inequality. The FHLBB in 1946 sought to use redlining as part of a national lending policy. This policy introduced a requirement stating that the age of a house was the only criteria needed to justify the diminution in value of a neighborhood. Americans' social agenda pertaining to African American housing was to offer little to no funds for the improvement and offer them older homes. As such, this policy was directly linked to the continued devaluation of older homes inhabited by African Americans. The underlying assumption was that old homes inhabited by certain groups of people were dilapidated and synonymous with slums. As such, areas within the redlined and predominantly African American communities were considered slums due to the homes' age alone (Woods, 2012). The development of urban slums across America, according to Woods (2012), came about as the volume of dilapidated housing grew not just because of the age of the homes but was the result of disinvestment in urban areas after the White flight to the newly-formed suburbs.

Not all African Americans who lived within the redlined area were impoverished. Seguin, Nierobisz and Kozlowski (2016) discuss this enigma referred by Nelson, Winling, Marciano & Connolly (2016) as the case of "the best negro". "The best negro" was an African American in the 1940s and 1950s who did not live in dilapidated houses and who had the potential of moving to a "better area" but was still found living in the impoverished urban neighborhoods. Though they may have posed the potential to move to a neighborhood whose property value would be parallel to their income, racialized lending
practices kept them bound within disinvested urban cores. The authors' description reveals that after decades of redlining and systematic disinvestment in housing, African Americans were now being blamed for segregating themselves and their occupied homes' diminished conditions. Even though they were regulated and spatially locked inside structurally underdeveloped areas, the blame still rested on them. The residential tool of redlining aided in developing society's belief that African Americans were themselves the embodiment of residential slums. This idea is based on the belief that African Americans had a choice to relocate freely but instead chose to remain in their impoverished neighborhoods…which is a clear case of victim-blaming.

Henricks (2015) examines racialized housing, wealth disparities, and the temporal dynamics of racial inequality and social disorder. He asserts a connection between current levels of symbolic racism and certain legislation enacted before and during the civil rights era. For example, racism is said to be organized in American society around a material reality, such that anti-Black beliefs were honed and increasingly developed through the civil rights era. The legislation was subsequently established to uphold normative values and make attacks against anti-egalitarian ideals synonymous with anti-American ideals. According to Hetherington (2005), White society believes that with the passage of civil rights legislation, years of oppression and its effect on African Americans would be forgotten and annulled. Too, African Americans would then be able to occupy the same social positioning as their White counterparts. What was really happening was that racial segregation was being normalized and rationalized away from race and racism and beginning to be viewed as more of a natural order.
The Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) policies and practices directly contributed to the normalization of segregation and reflected White superiority ideals, privilege and power, and were not beneficial for all American citizens. This was another missed opportunity for the Federal Government to step in and dismantle segregationist policies and practices of the Antebellum era. At a point in American history where there was an option to serve in the interest of all people's advancement, instead, the Federal Government saw fit to continue to disenfranchise one group while simultaneously investing in another. As a result, White superiority ideals were upheld, and African Americans' perceived inferiority was reinforced to a level of grandeur. Overt forms of structural and ideological racism practiced by the Federal government were alerted to more subtle terms through housing regulations, spatial limitations, and financial risk policies and laws directed towards African Americans.

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA)

The HOLC and the FHLBB were not the only federal government agencies that supported residential segregation, wealth distribution, and Whites' privilege. Deckard (2017) elaborates on the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) role and its National Housing Act of 1934 on perpetuating racially segregated neighborhoods. The FHA created the National Housing Act to set a standard for housing stock, neighborhood composition, mortgage rates, and lenders to stabilize the housing market nationally. However, in reality, the policies put in place both reflected and amplified racial prejudices. For example, the FHA lowered interest rates substantially so that people can afford to buy homes and, at the same time, created specific qualifying requirements that prevented African Americans
from taking advantage of the new interest rates and the opportunity to purchase homes. One such qualifier was having a stable employment history. Given that African Americans at that time were forced into unstable, transient and low-paying jobs, meant that they could not have an employment history that would qualify them for an FHA loan at the new lower interest rates (Deckard, 2017).

Further, the practice of redlining ousted African Americans from using these new loan rates as their neighborhoods were designated as areas of financial risk. This had a particularly devastating impact on African Americans during this era. Redlining was routinely practiced after the new deal, both de jure and de facto. To have a house qualify for a loan through the FHA, the house itself had to be in a certain area that was financially securable or in a neighborhood where the value of the property could increase. Once again, a government agency's policies appear to be founded on White privilege, beliefs, preferences, and practices that excluded African Americans from property ownership, wealth accumulation, and certain neighborhoods. This was in fact, positioned as legitimate by the state and its agencies (Deckard, 2017).

The new FHA requirements allowed for the overtly racist practice of excluding African Americans based on the premise they would lower the property value. Which in turn, continued to exclude them from the purchase of new homes. Lacking the ability to purchase these new homes at a low-interest rate also excluded African Americans from the ability to gain equity and wealth, further relegating them to a lower socioeconomic status in American society. This situation was further exacerbated because homeownership in areas predominantly occupied by African Americans could only be purchased using high-interest rates or cash. Consequently, FHA facilitated White economic expansion through
the subletting of houses in African American communities by White owners. These White owners would then sell or rent to African American Families at higher values. The homes that were rented would receive little to no property upkeep. In essence, the FHA laid the way for modern ghettos of African American communities with a preponderance of dilapidated housing. Deckard (2017) concludes that the FHA rules, regulations and restrictions in part created a situation where African Americans were boarders in their communities, occupying homes they rarely owned.

In sum, residential segregation resulting from pre-federal involvement and post-direct federal involvement was entrenched by constitutional amendments, zoning, ordinances, restrictive covenants, redlining, federal administration and loan agencies, and spatial mismatch. Further, residential segregation impacted financial acquisition and spending based on race and the intersection of race with social class. Housing segregation created by historical antecedents continued to operate on a local and national level. The nation served as a macrocosm and encompassed socially accepted beliefs, behaviors, trends, and movements. The macro-level government involvement, which led to the development of federal policies on segregation, would not have occurred if the socially accepted beliefs, behaviors, trends, and movements did not occur at the micro-society level. Thus, a dialectical relationship is observed between the macro and the micro levels of society and the structural and ideological dimensions. The outcomes were policies, beliefs, practices, and structures embedded in White superiority and the desire for control of wealth and property.

The impact of housing and tax laws, policies and regulations on unequal funding for primarily African American urban neighborhoods had several societal effects.
Consequently, the quality of education in these neighborhood schools was negatively affected because of redlining and the various public and private initiatives used to rationalize and maintain disparity in neighborhoods and access to educational opportunities. This history and continued practice have been critiqued by various scholarly arguments, including the socio-cultural theory of victim-blaming (Vaisey, 2010); the social situation in the determination of school access and education quality (Massey & Hanjnal, 1995; Pearcy, 2015); the use of color-blind rhetoric in housing policy changes (Williams & Land, 2006); and choice theory limitations in neighborhood and school preferences (Lareau, 2014; Pattillo et al. 2014; Rhodes & Deluca, 2014).

**White Influence on Spatial Mismatch, Public Goods, and the Social Capital Available to African American Urban Schools**

While the sections above focused on segregationist housing policies and practices and their impact on financial disparities in the quality of education available in African American city neighborhoods, this section of chapter two investigates the socio-cultural factors associated with neighborhood segregation and education. Specifically, it examines how normative White superiority ideals resulted in spatial mismatch supported by Constitutional law and used to control public goods including education. Explicitly how spatial mismatch resulted in negative socio-cultural and economic impacts on low-income African American urban schools. Along with the socio-cultural impacts, various biases held by teachers in these urban settings are discussed. The societal ideologies developed through White's shared beliefs are expressed through their assumptions of students who come from these impoverished urban hyper-segregated areas.
Spatial Mismatch and Constitutional Law

Constitutional law played a key role in residential segregation and has continued to do so through spatial mismatch in many of America's large metropolises. Spatial mismatch is segregated housing that arises either from zoning or White flight. Moreover, spatial mismatch determines how public goods such as jobs, schools and other resources are allocated (Anas, Arnott & Small, 1998). Oftentimes resources are taken from urban cores and sent to the periphery of cities as was the case when White flight from neighborhoods occurred when African Americans moved in (Anas et al., 1998). As Whites left the urban cores of large metropolises, the economic resources including funds for schools were transferred to the schools in the periphery of cities where Whites settled or used to build new ones there. The fear of integrated neighborhoods and the desire to remain racially segregated fueled the establishment of new "White societies" and simultaneously snuffed the economic support for schools in what became African American inner-city neighborhoods. This spatial mismatch based on the ideology of White superiority, privilege and preferences were supported structurally by the country's constitutional law and regulations. Worse yet, this was presented as the norm and legally justifiable through Constitutional law and the American courts.

In African American history the Constitutional law has not always operated in an objective manner, fair and equal to all races. For example, Constitutional law is created when a constitutional argument is successfully argued in court, but that ruling can be successfully challenged. However, at certain times in American history, court rulings on segregation based on the Constitution have not allowed challenges, adjudication and adjustments. This inconsistency and the impact are observed where Constitutional
arguments were used to restrict the rights of African Americans, as was the case of the 14th Amendment and outcomes of segregation\(^6\). Avins (1966) suggests that to truly comprehend the legislative history of the 14th Amendment, it is important to understand the framers' motives and perceptions of what constitutes places of public accommodation, as well as their beliefs on who had the right to be in these spaces.

However, Avins explains that it is difficult to find the intent of the drafters as they vary by state as manifested in the amendment's ratification process and outcomes. Congress was incapable of drafting a federal statute because states could not agree to the exact language. This resulted in each state having the power to decide whether to adopt the amendment -- or not. Congress's lackluster effort to pass a federal law laid the groundwork for states adopting a constitutional amendment on a "take it or leave it" basis and the freedom to use different interpretations of public accommodation and who had the right to occupy these spaces. Consequently, some states interpreted the amendment with the same or similar definitions of public spaces as were used during the slavey era in its implementation. As such, while the intent of the amendment should have offered African Americans absolute protection from discrimination through the federal government's intervention, the framers felt that Congress' ability to intervene be restricted only to Constitutional based arguments (Avins, 1966). As a result, the adoption of the 14th Amendment allowed for reference to the Constitution when an instance of discrimination took place, but individual states could choose either not to refer to it or use it to justify the

\(^{6}\) The Constitution was ratified on July 9, 1868 and granted citizenship to "all persons born or naturalized in the United States," which included former slaves recently freed. In addition, it forbids states from denying any person "life, liberty or property, without due process of law" or to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." By directly mentioning the role of the states, the 14th Amendment greatly expanded the protection of civil rights to all Americans and is cited in more litigation than any other amendment. http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/14thamendment.html
differential treatment of African Americans. For the framers, who were the White ruling class, the Constitution was serving its purpose in allowing the states to act as they saw fit. In their understanding (and interest), the Constitution was not meant to regulate public spaces and social relations.

Thus, while the 14th Amendment was designed to give all citizens the right to life, liberty and property under the law, this was based on the definition of public accommodation by Whites. For African Americans, Whites and the courts they controlled decided who to be friends with, whom to let in one's house, or who deserved to walk down the same side of the street with them. The right to occupy public spaces according to the 14th amendment was therefore left to the interpretation by the Whites framers of the Constitution in every state and resulted in segregated social settings, including neighborhoods and schools, and regulated by the law. In effect, structural and ideological elements that included the 14th amendment adopted in 1868 and its interpretations, the absence of enactment on the state level, and the absence of nationwide usage, laid the foundation for open discriminatory practices by de facto and de jure.

De Facto to De Jure Segregation

Wright (1965) suggests that there is clear evidence allowing one to trace de facto segregation to de jure segregation from court case rulings and the societal effects of such rulings. Neither the 13th, 14th, nor the 15th Amendments had any significant effect on protecting civil rights legislation from the disparaging arm of the White-controlled courts. Moreover, during the Jim Crow era, the Supreme Court declared that statutes attempting to protect the voting rights of African Americans, statutes trying to outlaw the KKK, and
statutes guaranteeing African Americans access to public accommodations were all unconstitutional. Thus, the issue of de facto segregation emerges as the result of White domination, privilege, superiority beliefs, and justification by written laws. So, for example, while de jure segregation was to end educational disparity in post-\textit{Brown v. Board I (1954)} through school desegregation, societal beliefs (de facto) supporting the separation of African Americans and Whites in schools continued to be rampant.

Wright (1965) suggests that based on the nation's experience with post-Civil War Constitutional amendments, it was one thing to declare the legal rights of African Americans, and it was quite another to actually make those rights an accepted reality. \textit{Brown} (1992), Donato & Hanson (2012), and Goodman (1972) further elaborate on the acceptance of de facto segregation while simultaneously dismissing de jure segregation. While they were able to show proof of laws passed in an effort to dismantle de jure segregation, there was a consensus that de facto segregation would remain in the hearts and minds of Whites who sought to set themselves apart from African Americans. Their studies reveal that the interpretation of the harm of segregation is what allowed continued de facto segregation in America. Harmful in the sense of potentially missed experiences that Whites and African Americans could share, or relationships they could foster as a result of their integration. Harm was only looked at as the potential of missed experiences and not the potential of physiological harm that African Americans were to be subjected to.

While de jure segregation was on trial in \textit{Brown v Board I}, it was the nature of that segregation itself that was viewed as harmful. The argument was that de jure segregation was harmful to the societal achievement levels of African Americans based on the lack of socialization that was potentially attainable through different races mixing and developing
a sense of understanding of and towards each other. Although at the time numerous studies examined the psychological and physiological impacts of segregation, these studies were not used in the Brown v. Board 1954 decision. The inclusion of these aspects would have allowed for cases to challenge de facto segregation and be continuously argued in the courts. While there have been studies done that show the psychological and physiological harm caused by segregation (Brown, 1992; Donato & Hanson, 2012; Goodman, 1972) laws that sought to integrate American public school children did not leave any room to challenge their veracity or to seek for stricter integration regulations based on those factors.

Failure to include the psychological and physiological harm factors as part of the ruling in the Brown decision meant that de facto segregation could not be addressed as a violation of the Constitution. De facto segregation is viewed as unintentional governmental segregation and is thus harder to prove in court. It is not clear that viewing de facto segregation in this manner was done to make it more difficult to fight for fully integrated schools. However, it is clear that the acceptance of de facto segregation enabled continued disadvantages for African American students in access, or the ability to fight for access to schools comparable to that of their White counterparts. If the psychological and physiological harm factors were included in the arguments to end de jure segregation, the same arguments could have been used to combat de facto segregation (Goodman, 1972), and the court's apparent disregard for de facto segregation would not be possible. Alleviating the psychological and physiological harm factors from court rulings, therefore, allowed de facto segregation to be viewed as a societal norm and accepted by law. Collectively, de facto and de jure factors supported residential segregation and spatial mismatch of public goods to Black and White neighborhoods and their schools.
Socio-cultural Impact of Education as Public Goods

Examining the impacts of residential segregation on educational experiences and outcomes are facilitated through a deeper understanding of the connection between education and public goods. Public schools are traditionally considered to be a public good, and funding for public schools is justified based on the presumed need or earned right to access public good. The term "public goods" is used to untangle and explain the wealth and goods such as businesses and jobs, schools and education quality associated with neighborhoods. A neighborhood with high levels of support for public goods reflects a measure of high wealth and high social capital (Ahn & Ostrom, 2008).

Scheller (2017) offers a few different theories on neighborhood racial composition and how it relates to public goods. The theories focus on the port of entry, collective action, and decentralized racism. Port of entry theory suggests that individuals of any minority group like to live next to members of their own minority group. Communities typified by the port of entry theory have limited ability to achieve cohesion regarding public goods due to their lack of clarity concerning which public goods they should champion. They are torn between alleviating oppression and maintaining their cultural identities or seeking measures to be seen as viable members of society with similar characteristics as members of the dominant White communities. To be viable members of society they must conform to White middle-class norms. Thus, communities typified by the port of entry theory need to figure out which public good to strive for – those that assist with alleviating systems of oppression - or for those important in the fight for equal acceptance by White middle-class standards.
Collective action theory asserts that Whites engage in restrictive housing practices such as exclusionary zoning to keep their neighborhoods segregated and the composition of the schools with only White students from their neighborhood. Under this theory, the community revolves around a shared interest in public goods and the disfavor of other groups who may attempt to amass public goods for themselves or encroach on their public goods. The accumulation of public goods by the non-White community is therefore viewed as harming the White community in its attempt to acquire public goods. The third theory that Scheller talks about focuses on decentralized racism. Under this theoretical lens, Whites are assumed not to act based on overt racism when enacting restrictive covenants and zoning. Rather, neighborhoods are thought to be segregated because African Americans cannot afford to live in the White neighborhoods where Whites are willing to pay for higher-priced homes. The decentralized racism theory illustrates Whites' in-group desire for homogenous neighborhoods based on social class intersected with race.

Coupling residential choice theories with the notion of public goods helps to explain cultural capital and wealth accumulation in segregated neighborhoods. Who can acquire which goods, and the types of goods that exist, aid in understanding how Whites rationalize disparities, White superiority, and White privilege. Founded on the concept of what constitutes public goods, and who has the right to access and hoard certain goods, Whites ensured the wealth and educational advancement of their children and their children's children. Thus, racial disparities in wealth and education are intergenerationally sustained. White's ability to hoard public goods simultaneously builds up their economic, social and cultural capital and diminishes the capital of non-Whites. This variance in the capital between Whites and African Americans affects the social mobility of each group.
differently, keeping neighborhoods psychically and financially segregated. It also
produces biased perceptions and beliefs about each other, including among teachers, 
students and parents.

Teacher-Student Pairing

Studies on same-race teacher/student pairing help to highlight how segregated 
neighborhoods of teachers and pupils affect the educational relationship between the two 
groups. Teachers from hyper-segregated White neighborhoods are most likely to have the 
stereotypical belief that the student from the "other" lacks the aptitude or is deficient. 
Research shows that teachers who are from White neighborhoods can harm the educational 
attainment and experiences of African American students within their classrooms (Bates 
& Glick, 2013; Dee, 2004; Dee 2005, Downey & Pritesh, 2004; Driessen, 2015; Irizarry, 
2015). These studies found that fostering a good teacher-student relationship leads to 
higher levels of student educational attainment. African American students who come 
from hyper-segregated areas and attend integrated schools are more likely to have White 
teachers, and are less likely to have good teacher-student relationships and a positive 
educational assessment by their White teachers.

The basic premise of these studies poses this question: can same-race teacher-
student relationships result in better outcomes for students? There are various responses 
to this question, but many arrive at the same general conclusion, that is, while it is not 
explicitly evident that having a same-race teacher will result in good student evaluation, 
same-race teachers are more likely to return positive evaluations of their students. This 
was found to be the case with African American teachers and African American students
as opposed to African American students paired with White teachers (Dee, 2004; Downey and Pritesh, 2004; Driessen, 2015; Irizarry, 2015). African American student ratings from White teachers are consistent with the societal stereotype that African Americans have low academic capabilities. These ratings are also congruent with the stereotypical belief that African Americans do not value education and why they exhibit problematic behaviors in schools (Bates & Glick, 2013).

However, researchers have found that minority students excel in class when they are paired with a minority teacher and are evaluated more harshly when paired with a White teacher (Dee, 2004). In the literature, this pattern is referred to as *Oppositional Culture*, in which educational disparities are examined through a cultural capital lens. The paring of an African American student with a teacher from the same culture helps to alleviate this false notion of *oppositional culture* or *counter-culture* (Downey & Pribesh, 2004). Having a same-race teacher allows for there to be somewhat of cohesion or understanding between teacher and student. The student knows that the teacher sees them as a student, appreciates who they are, and better understands their mannerism or certain behaviors that White teachers may deem as disrespectful or distracting. A teacher who does not understand or accept the cultural worth of an African American student will most likely regard the behavior of that student as wrong and label him or her as troubling. In turn, the student can potentially accept the label, leading to the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure (Agirdag, Van Avermaet & Van Houtte, 2013).

Teacher expectations are also lowered for students enrolled in schools where the majority of the students are from working-class neighborhoods. This adds yet another layer of bias as educational failure is linked to the values of parents who are not middle-
class and the role they play in the educational attainment of their child (Agirdag et al., 2013). Teachers frequently subscribe to the idea that education is the key to achieving the American Dream, and anyone who does not value education will not achieve that dream (Johnson, 2014). Moreover, a high value on education is often associated with families from White middle-class neighborhoods.

Teachers who are unable to understand these structural effects on the parent, child, and neighborhood are not equipped to move beyond the negative stereotypical assumptions. These assumptions question the student's potential and exacerbate the educational disparity associated with residential segregation. Schools that are in impoverished communities lack adequate educational/recreational facilities, qualified teachers, funding for educational supplies, and lack an influential voice to speak out against atrocities (Johnson 2014; Kozol 1991; Tyson, 2011). Teachers who work at such schools and/or with students from low socioeconomic status (SES) assume that all the students in their school fit with the notion surrounding the culture of poverty. Moreover, teachers who subscribe to believing in a culture of poverty think that parents do not value education and that the students themselves do not value education (Cooper, 2010; Cooper, Corsone, Suizzo & Pituch, 2009; Fan, Williams & Wolters, 2011; Gorski, 2008). Further, parental involvement in the child's education is linked to the teachers' perceived value of the child's family on education. False assumptions from such a teacher can render said student to perform to the teacher's false notions of their ability.
Teacher Bias and Parental Involvement

Parental involvement is regarded as another key element in the educational success of students. Parental involvement does not just mean showing up at school to check on a child; "Good" parental involvement is associated with being a PTA member, a donor, and/or an upstanding member of the community at large (Johnson, 2014; Tyson, 2011). Quite often, a child living in poverty has a parent(s) who, because of their work or domestic situation, are unable to attend school functions or participate in school-organized events (Cooper, 2010; Cooper et al., 2009; Fan et al., 2011). Sometimes it is also because of lack of accessibility (transportation to a distant neighborhood), lack of knowledge (the nature of meetings, etc.), and or potential intimidation the parent experiences from the approach (treatment) by teachers and administrators in a school. In many cases, a parent may be fully involved with their child's education at home. However, if they cannot attend school functions or donate to school funds, they are cast as not having "good" parental involvement (Posey-Maddox, 2014). Unfortunately, if the teacher has a negative perception of the student's parents and family values, this can affect their judgment, treatment, and educational assessment of the student. Researchers argue that a teacher can blame the student and their families for their impoverished conditions and label them as a low performer because they also see the parents as low educational performers (Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Simmons, Feggins-Azziz, & Chung, 2005; Speybroeck, Kuppens, Van Damme, Van Petegem, Lamote, Boonen, & de Bilde, 2012)

An impoverished student should be allotted more educational resources to offset socio-economic challenges but this is not the case. Being impoverished should not evoke low teacher expectations and a negative response from teachers. In impoverished areas
throughout most inner cities across the U.S., the school population is more likely to be African American and poor with low expectations from their teachers (Speybroeck et al., 2012). Conversely, teachers are more likely to have greater positive expectations of students who are not from impoverished White families and communities. (Speybroeck et al., 2012). Thus, poverty and race correlate in teacher-student expectations and the resulting educational disparity for many African Americans who live in hyper-segregated and impoverished urban core locales. This incongruity of teacher perceptions and student outcomes is founded on the same ideology of White superiority and African American inferiority used to keep neighborhoods segregated and disproportionate distribution of public goods based on race and social class.

Public Schools in Low-Income Neighborhoods

In the Courier Journal article discussions on whether to keep school assignments and busing, the JSCP school superintendent commented that families in the West End still have the choice to leave their neighborhood (Krauth & McLaren, 2021 Courier-Journal). While some may agree that this is possible, what is usually not appreciated is that the lack of economic opportunities as a result of residential segregation is prohibitive to families wanting to move out of impoverished communities and seek better educational opportunities for their children. The families that must stay in these communities are also constrained to send their children to the under-resourced schools in their neighborhoods. The arguments in the earlier sections of this chapter, as well as those in chapter two, explain how schools in African American inner city’s low-income districts are underfunded based
on property tax and populated with primarily White teachers who are not understanding of their African American students socio-economic and cultural circumstances.

Further, in many public schools where African American students from high-poverty schools were transferred to schools that were identified as low-poverty, the concept of "schools within schools" sprung up (Martin & Varner, 2017). Schools within schools are a process that allows some students to be channeled to lower educational track classes with lower funding levels. Within the same institution, other students take classes with higher educational rigor and have access to higher funding levels. The process of tracking and unequal funding, the "schools within schools" process, results in unequal student funding in the same institution rather than all students receiving the same expenditure allotment.

In response, Whites filed suits to directly guarantee that their children reaped the benefits from their low-poverty tax brackets. For example, in 2007 White parents in Seattle gathered to rebuke efforts to create racially balanced schools (Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, Martin & Varner, 2017). The White parents felt it was their right to ensure that their children had the first choice at the suburban schools in which there was a higher dollar per student ratio based on high property taxes. They were able to secure a victory, enabling their children to continue to benefit from housing segregation (redlining) developed almost a century prior to the case. The issue of school funding being decided by local residents and not at the state or federal level is well documented (see Reitz, 1993).

Clarke (2001) states that the most damaging aspect of the public school system is its reliance on local property tax. He explains that federal monies only cover about 7% of
public-school funding, translating into about 20 billion dollars of the 300 billion dollars spent on public education. Using local property tax to fund schools allows affluent neighborhoods to further their social advancements by providing more money per student for their districts. In contrast, poor districts cannot generate the funds needed to achieve a per-student spending ratio comparable to that of wealthier communities. State and local tax dollars directly affect how schools are funded, and proportionally impact a child's educational experience.

A common perception is that the more money a district can provide per student, the better that student's education will be. However, this assumption is not widely accepted by those who have the power to make a change. For example, Dayton (1993) conducted a structural analysis of various cases across states and attempted to ratify the correlation between expenditures and educational outcomes and found that each of the state's cases either went to the local Supreme Court or the Federal Supreme Court and that courts ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. Based on the findings of the Coleman (1966) Report, 13 high States (those fighting against funding resources) there was no evidence presented to show a direct correlation between expenditures and educational outcomes. However, they also found that there is no way to suggest what amount should be used per student or to suggest a base amount for equitable education.

With the ruling in favor of the plaintiffs in 13 high State courts, it was also concluded that more money does not equal better education. Further, the idea that more money per student should correlate to better education was rejected. It is important to note that the only measure used in the adjudications was the ability of students to meet the minimum state requirements on a standardized test, and no other aspects of what constitutes
a good education. Dayton (1993) suggests that research that looks at educational success and expenditures using state tests as the benchmark for educational success does not look at education holistically. Further, state tests (which are not required by federal law) should not benchmark the whole of one's educational abilities.

The lack of federal guidelines on the residential taxation that is used to fund schools makes it difficult to assess the correlation between actual neighborhood taxation and meaningful educational achievement scores. Since the structuring of the public education system has been deregulated and operates through federal guidelines that are State-specific, there is no means to detail how each residential area is taxed on a National scope. However, there is adequate information to assert that school funding based on residential segregation and property taxes affects African Americans’ educational attainment in low-income neighborhoods, which leans towards the belief that money affects education quality.

In sum, segregation due to spatial mismatch resulted in similar disparities based on race and social class as other historical factors such as redlining, tax laws, and funding practices infused by White superiority and dominance. Schools in hyper-segregated urban cores were negatively affected because of financial and sociocultural outcomes, the Constitution, and the rulings of the courts. A similar pattern is observed in metropolitan Louisville, Kentucky where attempts were made to integrate schools by race, social class, and locale of neighborhoods.

**The Voices of the People**

Quite often, the voices of those most marginalized, most affected and those with the most trauma are often the voices that are overlooked and the ones that do not show up
in research that deals with the intricacies of public education. A portion of the research
done on public schools aids in the conundrum that America's current public education
system can be labeled as suffering from. That is the rejuvenation of White middle-class
ideals. Nowhere within the psyche of an individual prescribing those ideals is the notion
that those ideals can potentially be harmful to those who are not White and middle-class.
With their ideals being held as the standard, anything that is thought of as beneath is
subpar or substandard. Hence, when individuals who prescribe to the ideals of White
middle-class standards conduct research on public education, they circumvent the
structural issues and attempt to have those suffering from the non-inclusive White ideals
labeled as the cause for their demise.

Using the voices of those most affected by public school integration can be
looked at as the most inclusive way to truly untangle our public school disadvantages. At
any given time, there can be well over 100 individuals on a commercial flight. One would
not go to first-class and ask a passenger how altitude and wind speed affect the plane's
wings and rudder. However, that is seemingly what is being done when attempting to
unmask the details of the faults of public school integration. The White middle-class
ideals are the first-class passengers, and the pilot, the one facing all of the issues face on,
the one most affected would be those who are non-subscribers to White middle-class
ideals.

While the voices of those affected the most by our public school integration are
very important, prior to a discussion of the significance of their importance is the
understanding of the ideological situation they are placed in. While their experiences are
most important, the experiences and perceptions of those in control or those who
subscribe to White middle-class ideals shape the experiences of those who are marginalized.

Carter (2003) discusses these issues by describing African American cultural capital with status positioning and school conflicts through the lens of dominant (White middle-class ideals) and non-dominant cultural capital. Carter's findings suggest that African Americans across social statuses adhere to the dominant achievement ideology but reject the dominant ideals that adhere to White middle-class dress, music, speech, and various social interactions.

While African Americans are displaying a more holistic understanding of White middle-class ideals and only accepting portions of those ideals they see fit, their absence of acceptance for the non-academic ideals in a school setting causes those who hardly prescribe to those ideals to perceive them as complete oppositional. Carter (2003) further explains that the lack of acceptance for these social White middle-class ideals has an adverse effect on those who prescribe to it and that their lack of acceptance is viewed as depreciation of the value of the dominant culture and therefore it is despised by those prescribing to the entirety of White middle-class ideals. This inability to see the dynamic ability of non-dominant members to use certain aspects of the dominant culture as they see fit is due to a dualistic European worldview (Carroll, 2014).

This damaging inability to see the experiences of those who prescribe ideals separate from the dominant can possibly be related to what Griffin was describing in their 2004 article. Griffin describes the difference in White individuals' experience, significance, and memories of the American Civil Rights era. Griffin found that Whites in the South tended to have more of a nostalgic memory of the "great" times that existed...
in their White space prior to the civil rights era and how they were perplexed as to what all the commotion was about while African Americans were fighting for basic human rights. For them, Civil Rights are associated with negative African American behavior. In their White Southern space, the dominant White ideals included African American subordination. Any instance going against African American subordination was illuded to as depreciation of their White ideals and counterproductive to their existence. These shared ideals turn into group beliefs and are internalized and passed on to subsequent generations.

Picower (2009) discusses the internalization of these beliefs. While examining White teachers who are on their way to teaching inner-city kids, Picower interviews descriptions seemingly jump off the page. Even the most liberal White female teachers interviewed lacked the ability to see the student beyond what they have been told of inner-city kids or from what they may have seen second-hand of inner-city students. Many of those interviewed were from those hyper-segregated White Southern neighborhoods and discussed their preparation for school as if they were headed to war. It was evident that their preconceived notions developed from their dominant cultural capital. Their lack of understanding for the other was developed and instilled in them without fully understanding the message or questioning perceptions they took for facts.

Understanding the ideals that African American students are faced with while integrating into public White school spaces, we can now move on to the experiences of those African Americans in those White spaces. Tatum (2017), with the revised edition of her 1997 release, dives deeper into the experiences that African Americans have while in those dominant public White school spaces. Different from the first edition is the
ability to look retrospectively at American society and see if those assumptions of the
dominant culture of the non-dominant culture have changed, got better, or stayed the
same. Tatum (2017) suggests the continuation of segregation in public schools is due to
the continuation of segregated housing and school assignments based on one's locality.
Along with these segregated neighborhoods, there are separate understandings of the
other. Being in the non-dominant group, one has to understand how the dominant group
works. There is no reciprocal understanding from the dominant to the non-dominant.

Tatum (2017) suggests that the relationship the non-dominant students have of
themselves is developed psychologically through what one perceives the other to think of
them and that self-identity maturates from one's biology and societal expectations. If a
student is subjected to societal expectations of their lack of ingenuity or competence
simply because they are seeking to not prescribe or be from that dominant White middle-
class ideal, then said student has more to prove than their academic competency. They
have to also demonstrate their humanistic worth.

Proving that is a feat much worse than an uphill battle. The preconceived notions
placed on these African American students from the non-dominant culture are based on
socio-historical beliefs that were developed to keep them in subordinate positions.
Whether it is unknowingly or knowingly, the personification of these White middle-class
ideals serves an even grander purpose today than they may have 40-plus years ago.
These ideals now are perceived as normal societal practices, but in reality, they continue
the uneven scales of balance between Whites and African Americans. One suggests that
you should change to my White middle-class ideals has little to no appreciation for the
experiences of those who do not prescribe to their mores.
CHAPTER 3

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY: HOUSING SEGREGATION, JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT & THE RAMIFICATIONS OF INTEGRATION ON AFRICAN AMERICANS

This chapter presents the first source of information surrounding the case study of Louisville, Kentucky, and the Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), the school district to which the public schools in Louisville, Kentucky belong. This chapter seeks to situate Louisville within its historical housing segregation in the 1970s and review the educational ramifications of integration on African Americans. Housing segregation in Louisville, Kentucky, Louisville's residential segregation during the 1970s through 1980s, a GIS map with a breakdown of the segregated neighborhoods of Louisville, segregation and education as seen through policies and practices, and the profile of the Jefferson County Public School system (JCPS) are all topics of discussion in this chapter.

The main focus of this chapter is to situate Louisville’s residential segregation and its educational ramifications within the national dilemma, introduce the hyper-segregated neighborhoods of Louisville, and offer some discourse as to how these problems developed.

Housing Segregation in Louisville, Kentucky

Research shows that the history of segregation policies in Louisville, Kentucky was not very different from the rest of the nation's metropolises. In fact, one Louisville city ordinance influenced federal policies. There have been a plethora of articles and there
continues to be literature that discusses the historical aspects of Louisville's housing segregation and the current segregation trends that continue to affect Louisville's African American population.

The material collected to report on Louisville's segregation provides detailed accounts of past and current race relations and residential segregation in Louisville from its inception in the late 18th century and equates to Louisville's residential segregation in the late 19th century and early 20th century to the appearance of a layered cake. Whites and African Americans lived in close quarters together but Whites lived on the main streets and African Americans were typically restricted to the alleys or back streets. This residential pattern of early segregation in Louisville existed because of the necessity of having African Americans live close to their employment in White households. There were very few other jobs for African Americans from which they could accumulate sufficient income, allowing them to move from the alleys and away from the bounds of a White master.

West (2006) discusses the early history of Louisville, Kentucky. Between 1830 and 1850, the number of enslaved African Americans doubled and reached approximately 10,000 right before the Civil War. Important also is that African Americans in Louisville, Kentucky had higher levels of autonomy than others enslaved throughout Kentucky. With the end of slavery, the number of African Americans rose in Louisville, Kentucky. By 1900, Louisville possessed the seventh most significant concentration of African Americans in the nation (Aubespin, Clay & Hudson, 2011). The once strikingly different autonomy African Americans possessed in Louisville, Kentucky before the end of slavery changed drastically once freedom came. An increasing number of African Americans poured in from surrounding counties in Kentucky and other southern cities.
The new large concentration of African Americans in the city called for Louisville's Whites to develop a more distinct "color line" and a more residentially segregated Louisville. According to Aubespin et al. (2011), two separate and unequal communities subsequently developed, along with overt discrimination, resulting in African Americans residing in poor housing and impoverished communities.

In an effort by Whites to gain control over the new larger population of African Americans in Louisville post-slavery, a housing ordinance was drafted in 1914 to make segregation in Louisville official through the legal system. The Louisville Board of Aldermen developed this ordinance (Von Hoffman, 2009), and it was similar to ordinances spiking up in cities across the US that also had large populations of African American residents. However, the housing ordinance created by the Louisville Board of Aldermen was later struck down in the historic Supreme Court case of Buchanan v. Warley 1917. This ordinance and the resultant legal case that started in Louisville would be the basis of later federal restrictions on cities' housing ordinances across the country.

Though Buchanan v. Warley 1917 marked a success for the stoppage of housing segregation policies, it still did little to allow for open and/or fair housing for African Americans within the City of Louisville (Von Hoffman, 2009). African Americans were still forced to live in dilapidated housing in the city's core, becoming more impoverished. African Americans did not cause these conditions. Instead, these conditions resulted from the city's reluctance to provide aid and fair treatment of African Americans by Whites within the city. Instead, Whites within Louisville began to associate Louisville's African Americans' impoverished living conditions with the personal traits of African Americans
and blamed them for the conditions created by the city and the White ruling class of Louisville, Kentucky.

As a result of the court's decision in *Buchanan v. Warley 1917*, new institutions were established to develop different ways of keeping Louisville's population residentially segregated. According to Hudson's (2006) interview, realtors practiced the concept of redlining and directed White and African Americans into racially segregated neighborhoods. Further, zoning laws sought to limit certain areas for multiple-family dwellings, typically housing for African Americans (Hudson, Interview, 2006). Multiple-family dwellings were necessary for Louisville's African Americans due to a lack of access to income that would allow them to acquire single-family residences. Louisville also actively constructed restrictive covenants that kept African Americans from living in specific neighborhoods. Simultaneously, Louisville allowed its White residents to pool funds together to acquire vacant property to maintain their neighborhoods' Whiteness (Hudson, Interview, 2006).

This emergent residential pattern persists in Louisville today, with pockets of hyper-segregated African American neighborhoods that now experience high overt police brutality levels, lack adequate employment opportunities, host an abundance of underfunded public schools, experience low levels of certified teachers in said schools, experience a disheveled housing market, and suffer from generations of underfunding in most of its social apparatuses. In essence, these pockets of hyper-segregated African Americans in Louisville, Kentucky, are the "Underfunded Hood" discussed in chapter 2.

While Louisville, Kentucky has over a decade of reported residential segregation issues that affected its African American population, the purpose of this chapter is to
discuss those issues that happened around the era of busing to integrate public schools. The aforementioned details of the early years of segregation within the city serve as a backdrop for which one can understand the reluctance to enhance residential integration within Louisville and the White backlash that comes with attempts for integration in any social situation.

*Louisville Residential Segregation: 1970s – 1980s*

In 1974 Congress passed the Housing and Community Development Act to respond to the lackluster product of HUD's urban renewal and the dismantling of several thriving African American communities, including Louisville's Walnut Street concourse (Kentucky Advisory Committee, 1982). Louisville applied for the new Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) to fight the city's poverty. However, the modus operandi adopted in the allocation of funds and relocation efforts was indicative of the White superiority beliefs and agenda of Louisville's officials at that time. For example, 91% of Whites who were moved were moved to majority-White census tracts, and 86% of African Americans were moved to majority African American census tracts (Aubespin et al., 2011). More than 50% of that tract's residents had to be of the same race to be a majority census tract. Thus, as Louisville attempted to be progressive and alleviate residential segregation, the individuals within the agencies empowered to do so were acting with White superiority lenses. As a result, even if new policies were enacted, they often returned to the same segregationist results. These local initiatives were enforced along with the national and state laws, local ordinances, policies, and practices. Instead of defeating residential discrimination, they ended up further separating Whites and African Americans.
Louisville continued to practice redlining and zoning regulations per its White propaganda, despite the Fair Housing Act of 1968, which sought to end residential segregation. President Ronald Regan's characterization of the "Welfare Queen" focused on new forms of residential segregation based on poverty (Hudson, interview, 2012). These new forms were still strongly associated with race. The multigenerational impact of marginalization preventing the acquisition of accumulated wealth and the inability to purchase homes even in the newly developed suburbs after WWII meant that African Americans still overly populated the lower socio-economic communities.

Although Kentucky at large saw a decrease in residential segregation cases from 1974 to 1987 based on results achieved by the Kentucky Commission of Human Rights (KCHR), the city of Louisville saw the highest levels of residential segregation in the state (Frankfort, Kentucky Commission on Human Rights Staff Report, 1987). While overt racial discrimination had been outlawed, subtle discrimination stepped in as its evil cousin. For example, in Louisville, a study done by the KCHR uncovered that African American residents' leases were doubled in cost to those offered to Whites. They were subjected to security deposits that were not applied to White applicants and were told that there were restrictions on pets (K'Meyer & Salley, 2013).

Figure 1 displays the African American population of Louisville, Kentucky, per the 1970 census, where the darker hew relates to higher concentrations of African American residents. The map shows portions of the county that appear to have large populations of White residents (lower amounts of African American residents), but because of the landmass distribution, the density is not as high as in the areas demarcated by the darker hews. Thus, the map's shades indicate that the highest concentration of African Americans
in 1970 resided in the West End. The Census data reports that the highest approximate number of African Americans in the darkest hewed census tracts in the West End was 6,402 African Americans. In general, Census tracts comprise 1,200 to 8,000 people, with 4,000 being an optimal number. Due to these census tracts' small size, it is evident that these small landmass census tracts are overly populated with African Americans.

The sizes of the census tracts within the city are not arbitrary, and they suggest the existence of several overwhelming amounts of census tracts within the West End are also overly populated areas. The sheer size of the small census tracts within the West End compared to the larger census tracts with lower African American populations suggests that African Americans in 1970 Louisville had a higher concentration of human population within a smaller spatial zone. With census tracts with low African American inhabitants, meaning higher populations of Whites, you have a larger landmass per spatial capital. An overpopulation of census tracts within the West End means that you also have an accelerated number of people exposed to societal issues. The map also possibly shows the overwhelming number of multi-family dwellings. Such a small landmass containing the potential for the same number of people as the larger landmass census tracts reflects the White superiority ideal of scared White space while simultaneously displaying neglect for the physical space of Louisville's African American population.
Beyond just a discussion concerning the overly populated and high-density census tracts of the West End with African Americans, this map also tells a few other stories.
First, is the size of the census tracts outside of the West End. The farther one goes outward from the West End and Downtown area (situated in the North Central portion of the map above), the census tract landmass size increases. As mentioned in chapter 2, the West End currently has an overabundance of its landmass space directly allocated for multi-family homes, which is why the census total, smaller census tracts relay that a smaller landmass has an equivalent population to a census tract whose landmass maybe three to 10 times its size. Census tracts are smaller within the West End. While every tract has approximately the same population

The above map shows the West End as heavily populated small census tracts with higher populations of African Americans residing within it. The other noticeable findings are that most census tracts within Jefferson County, Kentucky (the county Louisville resides in) had less than 1% African Americans residing within them. Too, all but two census tracts that have 14% plus African Americans residing with them are in the hyper-segregated West End. While there are a stark absence of African Americans in the South West, South, South East, and North East portions of Jefferson County, African Americans are present in other parts of the county. The majority of the tracts outside the West End suggest no more than 16% of African Americans per tract reside within them. Important is the size of these Census tracts. Most of the tracts outside of the West End could fit the West End's total landmass within them. While you have larger landmass areas outside of the West End, this map clearly shows the high-density overpopulation of African Americans in the West End, while also showing more landmass per person and low Census tract population percentages of African Americans outside of the West End.
There are ten neighborhoods within the boundaries of the city of Louisville that have high percentages of African Americans residing within them according to figure 1. Out of those ten neighborhoods, four of them are considered to encompass what is commonly known as the West End of Louisville. Those neighborhoods are Russell (the Eastern most), Shawnee (Northwest), Chickasaw (Western most), and Algonquin (Southernmost). For this dissertation, these neighborhoods will be discussed not as separate but as the encompassing West End of Louisville. The other areas in the city with large portions of African Americans residing within them during the 1970s are Downtown, Old Louisville, Shively, South Louisville, Newburg, and Prospect. Louisville is said to have 67 different neighborhoods, made up of 99 municipalities. So the ten neighborhoods that have larger portions of African Americans are roughly 10% to 14% of the city’s neighborhood space and landmass.

Downtown Louisville has a northern border of the Ohio River, an eastern border of Hancock Street, a South border of Jacob and York Street and a West border of 9th Street. While downtown Louisville has always been a business district, during the 1970s, it was also home to one of Louisville's housing projects, the Clarksdale Housing Complex. With Clarksdale's large African American population, it is likely why Downtown was shown to have a large African American population.

Old Louisville has a North border of Avery Street, a West border of I-65 South, a South border of Kentucky Street, and CSX railroad tracks to the East. Coincidently, Old Louisville was also home to a housing project, Sheppard Square. While Sheppard Square was one of the original massive housing projects built, several smaller apartment complexes and houses surrounded that area. This area was and is known as Smoketown,
and has been historically a predominantly African American neighborhood. Those factors allow for this area to show up with higher amounts of African Americans.

The Shively area is situated directly south of the West End (the Algonquin neighborhood). Its border to the North is Millers Lane, 7th Street to the East, Rockford Lane to the South, and St. Dennis to the West. Shively was one of the first "Suburbs" of Louisville, Kentucky, historically predominately White and home to a McCarthyism era house bombing in 1954 when a White couple (Carl and Ann Braden) purchased a home for an African American couple (Charlotte and Andrew Wade) (Saltzman, 2005). After that 1954 bombing, the neighborhood of Shively slowly became more of a mixed-race area due to White flight from further fear of encroachment from African Americans families. Those historical events can potentially explain the higher numbers of African Americans within the area of Shively.

South Louisville also showed a higher population value for African Americans. Its boundaries are 3rd Street to the West, Woodlawn Avenue to the North, CSX Railroad tracks to the East, and Southside Drive to the South. The Newburg area also showed larger amounts of African American populations. Its boundaries are I-264 to the North, Indian Trail to the West, Fern Valley Road to the South, and Old Shepherdsville Road to the East. The Newburg area was and currently is a swamp plain, making the land there less expensive. The African American population arrived there in 1851, and freed slaves began to call that area home soon after Emancipation. This area of the city has been historically African American.

Prospect, or the area once known as Harrods Creek, has the boundaries of Oldham County to the Northeast, the Ohio River to the West, and Harrods Creek to the Southwest.
This area is also historically African American and was once home to an African American Bed and Breakfast with docks and river access.

The largest of all of these areas from figure 1 with the greatest census tract by census tract continuation of African American population is Louisville's West End. Its borders are the Ohio River to the North and the West, Millers Lane to the South, and 9th St to the East. Within the West End during the 1970s, there were four additional Housing projects: Beecher Terrace and Village West (now City View Apartments) sitting side by side; Park Hill, and Cotter Lang Homes resting in the Southwick area (once known as Little Africa). More than just these four projects, the West End during the 1970s was full of street after street of single and multiple family houses with some business districts within. The overabundance of neighborhoods and street after street is why you see the very small census tracts in figure 1. To keep massive amounts of overly populated census tracts in the West End aggregated correctly, smaller census tracts had to be drawn. The majority of the West End (West of 34th street) at one time was predominantly White. Rioting in the 1960s for social equality saw the bulk of the West End’s last White residences leave, helping the West End to be a stronghold for African Americans.

Each of the areas within Louisville that have larger portions of African Americans residing in them has some historical or cultural reasoning as to how these areas became localities for African Americans to call home. As described in chapter two, neighborhoods with larger portions of African Americans take on the negative ideologies of the people who inhabit them (Anas et al., 1998; Ross & Leigh, 2000). Along with the negative stereotypes of African Americans being associated with their localities, chapter two also
discussed that teachers set a student's capital and performance expectations based on their race and locality (Carter, 2003; Speybrock et al., 2012).

Before discussing the racial and residential segregation condition of Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), Louisville's public school system, we must revisit the connection between race, residential segregation, and public education. While one’s race can be a pivotal component of the state of their education in public school, residential segregation can serve as an exacerbating factor.

**Segregation and Education: Policy and Practice**

Desegregation in America may have never happened if *Brown v. Board 1954* had never taken place. Many scholars have attempted to answer the questions surrounding that case. These questions arise: Did it work? What was the reason behind it? Why did it not come to full fruition? How could it have been better? What becomes evident as individuals attempt to answer those questions is the fact that there was no attempt to gauge the psychological impact integration would have on African American students (Brown, 1992; Donato & Hanson, 2012; Goodman, 1972).

Bell (1980) takes a different look at the impacts that desegregation had on African American students. Bell's approach looks at the distinction of residential segregation or the differentiation of different groups from different communities coming together. Bell frames his argument concerning the lack of acceptance of African Americans by Whites through the use of Interest-Convergence. Due to the lack of a humanistic understanding of African Americans, the decision-makers attempted to examine integration from a pros and cons point of view rather than a humanist point of view. In doing so, they lacked a
humanistic understanding of possible outcomes and exposed African American students to the threat of continued psychological damage.

While Brown v. Board 1954 may have allowed African Americans an opportunity to finally demand equal treatment under the Constitution, African Americans are still in schools that are inferior and racially isolated (Bell, 1980). Brown v. Board 1954 was justified based on the conclusion that segregation was indeed harmful to African Americans because segregation of schools was ultimately labeled as discriminatory, and discrimination itself was the factor that was the harmful -- not the differentiation of the actual schools or funding for the separate schools. Whites may have agreed that segregation was harmful, but rather than call for the integration, many advocated finding other solutions that did not disrupt their status quo (Bell, 1980).

This is where the conundrum of interest convergence comes into play. African Americans attempting to reach racial equality can only be actualized if and when it complies with the interests of Whites (Bell, 1980). The desegregation of schools had to be done in such a way that Whites still benefited. Many working-class Whites who were the ones who would be affected the most by integrating their children's once all-White public schools felt as if they had been led astray by elite Whites. They thought that integration would indeed disrupt their social order. However, those white elites realized that integration would also benefit rural sun-belt society, claiming integration would be profitable due to the alleviation of state-sponsored segregation (Bell, 1980).

What causes this diluted understanding of integration --one that approaches integration not on how it could have benefited African Americans but on how it could hinder Whites? America and its systems have been steeped in racist policies since the first
institutions were developed in America. Lopez (2003) states that a lack of socio-historic understanding of American culture causes some to think of African American progression as a form of Black Nationalism. In connection with Bell (1980) and Interest-Convergence, policies and or laws directed to help African Americans are seen as harmful to White's social order and, there, must have a component that aids Whites within them.

The case of Brown V. Board I 1954 was not even settled a whole year before it had to be revisited. This second installment of Brown v. Board II 1955, called for integration with all deliberate speed (Russo, 2009). With the landmark ruling of Brown v. Board I 1954, Whites began to show up in resistance to the integration of their kids and community schools. The organized resistance from Whites led to massive protests that closed some schools and limited access to schools for African American and White children.

White resistance to integration called for the closing of whole school districts. Prince George County, Virginia had its public school system shut down to stop the integration of African American students with Whites (Bonastia, 2009). Immediately after Brown v. Board I 1954, it was evident the majority of Whites throughout the country did not want their kids mixing with African Americans kids. There is evidence of several school districts and or schools closing throughout the country to show resistance to integration. The presence of a Brown v. Board II 1955 just a year after the original ruling shows how much negative association Whites attached to integration (Russo, 2009). Brown v. Board II 1955 called for “integration with all deliberate speed” (Russo, 2009). This did not set a date for integration to happen or your district would lose funding, this called ruling handed over the control of integration to the States, allowing them to integrate on their own time.
A simple remedy to allow for a better transition to integrate school would involve voices from both sides of the racial tract. African American school leaders and White school leaders should have spoken openly and heard equally regarding the best transition. Allowing for respectable open dialogue may have changed the face of integration. The lack of humanity given to the African American body and its potential experience in an integrated school system left them out of decision-making conversations and led them into harmful situations. While residential segregation is not the only reason African Americans were left out of the decision-making processes of integration, the lack of being accustomed to a shared space heightens racial tension.

Residential segregation has allowed for those false ideologies of race and racialized behaviors to become commonplace in the minds of Whites when they think of African Americans and their potential. The racialized practice of separation not only has a history of being embedded within policies and laws, but through practice, it has become entrenched in the mind and assumed as normality (Lopez, 2003). The normality of this racism, along with Interest-Convergence, is what allows Whites to not only bypass racial injustices but to demand that their voice is heard first when another race is attempting advancements that seem likely in their false ideologies to hinder their social order or social positioning.

Louisville, Kentucky, and its JCPS is not an apparatus whose institution of public education bypassed these issues. The following section details various discussions around said policy changes as they occurred within JCPS.
Louisville and the Jefferson County Public School System

Louisville did not fully integrate its public schools until 20 plus years after *Brown v Board 1955*. There was one attempt closer to the date of the *Brown v Board 1954* decision which did not pan out due to residential accessibility. The time frame of this early failed Louisville, Kentucky integration plan was approximately 1957-1960. At that time, there were two separate school districts – one that rested within the old city boundaries and another that existed outside of the city and extended throughout Jefferson County. (McConahay, 1978; Middleton & Robinson, 1979). Whites' economic standing in Louisville post-*Brown v Board 1954* was such that it allowed those who did not want their child in an integrated school to move out of the city limits and into the Jefferson County School District. Thus, Louisville's first attempt to integrate schools was short-lived, and it was not until the federally mandated busing to integrate court order in the 1975 -1976 school year that Louisville became a "fully" integrated school district (Atkinson, 2006; Time, 1975a).

There were several different organizational structures in the Jefferson County Public School district post-1975-1976. These various arrangements were reflections of segregation and integration trends of the larger society at different periods in America's history and attempted to adjust integration to fit a rubric that replicated White privilege. While gains were expected to be made for African Americans during integration, Whites actually benefited, and White superiority ideals and preferences were placated (Gillis, 2010; Green & Cowden, 1992; K'Meyer, 2013; McConahay, 1978/1982). The situation was no different in Louisville, Kentucky, where changes to Jefferson County Public School's (JCPS) integration plans were linked to Whites' preferences. These adjustments
resulted in persistent educational disparities between White students and African American students.

In his research, Atkinson (2006) illustrates a timeline for the structural adjustments of JCPS that subscribed to White ideals. For example, in JCPS's original integration through busing plan in the 1975-1976 school year, there was required to be no more than a 40% and no less than a 12% African American student population in each elementary school (excluding 1st grade). The middle and high school percentage was no more than 35% and no less than 12.5% African American student population. The first major shift in the integration plan was in 1984 when school boundaries were redrawn to allow some JCPS students to attend schools in their neighborhoods. The next major change to JCPS's integration plan occurred in 1991 when the allowable percentage of African Americans per school changed to 15-50% in elementary, 16-46% in middle school, and 12-42% in high school. This change was mandated in response to the desires of White parents to have the "choice" of school for their children. In 1996 there was yet another adjustment, and the percentage of African American student population was set at 15-50% for all JCPS grade levels.

In Louisville, Kentucky, Central High School represents a significant case as a traditional African American school that was also a magnet school. Historically, Central High School was the only public high school for African Americans. It remained that way until 1957 when Louisville public schools attempted their first desegregation plan. Based upon its original status in the City of Louisville as the only high school for African Americans, Central High School holds a place of nostalgia for the African American community regarding education. Central's racial makeup had not been questioned since
Louisville's first attempt at desegregation. However, a lawsuit was filed in 1998 to increase the number of African Americans at Central High School. In 2000 a US District Judge decided that limiting the number of African Americans who could attend magnet schools such as Central High School was unconstitutional. With that ruling, Central High School could have as many African American students as it desired.

In 2001 three additional schools were added to the list of magnet schools that could have the percentage of White or African American students as they desired. Notwithstanding the advantages that Whites received with the JCPS percentage arrangements, in 2002, a White parent filed a lawsuit. The claim was that her child was denied admission into her neighborhood's traditional elementary and middle school because of the court ruling that allowed more than 50% of African Americans into Central High School. In 2003 another White mother was added to the 2002 lawsuit, claiming that her child was also denied admission to 3 non-magnet elementary schools per enrollment guidelines. In 2004, a judge ruled that JCPS could no longer use separate race lists in the admission process for magnet or traditional schools. Only regular non-magnet, non-traditional schools could continue to do so. That case was appealed and upheld in 2005 by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

While the lawsuit filed regarding Central High School was to keep the doors of a traditionally African American high school open to all African Americans who wanted to attend, the resultant decision had multiple effects. Central High School was in fear of closing due to the lack of White enrollment. The high school is located next to one of Louisville's first massive African American housing projects (Village West). However, this school offered medical and other professional magnet training programs. Its locality in an
African American neighborhood and the hesitancy of White students wanting to attend led many Whites to oppose keeping Central High School open. As a result of this recalcitrance, Central High School's White student enrollment numbers remained low, and a lawsuit was filed to keep the school open.

The ruling on Central High School's enrollment applied to other JCPS magnet schools, and there was now no way to regulate how many African American students had to be in attendance at JCPS magnet schools. The Central High School ruling allowed African American students to be in the majority at one magnet school; however, this decision also dismantled the apparatus that ensured African American students had to be a certain percentage at all of the other magnet schools within JCPS. The Central High School case and the timelines developed by Atkinson (2006) show how Louisville and JCPS' segregationist policies on education consistently shifted to meet the preferences and benefits of the White ruling class.

The original structure was such that African Americans would constitute a minority in any school where they were enrolled because school boundaries and attendance zones were linked to residential segregation. By 1984 when the lines were redrawn, African Americans were going into their ninth year of busing. The majority of African American neighborhood schools were closed or used for non-educational purposes. Boundary lines were redrawn so that Whites who lived in segregated neighborhoods could have their kids go to the schools in their neighborhoods with other White students. This was possibly the first instance showing evidence of re-segregation within the new JCPS. Allowing White students to attend schools in their neighborhood is similar to the school plan that existed before integration.
Changing the percentage from 15-50% African American while simultaneously introducing the concept of choice for parents was a way to placate White parents and signal to them that they had the choice. African American students living in hyper-segregated West Louisville were bused out of their neighborhood to schools further out in the county, especially middle and high school students. The only choice that West Louisville African American residents had was to move to another section of the same West End section of town. Their children were thus destined to be enrolled in a similar school, based on the residence of another section of the West End. On the other hand, because of the residential mobility of White families, White children could attend any school of their choice throughout the city and the county.

However, the racist policies and actions were not without challenges as the 2002 lawsuit and the subsequent lawsuit filed against JCPS in 2003 challenged the White superiority ideas of JCPS, White parents, and officials. The court ruled against the use of separate race-based lists for admission into JCPS magnet and traditional schools. Instead, schools could determine whom they would accept and how they would accept students into their programs. Although there were small signs of progress, Whites' opposition to a racially integrated school system never ceased. As soon as the news of busing to integrate Louisville and Jefferson County public schools spread, there was a loud outcry from White families throughout the city and county (Time, 1975a). White parents wasted no time organizing their existing White superiority groups to oppose busing and school integration. It seems that when these original White resistant, antibusing group ideals in Louisville developed, they never ceased.
It was the hope and intent of White Louisville and Jefferson county residents that regulating where African Americans could live, limiting their ability to acquire wealth, and restricting their residential and social mobility would also keep White children out of schools with African Americans (Gillis, 2010). The logic bears a certain likeness to what has been referred to as the impact of neighborhood ties (Green & Cowden 1992, McConahay, 1978/1982). The concept of neighborhood ties furthers the presence of White self-interest and is a reflection of America's racism. It was the same self-interest based on racism that motivated Whites to fight against busing and school desegregation. Gillis's (2010) and Ryland's (2017) research on White anti-busing groups describes the extent to which Whites fought busing. Their fight involved physical violence at the schools and towards the buses carrying African American students (Gillis, 2010). Whites who opposed the busing system made political demands to keep their kids in all-White schools and/or moved to neighboring counties (Ryland, 2017: Time, 1975b). The attempts to keep African Americans from attending integrated schools were pursued steadily through the first few months of Louisville's 1975-1976 school year.

Eggington (1980) conducted a study to see how students of the newly formed JCPS felt about the city and county's racial tensions related to the new busing practice. This study was qualitative in nature, examined 464 middle and high school students, and was completed after much of the overt White racism had dwindled (Time, 1975c). The students involved in the study were, however, still exposed to acts of racism. The study findings concluded that African American students could tolerate less racial hegemony than White students. The results are not surprising given the aggressive reaction of Whites to busing
and integrated schools. One can only assume that the desire for racial hegemony weighed heavier upon Whites.

A few years after the tension began to die down, Louisville became somewhat more diverse within its residential localities (Briley, 1985; Cloud, 1998; Cunningham & Husk, 1979). The reach of African Americans bled into once White-only areas. African Americans were now permitted to obtain residency within apartments in once White-only areas (Briley, 1985; Cloud, 1980; Cunningham & Husk, 1979). Simultaneously, JCPS was also changing how students were being bused to school (Atkinson, 2006). The new shift allowed African American students who moved into integrated neighborhoods to attend the White majority school in their new neighborhood. This meant that the inner-city schools were now heavily populated with African American (and some White) kids with the same low socio-economic status.

In sum, with busing, it was almost as if JCPS attempted to re-regulate the schools' racial makeup while the city residents were attempting to change their residential localities. The City of Louisville reflected the rest of the nation's racist experience of residential segregation and educational disparities. In 2010 the total spent on busing students in JCPS was approximately $70 million a year (USA Today, 2010). The racial makeup of that school could still determine each school's educational quality. Schools with higher percentages of White students had higher overall achievement scores. In some instances, due to continued residential segregation in Louisville, some students had to travel over 45 minutes to and from school (USA Today, 2010). Some may suggest that spending some of the $70 million on funding schools equally could have served a better purpose than
forcing African American children into schools and neighborhoods where they were not welcomed.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The overall purpose of this research was to investigate how racial structures and racial ideologies have historically and continually created racial disparities in educational attainment. These racialized structures are examined through government-aided residential segregation and the unequal funding for public schools based on neighborhood property taxes as the means of differential funding. In Louisville, Kentucky, African Americans’ busing from their neighborhood schools to majority-White schools was intended to ease racial tensions and expose African American students to the same educational opportunities as their White counterparts in schools in White neighborhoods.

This study examined the extent to which Louisville, Kentucky exhibited historic trends similar to national patterns of neighborhood segregationist policies, ordinances and laws. Data showing the resultant impact of such factors on recent JCPS educational attainment scores by school and race is included to show how years of segregation and differential school funding have created or dissolved educational disparities. The impact of the first year of busing to integrate Louisville, Kentucky schools is examined through a qualitative case study of six individuals who took part in open response qualitative interviews. These participants were all African Americans who experienced the 1975-1976 JCPS inaugural year of busing. The interviews were supported contextually through the use of GIS mapping and archival data.
There were three main stages of dissertation research. First, a thorough investigation of the socio-historical literature on the laws and policies aiding or creating residential segregation on a national scale was conducted. This first portion of the research looked at the guiding factors of residential segregation as well as the resultant factors. The main information gained in this first portion of the research was that White superiority ideals held on an individual level consolidated into White superiority group appointed legal actions ranging up to the adoption of local and federal laws. These legal actions are then examined to determine if they coexist with educational disparities or, in fact, are potential culprits that lead to the educational disparity. These legal actions laid the groundwork for the various spatial mismatch forms we see throughout the country today and are described in chapter 2. In general, the literature review findings are reported in chapter 2 and provide a socio-historical context for the dissertation research.

The second component of this research examined the socio-historical literature on the laws and policies aiding or creating residential segregation and the White superiority ideals that help create it, but with a focus specifically on Louisville. This component had a brief examination of Louisville, Kentucky’s history of residential, segregationist housing policies, ordinances, regulations, and laws, but focused mainly on the immediate years surrounding the inaugural year of bussing to integrate, 1975-1976 school year. All of these components are examined with the intent of determining how Louisville’s history of residential segregation and shared White superiority ideals defined educational disparities within that first year of busing. Many such ideals are still prevalent within JCPS today.

The third portion of this dissertation involves qualitative and quantitative data collection. The quantitative data and qualitative observations were compiled to meet the
dissertation’s research objectives, which are: (1) what were the experiences and perceptions of African American students in high school who lived in the West Louisville hyper-segregated neighborhoods and were part of the first wave of busing that sought to integrate the public schools within Jefferson County, KY in 1975; (2) what did the residential segregation (hyper-segregated neighborhoods) and busing of African Americans from their urban communities to White suburban schools look like geographically; and (3) what were some of the decision-makers on the school board’s apprehensions and rationale for busing to integrate.

Research Design

This research is situated within the Critical Race perspective, which argues that racial disparities result from structural racism based on White superiority ideology and White privilege. As such, the demographics of American neighborhoods are not uniform across racial and social class lines. Socio-historical laws, policies, regulations, practices, and beliefs have collectively resulted in residential segregation and disadvantaged educational experiences and attainment for African American students, limiting their quality of life as adults.

To investigate such a complex socio-historic phenomenon and its contemporary structures and outcomes in a Louisville, Kentucky case study, this dissertation adopted an exploratory, qualitative research design and a triangulation methodology that included a participatory approach (open response qualitative interviews), data collection component (GIS mapping), and archival research (JCPS Board meeting notes). The exploratory research design was adopted because it sought to find patterns and consistent ideas and
explore certain hypotheses (McDougal, 2017). Although the elements of the research grounded in a review of the literature were not unique regarding exploratory research through the lens adopted, the case study and the examination of the systematic ways in which racial structures and practices persist is exploratory and offers a new orientation in research on educational disparities.

The dissertation examined historical racist White superiority laws, policies, and practices used to establish and support segregated neighborhoods and educational disparities. Thus, the investigation embraced a decolonization process by adopting a race-based epistemology (Rajack-Talley, 2018) specific to African Americans, so that the paradigms used for data collection and interpretation were not grounded in ethnocentric biases (McDougal, 2017; Stanfield, 2011). Critical race theory was a complementary lens for analyzing and understanding racial power, privilege, and oppression within this framework. Theoretical perspectives on structural racism, ideological racism, and color-blind racism explain forced racial residential segregation and its economic and social impacts (Bonilla-Silva, 2008; Lewis, 1998; McConahay & Hough, 1976).

Triangulation offsets the potential limitations of any of the three data collection methods (McDougal, 2017). The components of the triangulation were: (i) open response qualitative interviews, (ii) GIS mapping, and (iii) archival research. A literature review was used to situate the case study of Louisville, Kentucky, within the socio-historical context of African American neighborhoods and education (chapters 2 and 3). Archival research was conducted on the local conditions before attempts to integrate schools through busing. The materials were located inside the current apparatus of JCPS, where there is a large archival department.
Field open response qualitative interviews were conducted with African Americans who experienced Louisville City Public schools merger with Jefferson County District schools in Kentucky. The aim was to collect content on the educational experiences and the psychological consequences and trauma effects experienced by those who experienced the early years of busing (see also Brown, 1992; Donato and Hanson, 2012; Goodman, 1972). The content was gathered to add depth to the literature and provide some exploratory information relating to the quantitative data used for the GIS maps and the qualitative archival data collected. The interviews’ primary use was to add first-hand experience to what the other data suggested, back up such data, highlight such data, or contradict such data. Few studies examine African Americans’ experiences and psychological effects due exclusively to busing and/or school integration. The field interviews also gave voice to the narratives of African American students who were part of that first wave of busing to integrate schools in the 1975-1976 JCPS inaugural school year.

A participatory approach was used for the interviews so that the information collected reflected the participants’ reality and was not dominated by the researcher’s interpretation. Such knowledge acquisition was achieved through democratic dialogue where the participant’s voice and experience led the research and were the main focus (Lincoln et al., 2018). Along with the participatory approach, the interviews were guided by a phenomenological slant similar to what Panesar (2010) used in his research on teacher expectations and the reality of the teaching profession. The idea here is that those who are part of a phenomenon have the best insight into what occurred (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Panesar, 2010). Further, the best way to receive this information is to allow those directly
involved to provide their knowledge. This can be done through semi-structured interviews (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano & Morales, 2007).

The GIS maps were constructed by me using various data sources. 1970 Census tract population data, and ACS 5-year longitudinal study 2011-201. In constructing GIS maps using various data sources, the geographical databases must first be linked together. The files are linked together using a similar geographical variable that the targeted data sets share. If the data is broken down into census tracts, the researcher can use census tracts or any other geographical location variable to link the data sets. After the data sets were linked together, variables were swept through to weed out and delete those not pertinent to this research. From that point, a selection process begins as to which types of map are necessary to create and generate to best display the objectives of this research.

The map used has no more than six variables displayed at a time. All variables must have a geographical component to create a GIS map. The geographical variables used for all of my maps were broken down to census tract levels. GIS maps and data must be in a shapefile that allows one to superimpose maps and data together. All of the resultant maps were constructed by me.

The specific archival items that were examined were the minutes of the school board meetings leading up to the 1975-1976 school year when busing was enacted. Examining the board meeting notes allowed for insight into the board members’ mindset and how district members responded to the integration of schools by JCPS. The archival research shows the policies and lack thereof that were enacted towards the approach of busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky.
In sum, this qualitative and quantitative mixed methods design allowed for the triangulation method of collecting data, which has been encompassed to create a multi-layered case study of Louisville, emphasizing six participants surrounding one particular reference point in history (McDougal, 2017). A case study involves the researcher(s) examining a particular person(s), group, or a certain phenomenon surrounding a specific period (Black, 1990; Michael-Luna & Marri, 2010; Schwandt & Gates, 2018). Hence, the perspectives of multiple individuals interviewed were corroborated and situated within the literature reviews and supported contextually through GIS mapping and archival research.

The epistemological framework, critical race theory, and the participatory approach adopted in the dissertation research facilitated incorporating the concepts of power, privilege, and oppression when examining the structural and ideological dimensions of redlining, educational disparities, and the participants’ educational experiences. The race-based epistemological framework used in the data collected from the interviews and archival research provided the lens through which to observe forms of racial oppression, submissiveness, or deceitfulness that may have influenced laws, policies, regulations, beliefs, and practices.

Traditional research revolving around education explains the subsequent educational disparities without the inclusion of the marginalized voice, relies on genetic or biological terms to explain inconsistencies in academic performance, and attempts to relic race indifference solely around class or gender (Parker & Lynn, 2002). Incorporating the use of Critical Race Theory in your methods on educational research (i) enables one to encompass race, racism, and all of their facets while allowing for the simultaneous discussion of the intersections of race, class, and gender through the participants’ lens; (ii)
breaks the traditional educational research mold mentioned above; (iii) provides participants a chance to liberate or transform their marginalization through the process of their narration; (iv) allows participants marginalized through race, class or gender to have their experiences of subordination also include reflections on the agency’s actions, and (v) the inclusion of multiple academic disciplines in the knowledge base of CRT, allows for a more holistic interpretation of marginalized participants (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002).

Situating educational disparities in Louisville, Kentucky through a socio-historical examination of segregation and the policies, laws, and regulations that birthed, enhanced, and fed the educational disparities that occurred during the first wave of busing to integrate in the 1975-1976 school year, and providing an explanation as to why, how, and where to go is exactly what Parker and Lynn (2002) would claim to be the correct use of CRT in practice. Solorzano and Yosso (2002) would further suggest the theoretical sensitivity used within this dissertation’s triangulation methods incorporating various forms of data is yet another incorporation of Critical Race Methods.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

While there are many perspectives on structural racism and its effects on African Americans, Williams and Land (2006) examine structural racism through color-blind policies. The claim that color-blind ideology produces race-neutral policies and laws enhances White domination and sustains African American subordination. Thus, they assert color-blind policies hold African Americans to what is now a normalized White standard. This concept of color-blind rhetoric is not simply one that occurs overnight, but
rather it is expressed as racial priming. Williams and Land’s (2006) work describes structural racism and shows how it takes shape in policies through color-blind rhetoric.

Such theories that elaborate or rather untangle this idea of color-blind racism focus on the early theoretical perspectives dealing with racially non-inclusive policies. One such entanglement of this theoretical framework is presented by Ross and Leigh (2000). An example of these -pre-color-blind theories and policies that were racially blind or racially non-inclusive policies is the Federal Housing Act of 1965. Before the existence of said color-blind policies and amid the extensive use of overt structural racism, a policy (Federal Housing Act of 1965) meant to help African Americans and their ability to purchase homes was also an Act that sought to secure the ability of Whites to accumulate wealth through their already advantaged status. Homes in newly developed suburban American cities were zoned with the ability of those White families who owned such homes to accumulate a certain income based on the price of their home not dropping while there was no such guarantee given to the African American families who lived in the urbanized newly forming ghettos of America.

These discussions suggest that economic deprivation caused and continues to allow African Americans to be racially segregated within the housing market. These social relations impact individuals given a subpar education based on their residential location. Understanding that a community may be afflicted with economic and social ills due to its objectification and emergent structural issues linked to capitalism highlights the importance of research focused on the intersection of race and social class.
Du Bois’ (1899) examination looked at the lives of African Americans within Philadelphia. Within this work, he untangles the various jobs that existed within the city for African Americans, their lifestyles, their knowledge of the system that placed them there, and how they dealt with said system. Du Bois, in this piece, connects the low wages of African Americans to their colony (slave) and free to little paid labor (p. 14). While his main point may have been to explore their lives and how they existed within a large American city, he did much more by detailing the various wage gaps and job gaps in America. While African Americans were free, the social stigma that existed during slavery just 34 years before Du Bois’ book still existed in Whites’ minds. Due to that, African Americans were still strictly relegated to an economic and social status very similar to their status during slavery.

Du Bois’ (1903) piece takes the expressions of African Americans and makes sense of how they are adjusting to their post-slavery status. It is within this work that the seminal term “double conscious” is developed and formed. That term relates to how African Americans have to simultaneously deal with the fact that they are American and African first. This distinction plays out in various economic and social forms, which allowed Du Bois to develop this term. In retrospect, one can say that Du Bois’ 1899 and 1903 pieces show that, as a result of colonization, the plight of African Americans in America is regulated based on the social stigma that was created to keep them enslaved. In America’s eyes, while free, African Americans are still bound economically and excluded from non-Black social spaces. This distinction in their current economic and social condition did not start with their freedom from bondage but was formed while they were still in chains.
Cox (1948) takes a different approach and examines American society’s structural issues and how they have allowed for such a separate distinction between African Americans and Whites regarding economics and social issues. In Cox’s (1948) work entitled, “Caste, Class, & Race”, he sets out to examine the similarities in American race relations and the Indian caste system as well as issues of race and class within an American context. While he does not fully develop complete parallels between American race relations and the Indian caste system, he does find different aspects of American social institutions similar to the Indian caste system. One similarity, in particular, was what he described as the caste school of American race relations. Cox believed that American race relations were developed out of capitalistic class interests and that American race relations during his time would not be a mechanism that would find racial equality due to its premise of development which revolved around false ideologies associated with race.

Cox (1948) explained that these false ideologies supported by Whites were based on their rumored moral belief that Blacks were inhuman, and that same ideology was shifted into the political sphere resulting in Whites excluding Blacks from their views regarding democracy (p.434). He connects Whites’ ideologies towards Blacks to their notions of the morality of slavery, asserting that some societies allowed for class subordination and that some allowed for slavery to exist. Both societies were built on false ideologies regarding those who were subjugated (p.433). To remedy the situation, Cox (1948) insisted that both such societies must have critical dialogues about the falsehood of their ideologies regarding Blacks and then work towards a society with true societal practices based on genuine democratic views.
These ideals of false morality can be seen in the works of Mills (1997), where he addresses the racial contract which stems from the social/ political contract. While the contract is not an actual, physical, signed document, it is a social contract that benefits all Whites. Mills (1997) asserts that within American society, it is believed that all have the right to operate freely, but that those rights to operate freely were originally only intended for landholding White males and were never regarded as including African Americans. It was Mills’ (1997) belief as well that this exclusion of everyone except land-owning White males from the fruits of democracy could be remedied if and only if there was a critical dialogue seeking to express the falsehood of the creation of American democracy and then a system put in place that would operate based on a true set of democratic goals.

Cox (1948) states that these concepts of race relations in America stem from the thirst for capitalistic domination. He includes “trade, profit, the indispensability of money, inventiveness, mechanical power, money-marketing, factory manufacturing, efficiency, individualism, competition, bourgeois freedom, utilitarianism, exploitation, nationalism, humanitarianism, and idealism” (p.143) as key variables of capitalism. He adds that those variables and the strong desire to acquire them set forth the thirst for capitalistic domination.

These problems occur within capitalism due to the assumption that all have the same ability to acquire the same goals and that if one fails to reach their capitalistic goals, they must assume the personal blame for doing so (Cox, 1948). This focus on individualism, which is a part of capitalism, does not account for structured inequality that allows one group to prosper while simultaneously requiring one group to fail or exist merely to be exploited by those set to gain. The issues of class are also rooted in the
capitalistic system. Those at the top are the ones who control the government and set forth ideas that benefit them alone (Cox, 1948). By setting forth ideals to benefit themselves alone, the dominant group can determine who will have a chance at a vertical shift in class. While there is some sentiment regarding class unity, such sentiment unites those who see themselves as distant from other classes, which tends to unite the superior class against the inferior classes (Cox. 1948).

Similar to what Du Bois found, Cox argues that economic and social relations within America for African Americans are based on the system of slavery. Cox adds the connection to European capitalism -- the idea of America being a caste system where almost two complete societies exist simultaneously, with one controlling the power and one forced to operate within the dominant one. The final component that is different from what Du Bois uncovered is that Europeans seek capital domination and thirst for it. It is almost as if Cox relates their supposed need to be in power to a spoiled child’s need to receive their demands. In both situations, neither the spoiled child nor the Europeans deserve to have what they want; however, they still seek it and pull out every trick in the book to reach that goal.

Robinson (2000), in his examination of Black Marxism, peers through some of the same lenses as both Du Bois and Cox. Through his explanation of what Black Marxism is, he discusses why it is needed to offset capitalism. Although capitalism revolves around money, the economic differences created in a system of capitalism create social ills. Robinson adds that capitalism that exists now goes back further than mentioned by Cox or Du Bois. He claims that the relationship between Africans and Europeans before slavery
laid a foundation for the current trends in capitalism -- with those trends relating to who is in power and who is not.

In a deep, historical look at previous contacts between Blacks and Whites, Robinson (2000) finds that race relations were initially ignored -- then there was a shift from Blacks being seen as Islamic militants and soldiers to slaves with a very different set of stereotypes. From there, he looks at the long history of the slave trade, starting with the Italian trafficking of “Tartars” and “Poles” and “Cathays”, which expanded later into the extraordinary movement of tens of thousands of people in the trans-Atlantic trade.

As Robinson states: “European civilization is not the product of capitalism. On the contrary, the character of capitalism can only be understood in the social and historical context of its appearance” (p. 25). Because this is true, the age-old conceptions of race, enemy, and the exploitable other simply translated themselves into new terms as the world changed. “As an enduring principle of European social order, the effects of racialism were bound to appear in the social expression of every stratum of every European society no matter the structures upon which they were formed. None was immune” (pg. 29)

Robinson also agrees that the current economic and social issues facing African Americans result from race relations. For him, it is more than slavery, more than just early European capitalism since it has its roots in a time before the encroachment of Europeans on African soil for the purpose of enslavement. For him, the conditions seem to have their roots in an economic system that existed before the term capitalism.

Lemelle (2001) examines the life and times of Cox and his works. Through this examination of Cox’s work, Lemelle adds another layer as to why African Americans’ economic and social conditions exist today. Starting with a look at the differences between
Cox and Parks & Frazier (two of the seminal race sociologist from the Chicago school of thought), Parks and Frazier sought to examine race as the object and tried to conclude that one’s race does not affect one’s condition -- but that one of a certain race may display certain conditions. When many of Cox’s major works were first published, they were dismissed due to their stark difference from the Chicago school of thought. Based on this reaction to Cox’s work and Cox’s opinions regarding assimilation, Lemelle adds to the conversation the aspect of Black-Hate, which he believes aids in developing their economic and social conditions.

This aspect of Black-Hate involves Black thought assimilating to a space of Whiteness without being accepted by Whites. It is based on the belief that accepting what Whites say is right will somehow place you on the same level as Whites. This concept was expressed through political parties. Some African Americans will accept cold-heartedly, due to their political affiliation, whatever is being passed to them, while simultaneously denying the voice of their African American brother or sister who has something to say in opposition. This concept is similar to those mentioned previously. Had there been no race relations between Europeans and Africans, no enslavement, and no continuation of the stigma of slavery -- the Black-hate belief that allows for Whites to control economic and social conditions would still exist.

Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) look at Black liberation. Their first chapter is entitled “White Power: The Colonial Situation”. This opening chapter examines how Whites have control over African Americans and their economic and social status using capitalism. They argue that African Americans have a colonial relationship with America through institutional racism and overt acts of racism. For them, social and economic
conditions exist due to power relations. These power relations, they believe, are operated within the African American community by Blacks who have co-opted, like the Black-hate theory mentioned above. The individual who co-opts with the larger White society is seen by White society as a lackey. Such individuals assume that they have made it in society and administer the rules of the dominant White society within their communities to their sisters and brothers. Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) add that political boundaries are drawn to swallow up African Americans’ potential power. There is economic deprivation through policies created as a result of the lack of political power. Coupled with that lack of political and economic power is the abused relationship between the merchant and the welfare recipient. Within this relationship, the merchant seeks to further humiliate and exploit the African American welfare recipient.

Carmichael and Hamilton link this characteristic to that the conditions and stigmas created during slavery. Thus far, we have examined the economic and social ills of African Americans within a colonized America through examinations of the wage and job gaps, through an examination of structural issues that we linked to capitalism in Europe, through trade relations that existed in Europe before the invention of capitalism, through the use of Black-hate, and finally through the view of co-opting. The one consistent factor in each of these areas and views is that the culprit is the dominant Whites in society -- their need to hoard that power and their ability to do so using the stigmatization of African people they created.

The similarities between Cox’s work and Du Bois can be viewed as a form of “discursive continuity”. Discursive continuity refers to how modes of thinking and expressions can happen simultaneously or apart, without any direct effort to continue that
mode of thought or expression. While Du Bois used multiple methods to collect data for his 1899 and 1903 pieces, the uncovered results through Cox’s 1948 piece were very similar. Both found a broken economic system that was riddled with exploitive capitalism. Both found a structural system in place that continues to allow African Americans’ economic and social deprivation.

Critical race theory is developed from this understanding: the persistence of economic and social racism or racialized power, privilege, and oppression. Structural or institutional racism, oppression, and privilege are used in many institutions in American society. In comparison, theoretical perspectives on structural racism, ideological racism, and color-blind racism were used to explain forced racial residential segregation and its economic and social impacts (Bonilla-Silva, 2008; Lewis, 1998; McConahay & Hough, 1976). Another theoretical layer used in this research deals with systems of city design and segregation.

Ideological racism can be examined through dysconscious racism. This relates to an uncritical mind that not only accepts but seeks to justify inequality and generally accepts the given racial and or social hierarchy structure (King, 2015). From this explanation, ideological racism is based on false beliefs one has of self and the “other”. Other here refers to African Americans or non-Whites. This ideological racism is a manifestation of internalized beliefs regarding self and others.

Lewis (1998), when discussing ideological racism, claims that ideological racism is such that it can be developed or heightened during various periods of history. He claims the 19th century and early 20th century were such a time for America and Europe. This is due to the racial hierarchy seeming to fall apart with the emancipation of free slave labor.
This ideological racism can be considered a coping mechanism for Whites, who feared that they would now have to share their spaces with African Americans. To cope with this fear, they developed an ideology that they were to remain in supreme power and had the right to treat African Americans and other non-Whites however they saw fit. This treatment includes unequal practices that were ideologically arranged and set in place to push White superiority.

Lopez (2003) states that it has become increasingly harder for people of color to prove they are experiencing racism. The claim is that what separates current racism from the racism of the past is the mode through which this current racism is deposited. In the past, racism took on more overt forms. Modern-day racism is covert and entangled within the intricacies of color-blind policies and color-blind mindsets of those not affected by racism. Due to racism’s covert and subtle nature, its power and control over the African American body have never changed throughout history (Lopez, 2003). The trivialization of the racism experienced by the marginalized is as such due to the lack of acceptance of their voices as their stories.

Coupled with color-blind policies and the lack of acceptance of marginalized stories as valid is unacknowledged White privilege. The privilege that Whites feel is due to the dominance component that accompanies racism. In some cases, Whites accept their dominance; in others, they are unknowingly the beneficiaries of White privilege (Lopez, 2003). The White belief that they should dominate African Americans simply because of their skin color has become nomenclature. This nomenclature belief has been entrenched with the development of color-blind policies and practices. Once one does not see racism or have policies that allow them to look past race as the actual terminating factor for the
others’ marginalization, they will take an individual's marginalization as being their own fault. To eradicate racism, one must do more than just pass policies and laws aimed at helping African Americans and other people of color. The system of White dominance and privilege must also be dismantled (Lopez, 2003). Lopez further claims that African Americans and other minorities are far from being incorporated as full citizens. He asserts that Americans must first show African Americans and other minorities as equal members of the nation under the law, and throughout American history, up to current times, there has been a constant attack on African Americans through the social, political, economic, and educational spheres --and even within the field of planning. Through opening the curtain of these hidden forms and practices of racism and White privilege while exposing America’s racially stratified systems, CRT aims to show the atrocities that have been done to African Americans and other people of color.

_Urban Perspectives on Planning and Race_

These theoretical approaches to city design cover everything from land usage (residential or commercial), single or multiple family unit homes, school locality, school funding, and overall segregation of individuals. This segregation is not just residential, but it is educational, economic, and political. These theories have been congregated and explained as being related to planning theory per Ross and Leigh (2000). In their explanation, they also use a CRT approach. They assume that planning as a theory and practice has racism at the heart of its creation.

Their theories on planning and structural racism are useful in this research due to this research’s nature. Focusing on segregation in the hyper-segregated West End of
Louisville, Kentucky and its impact on education aligns with planning. To formulate and support the continued existence of an area of the city that goes underdeveloped, underfunded, and hyper policed, and for that same area to be required to send its children to public schools that consistently disservice them are all issues that do not just happen through the actions of the residents within that area. For those issues to continue, there is a sense of those ills being created through city planning.

Ross and Leigh (2000) explain this through understanding the four planning theories: rational/comprehensive, incremental, advocacy, and equity planning. Before describing these theories, it is important to understand that the planning profession was developed at a time in American history when African Americans were subjected to overt racism was commonplace. Thus, the early founders of planning were not exempt from having these same beliefs and expressing them through their actions. *Rational/comprehensive* planning looks at every possible action and outcome when making city plans. Starting from goals and objectives, alternatives to achieving those goals are then assessed, and a decision is made on the best outcome thought to be possible (Ross & Leigh, 2000).

*Incremental* planning was the next theory to take precedence due to *rational* planning being thought of as being oversimplified and unrealistic. *Incremental planning* uses limited comparison instead of considering any other alternatives due to the earlier planning theory being labeled as exclusionary of racial minorities. From that understanding, the first of the progressive theories developed was *Advocacy* planning. *Advocacy* planning argues that planning needs to take a turn and act progressively to ensure that communities that have been underrepresented are served through access to resources
and that such communities be allowed to have their voice in the planning process (Ross & Leigh, 2000).

Like advocacy planning, equity planning says that the planner should not be the only objective technician in the planning process. Equity planning states that there needs to be a redistribution of authority in the planning process to balance the power and resources. There is also an understanding that the planning that occurred up to this point in American cities has been racially unjust; planners have deprived certain communities of authority and discriminated against low-income communities that are, more often than not, communities of color (Ross & Leigh, 2000).

This description offers theories about how and why these instances of racially unjust and discriminatory outcomes have been fostered in American metropolises through planning. They also suggest that zoning, the dilemma of brownfields, and the stigma of crime have been the culprits that allow this structural racism to survive in the realm of planning.

From the theoretical perspective of Ross and Leigh (2000), zoning was one of the first structural housing tools used to restrict where African Americans could and could not live. Buchanan v. Warley (1917, 245 U.S. 60), a case originating in Louisville, Kentucky which concerned an overt zoning policy that attempted to limit certain areas of the city for African American occupation, illustrates that Louisville, Kentucky has had over one hundred years to reinvent, morph, and make policies which abide by the federal zoning regulations. The aspects of zoning that Ross and Leigh (2000) describe as structural racism involve zoning’s construction of the inner city’s plight through residential segregation and industrial expansion. The theory here is that industrial expansion from the inner city to the
suburbs has taken the economic expansion out of the urban inner-city core and moved it to the suburban periphery. With those zoning changes and deindustrialization, the urban cores experienced disinvestment and dilapidation along with their African American inhabitants.

The Brownfield dilemma is the second component of what Ross and Leigh (2000) describe as their theoretical component of structural racism in planning. Areas deemed to be Brownfields are areas that were suspected to be areas that once held factories with environmental waste. Given the lax environmental regulation in the once-booming urban industrial cores, many areas within these American urban areas potentially suffer from being labeled as a Brownfield. Being labeled as a Brownfield area, the chance for expansion or a revamp of that Brownfield area must be taken on by a private entity, not a government entity. While the government does have money available for the potential expansion or revitalization of these Brownfields, to qualify for these grants, one must provide more equity in the form of investment than can be amassed from those living in and around the Brownfield area itself. The Brownfield designation is another hindrance that has been placed on these inner-city, urban, African American spaces as a reason not to reinvest.

The stigma of crime is another structural racist planning tool used against inner-city Urban African American communities. With zoning and brownfield designation already diminishing the ability to have full employment, access to good schools, and a reasonable quality of life, many individuals see themselves being cut off from the general American society. Even though they try to adhere to said society’s rules, these individuals often turn to crime, or crime in these areas is exaggerated due to the stigma these areas
Data Collection and Analysis

Interviews

Parker and Lynn (2002) claim that CRT and its use of stories from those most affected can potentially change how those in opposition to that story see the world. The lack of marginalized stories in mainstream media allows the falsities that one hears to remain idiotic facts. One has to only cut on CNN, CSPAN, or FOX news to see a school board meeting that has been torn ascender because some parent thinks that the inclusion of CRT in their child’s curriculum will in some way cause that child to hate their White skin. In reality, CRT wants that White child to understand the world from more than just the winners’ stories. The inclusion of descriptive narratives and storytelling in case studies allows readers to move past their preconceived notions of race and move to a full examination of the overt racism that exists within America’s institutions (Parker & Lynn, 2002), education in the instance of this dissertation.

The research population of this study was African Americans who resided in hyper-segregated communities and were participants in attempts to integrate the educational system in the US. The research sample was comprised of participants from Louisville, Kentucky, who participated in the busing project that was introduced to integrate the schools with students from different racial backgrounds and who lived in segregated neighborhoods. African American students who lived in the city were bused to schools in White neighborhoods outside Louisville limits, in Jefferson County. Participants for the
study were selected based on experiencing both the pre and post busing school systems in Louisville’s public schools and Jefferson County public schools in the 1975-1976 school year.

The research sample was selected through three qualitative research procedures. First, purposeful sampling was adopted to ensure that study participants were residents of West Louisville and were part of the busing project and thus were representative of the research population. A non-probability sampling procedure was then used to select participants from a conveniently available pool. The convenient sampling process was efficient, uncomplicated, and provided a group of readily approachable participants (McDougal, 2017). From this pool of qualified candidates, direct contact was made through family members and by sending out messages and posts through two Facebook groups that potentially held participants or could lead to contact with possible participants (West Louisville Kickball, & Douglas Family Page). Thus, the third selection procedure used was snowball sampling which proved to be the best method for reaching study participants.

The original participants were collected through the Facebook posts placed on the Douglas Family page and the West Louisville Kickball page. Contact was also made at community social functions such as a Christmas party, community forums, and open dialogue events in public spaces. When researching information sensitive to racialized experiences, it is helpful to have a family or community connection to gain access to participants. Having this connection enables the participants to open up with trust towards their racialized experiences. While these methods were employed, the age and technology savvy differential between the researcher and the aged participants presented challenges in
continued communication and negatively impacted the ability to successfully relay research-related messages.

The projected sample size of participants was no less than five and no more than 10. Creswell (2007) suggests that for phenomenological case studies, the number of participants needs to be at least five and no more than 25. The idea is that if at least five people are discussing the same issue, then a minimum of 5 individuals can be used to get perspectives on the same phenomenon. There were 30 potential participants notified about the research. Out of that 30, 17 were contacted and corresponded more than once. From the 17, 6 participants were able to participate in the research. The sample's age range was approximately 58 to 64 and depended on whether the participants started high school at the age of 14, 15, or 16 prior to busing in 1975 or ended high school at the age of 17, prior to 1975 busing.

Table. 1 Participants Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age at Interview 2019-2020</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Economic/Employment status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>Retired, business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Some Post Graduate</td>
<td>Employed, property manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Disability, SS, SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Employed, two-state jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gohagan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>Serial temp worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Employed, Dental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open response qualitative interviews were used to collect the information needed to meet the research objectives. Respondents were asked the following specific research
questions in order to obtain some general demographic characteristics and to push start the conversation:

1. What year did you graduate High School in Jefferson County Public Schools?

2. How many school years and at what grade level were you in Jefferson County Public School after being bused to school?

3. What neighborhood did you reside in while you attended high school, and which high school(s) did you attend?

4. What high school would you have attended if you had not been bused to a high school?

5. What were some of the major differences you observed during your time in a segregated school (prior to busing) compared to your time in an integrated school after busing took place?

6. Which school setting, segregated or integrated, do you believe was the most beneficial for your education experience, and which setting do you feel was better suited to prepare you for life after high school?

7. In which ways do you believe the school(s) you attended after busing prepared you for the workforce and/or college after your high school graduation?

The open-response interview format allowed participants to speak to specific questions first and then elaborate how they chose. The conversation style of the interviews allowed participants to freely express their experiences and perspectives. The interviews served to document the respondents’ oral history of their life and what was happening in their neighborhood and to their community during the period in which the research is located.
The open-response interviews were conducted with each participant and centered on the lived experiences and impact of busing on life chances as adults. The research instrument and the archival data research proposal were approved by the University of Louisville’s Institutional Review Board prior to the field research. All of the interviews were conducted in person, and participants received an informal letter describing the interview process and were required to sign a consent form before the interviews were conducted. Although the signed consent form permitted the interviews to be recorded, one participant refused to comply after signing the form.

Because of the age, health and sensitive nature of the discussions no single interview went over two hours. On one occasion, an initial interview was approximately 45 minutes due to the participant refusing to be voice recorded. The interviews began with an introduction and an explanation-description of the research focus and purpose. Most of the conversation prior to the interview was directly connected to the information given to the respondent on the informal information sheet. All of the participants were interviewed more than once with a combination of over two hours of taping plus field notes.

While the interview questions were being asked, phenomenology reduction techniques were used. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) suggest that phenomenology reduction techniques occur when the researcher continues to return to the essence of the phenomenon/experience to drive out the inner meaning of the total experience. This was done by rewording the answers of the respondent or offering a similar story. Both techniques allowed the participants the opportunity to fully describe and re-describe each situation or experience relevant to the research.
Each of the interviews was recorded and transcribed into text. Written notes were also recorded and used to report and analyze the findings linked to the specific research questions. At various points in the interviews where respondents were narrating their life experiences, the researcher took fewer notes and engaged in recording the participants’ oral histories. However, the researcher noted wherein the interviewees' expression of human agency was strong.

The transcribed notes were first organized around each research question, and patterns of similarity and differences were noted. The findings were then analyzed around themes that emerged from the literature review, the lens of Critical Race theory, and racial structure and ideology theories. Direct quotes from the interviews were inserted into the discussions to highlight specific findings.

Using a participatory approach, a personalized and humanizing evaluation strategy such as that described by Patton (2002) was utilized in the interview data collection methods. Personalized and humanizing evaluation allowed for democratic dialogue and put the participants and their stories first.

Within the interview questions themselves, two types of questions were used. The front end of the interview questions was more focused on demographics, and the second half of the questions were more descriptive and allowed the respondents to freely discuss any memories that may have come during the front-end questions. For this reason, the demographic questions and their purposes will be described within this subsection.

After asking the question and beginning the writing process, the rationale for the first four questions shifted from just being interview questions to the methodology of the questions. The questions and their rationale are presented within the rest of this section.
What year did you graduate High School in Jefferson County Public Schools?

This question was used to determine what year the participants came out of JCPS and to assist the participants with rekindling thoughts of that year and the timeframe surrounding their experiences once bused. One participant (Gloria) graduated in 1976, and one dropped out in 1978 (Gohagan). Of the remaining participants, two graduated in 1977 (Diva and Benevolent), and two graduated in 1978 (Skip and Ms. D).

The participants were all roughly around the same age based on the year they graduated/completed high school. Having a sample saturated within the same basic time frame allowed for multiple perspectives regarding the same few years. That saturation accompanied by compatible information enhances the significance of the data collected.

How many school years and at what grade level were you in JCPS after being bused to school? This question was intended to gain an understanding of the time period during which each participant had to endure subjugation and recrimination at their newly integrated schools. At the time busing began in Louisville, Kentucky, the county and city schools were still using the junior high school system. High school did not start until 10th grade. Three of my participants started their high school career as 10th graders in this new busing system, leaving them three years to graduate (Skip, Ms. D, and Gohagan). The participants had to go from a junior high setting to high school, which is already hard enough; however, their transition also meant they had to deal with the new obstacle of being bused to an integrated school.

Two of the remaining participants had one year of high school pre-busing and started being bused in the 11th grade (Diva and Benevolent). This left them two years of being bused to an integrated school. One of the participants was bused for six years,
starting in the 7th grade and ending upon graduating from high school (Gloria). This case in particular was interesting and will be detailed in the next question.

Although two or three years of attending school in a busing and integrated setting may not seem like a lot, those years of busing and integration for some of the participants also occurred during adolescent years which are formative years for one’s self-esteem and social development into adulthood (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). In actuality, it is potentially likely that those few years in that newly bused integrated school had a larger than expected impact -- or may have had the actual effect the school board members who adopted the busing plan believed it would have.

What neighborhood did you reside in while you attended high school, and which high school(s) did you attend? This question was to understand the distance the participants had to travel while being bused to school. Skip lived originally in a mixed-race community at 12th and Kentucky. Right before high school, Skip’s family moved to a majority African American neighborhood on 43rd and Muhammad Ali Boulevard. He attended Doss High School after busing. Ms. D lived originally at 36th and Broadway but moved to the Hallmark neighborhood at the end of her elementary school years. The Hallmark neighborhood at that time was close to the end of the city limits. Due to that, Ms. D was allowed to go to county schools. Ms. D attended Butler High School (a county school) until busing started and then went to Iroquois High School after busing.

Diva lived in Beecher Terrance (housing projects) and then moved to 19th and Madison (about ten blocks West). Diva attended Central High School (a historically Black high school in Louisville) prior to busing and then attended Ballard High School after busing. Benevolent lived on 40th and Broadway in the Shawnee neighborhood. Prior to
busing, Benevolent attended Shawnee High school. After busing, Benevolent attended Valley High School.

Gohagan lived off 24th and Market. Coming straight out of junior high at Western Junior High, Gohagan attended Ballard High School. Gloria lived off Algonquin Parkway on Pennway. The house Gloria lived in was split between the city and county line. Her family’s front yard was the city and the back yard was the county. Due to that, the school system for her house was aligned with the county school system. That is how Gloria was bused to Butler High School beginning in the 7th grade.

On average, the distance from the participants’ house to school was 9.2 miles. That 9.2 mile is the straight distance from the home to the school. That mileage does not include the other stops the bus would make along the route. The longest distance from one participant’s home to school was 12 miles, and the shortest was 3.7 miles. Attending integrated school for the first time is traumatic within itself. Being bused into a racially hostile environment enhances the traumatic experience (Ravitch, 2000; Reagen, 1974).

**What high school would you have attended if you were not bused?** The premise of this question was to track the potential travel distance of the participants from their home to their school if they were not bused. This question attempts to get at the differences between community-based school systems and bused school systems. While busing was intended to offer the same education for African Americans and Whites, that was not what was indeed achieved through busing. What has been revealed is a negative effect on the self-concept, self-awareness, and educational achievement levels of the integrated African American students (Bobo, 1983; Green & Cowden, 1992; McConahay, 1982).
If not bused, Skip would have gone to DuPont Manuel High School. Ms. D would have stayed at Butler High School if busing to integrate did not occur. Diva and Gohagan would have attended Central High School if busing to integrate did not occur. Benevolent would have attended Shawnee High school if busing to integrate did not occur. Gloria would have potentially remained at Butler High School because that was the participant’s designated home school based on county residency.

The average mileage of travel to school for the participants had busing not occurred would have been 3.1 miles. That is just about a third of the actual travel mileage to school for some participants. The highest travel time peaked at 8 miles, and the lowest travel time rested at 0.4 miles. We can likely assume that students with shorter mileage times may not have needed to catch a school bus. They could have used city transportation or walked. These other potential transportation sources would definitely make the travel time to and from school more accessible for students and parents. The parental component stands out when one examines teacher-parent relationships. Teachers tend to value the student more based on the relationship or perceived relationship the teacher develops with the parent (Cooper, 2010; Cooper et al., 2009; Fan et al., 2012).

GIS Mapping

There were two GIS maps constructed for the purpose of this dissertation. One of them was presented earlier in chapter 3, showing the percentage population percentage of African Americans per Census tract, and the other is presented in the findings chapter. The second map displays one layer that represents the same data from figure 1, along with directional data that details where the participants lived and where there were bused to.
Combining those two layers details the austere racial make-up distinction between the participants' home address and the location they were bused to, compiled with the travel distance. The maps were created to highlight what the literature suggests happens within a city with a hyper-segregated African American population, which is, beyond residential isolation, but also financial deprivation. The GIS maps highlight the residential and educational disparities with a geographically birds-eye view of what those disparities look like. Suggesting that the City of Louisville may be segregated is one issue; demonstrating the segregation geographically gives empirical evidence of that segregation.

Archival Research

While CRT does not specifically discuss archival research, the archives tell a story. It can be from a found image, from the words someone said, or from the words that were needed and not said. The archival set that was examined for this dissertation was, as mentioned the Jefferson County School Board. It is important to note that more scrutiny should be placed on the efforts of school boards when dealing with sensitive situations that can have adverse effects on different races with the same ruling. Schools are extensions of the government apparatus through the federal government influencing the school with federal regulations, which should require policy changes. Policies are not only determined by a select few who decide what changes; the practice of policy changes decides which issues are up for adjustment. So those who construct these policies can mold them in a way that can benefit whom they would like them to and for whatever reason they see fit (Lopez, 2003).
Before accessing the JCPS archives, it was necessary to gain permission through the proper channels. Once access was granted, the archival attendant was made aware of the information needed. Upon my arrival, the attendant had already selected the Jefferson County School district board meetings’ pdf files leading up to the 1975-1976 school year busing integration plan. During some months leading up to the merger, there were two meetings per month. Predominantly, however, there was just one board meeting per month. Approximately 16 different board meeting minutes had to be deciphered to gain relevant information. During that school year, the federal court decision required the city and county schools’ merger to achieve “integration” in Jefferson County, Kentucky through busing.

Each document was approximately 88 to 120 pages of notes developed from the stenographer machines and transcribed into a full account. McDougal (2017) warns that archival research, especially when dealing with archives that potentially relate to African Americans, may be limited or abnormal compared to that of the reporting on Whites. With that in mind, what existed was examined, and what was missing was noted. A key point of observation in the archival materials was how the Board reacted in discussions related to busing and integrating the school system in Louisville and Jefferson County.

Due to the meeting minutes being in PDF format, the word search function was available. Keywords related to discussions revolving around the busing to integrate plan were picked out. The words used as part of the search were “Black,” “county,” “city,” “desegregate,” “merger,” “integration,” “bus,” “busing,” and “White.” After the words were picked out, each meeting minutes was searched thoroughly for mention of any of those words. The only words that consistently returned relevant information were:
“Black,” “county,” “desegregate,” “city,” and “merger.” All of the words did not hit in all of the meeting minutes, and each of the words that did hit was not in each of the meeting minutes. The meetings that had relevant content will be discussed separately, and each word that hit within that meeting will be discussed within the context of that meeting. Also, additional information was pulled from the meetings, and that information will be discussed after all meeting minutes are discussed.

**Limitations of the Study**

This research process was not exempt from limitations. Both internal and external validity, as well as generalizability issues, were encountered. External validity was encountered through the JCPS Board meeting archival and attempting to acquire research subjects. Attempting to have my population respond through email, text message, or even simple voice mails posed the first limitation. The age range of my participants and their ability to respond to me was a limitation. This was due in part to their busy schedule (work or family-related), their ability to participate in general (interest level, or understanding of the research pitch), some assumed that it may have been a scam (even with documentation, individuals of this age range are consistently targeted for scams) and lastly some of them would rather have spent their time doing something else. In general, dealing with individuals in the age range necessary for this research can present a wide array of age-based limitations (Conforti et al., 2008).

The location and attitudes of subjects were a form of internal validity encountered. Location validity was due to the location in which the interviews were taken. A variety of issues can come up that can affect the internal validity at this level, affecting the
participants' comfort level (Conforti et al., 2008). Knowing that the location affects the participants' comfort, there was an attempt to make all the locations places the participants chose. In some instances, the locations picked out were not comfortable for the participants.

Attitudes of Subjects relate to the attitudes of the participants. The attitudes of the participants had a wide range. Most of them were thrilled to be taking part in the research. However, their eagerness to participate can also reflect or forecast an embellishment in the information given (Conforti et al., 2008). To combat these issues, I, as the researcher, had to be aware of this possibility and attempt to ask follow-up questions based on the potentially embellished response. A follow-up question helped to see if the participants answered the same question in the same manner. This helped to improve the reliability of their interview and generalizability.

Expanding on generalizability, this research has low levels of generalizability. The amount of the sample size was lower than expected. There is no way to generalize the information provided by participants, nor the segregated setting of the city or schools the participants lived in and attended school with other metropolises around the country; without said city meeting certain parallel city demographics. Generalizability reflects the study's ability to be reproduced and have the same outcomes, which speaks to the ability to have what was gained in this project speak the same for other cities or locations (Patton, 2002). For this research to be generalizable, the city in which it is replicated needs to have a history of hyper segregation of its African American population similar to Louisville’s history, it needs to have a similar history of race relations between African Americans and Whites, and finally, it needs to have a similar history of school integration with the level
of White backlash that took place in Louisville, Kentucky during school integration. Although the information that could potentially be gained from replication of this research in another locale may not be identical to the information acquired through this study, it may be substantially similar. The generalizability of this research only applies to cities that have the same three criteria mentioned above.

From a short discussion within chapter 1, the total of participants was an initial limitations concern. Along with the limitations issues above with the participant population category, the open response interviews and their scheduling begin late fall of 2019. The onset of COVID-19 and safety concerns added an additional layer of potential limitations due to participant sample size. To offset the number of participants, the information provided by participants relating to non-participant experiences was included in the process of analyzing and concluding. This inclusion enabled this dissertation to reach a scope beyond the interviewed participants.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION: BUSING IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

This study engaged prior research that analyzed the role race, and racism played in housing segregation and the distribution of financial resources and public goods that disproportionately disadvantaged African American communities, schools, and educational outcomes. The review of this body of literature informed the dissertation's overall purpose: to examine how racial structures and White privilege are maintained through residential segregation and social institutions like public schools and are supported by governmental and non-governmental policies. Further, this dissertation examines how racial practices are carried out by group and individual actors founded on racial ideologies and racial etiquette (non-government policies). The study specifically looked at the city of Louisville because of its historical and contemporary importance in housing segregation and busing to integrate its schools, which started in 1975-1976. Moreover, busing to integrate schools in Louisville is once again being assessed to determine whether it addresses educational disparity and social relations based on race.

This study adopted a triangulation methodology: open response qualitative interviews, GIS mapping (through census data computations), and archival research. The triangulations together serve to address the structural and ideological factors, including the macro and micro levels of actions linked to housing segregation, busing, and educational disparities. Data from population census tracts were used for a geographic information
system (GIS) map to provide a physical representation of Louisville’s neighborhoods. The GIS map and the archival research seek to add content to the interviews and aid in linking all three to the information from the literature. Each component aids in developing patterns of race and social class in the Louisville neighborhoods and schools and the educational outcomes for African Americans in the city.

The archival research utilized the minutes from Jefferson County Public School Board meetings taken during the period when the decision to bus to integrate schools was being deliberated. It provided documented memory of the major decision-makers during that period with critical insights into the ideology and claims of those empowered to make decisions across race and social class. The archival research tells a behind-the-scenes story about facts that also played a major role out-front. Therefore, the dissertation adopted an African American epistemological approach and deliberately included the voices of the African American students who were most affected, those who experienced the first wave of busing in the 1975-1976 school year. The findings in this chapter are arranged under the three research methods used and are analyzed and discussed in the context of the literature on housing segregation, school underfunding, and the educational experiences of African American students.

**Participant Busing Data**

While the interviews within this dissertation serve the purpose of collecting information, demographics, and information associated with each participant's residence locality, school bused too, and the racial breakdown of both influences how each
participant experienced their time being bused to integrate. The following chart details participant busing data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Neighborhood during Busing</th>
<th>High School if no Busing</th>
<th>High School post-Busing</th>
<th>Distanced to bused School</th>
<th>Grade when Bused</th>
<th>Years Bused to School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>40th St &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>12 mi.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D</td>
<td>Cypress St &amp; Dixdale Ave</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>7.9 mi.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip</td>
<td>43rd St &amp; Muhammad Ali Blvd</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Doss</td>
<td>10 mi.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diva</td>
<td>19th St &amp; Madison St</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>11 mi.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gohagan</td>
<td>24th St &amp; Market St</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>11 mi.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Penway Ave &amp; Wilson Ave</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>3.7 mi.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table two is representative data reflecting the structural aspect of busing to integrate for the participants. This data informs us of the participant's neighborhood bused from, the school they would attend if busing were not initiated, the school they were bused to, travel distance to school, the grade they were in when bused, and how many years they took part in busing to integrate.

While the time frame of attendance at integrated school variated among the participants, the time limits that were bused affected them differently. For Gloria, her one year of busing while she remained at her school of attendance prior to busing had the least differentiation between her experience pre and post busing. This is mainly due to her
already experiencing an integrated school within the county school district. When busing to integrate was initiated, Gloria was already accustomed to dealing with bias, prejudice, and discrimination from her White counterparts, teachers, and school staff. Ms. D, Skip, and participant Diva experienced two years of busing to integrate. Ms. D, Diva, and Skip all had two years of busing to integrate. These two years allotted them time to have an introductory school year and then one school year to act on the notions they gained in dealing with the White discomfort caused by them being in this new White school environment space. Gohagan and Benevolent experienced three years in busing to integrate the school system. These two had the most years within the newly organized busing to integrate school district out of all the participants. Based on the participant's responses to their time frame being bused, those allotted more years begin to normalize the negative racialized treatment they were subjected to. However, not all participants responded to the normalization of their racialized experience the same way.

In addition to the participant busing data, the following students’ biographies add an additional layer that aids in explaining how and why they reacted the way they did to their busing experience.

**Participant Biography’s**

*Benevolent*

Participant Benevolent was bused from a city school and attended a county school. Her travel distance from 40th St and W Broadway to Valley High School was approximately 12 miles. During her time of busing, her family structure consisted of two in-house parents who were married and valued education. Benevolent often remarked
during her interviews that her parents operated as the driving force for her to push through school. While she did use other forms of agency, she is more consistent as an individual operating from high family parental support towards her education. She went on to college and worked for several years, before retiring and going into business with her first and only husband.

Ms. D

Participant Ms. D was bused from a county school to a city school. Her travel distance from the Hallmark area (Dixdale Ave and Cypress St) to Iroquois High School was approximately 7.6 miles. Ms. D came from a county to a city school, and she was about two years ahead of her pre busing to integrate with city school peers. Her family structure with two loving married parents who pushed education enabled her to persevere at her county and city schools once busing began. She grew bored with her city school due to being two years ahead and sought to find additional ways she could extend her educational career while in high school and beyond. She graduated from college, married, and has two kids and a few grandkids. After working for the state in different managerial roles, she is the housing manager at a large apartment complex in Louisville. KY.

Skip

Participant Skip was bused from 43rd and Muhammad Ali Blvd to Doss High school, with a travel distance of approximately 10 miles. His case was unique. He was bused from a county school to a county school. While the county school he attended was within the city limits, its historic presence in the city (being the second high school in
Louisville, KY) was part of the county system when the systems were developed. While he did not dive deep into his home life, he was a middle child and sought refuge from his siblings and single mother on the basketball court. He never fully expressed if he graduated from college or not. He did speak of a notable college basketball career but never expressed graduating. He did speak on working heavy manual labor jobs. During the interviews, he was on disability and living alone.

Diva

Participant Diva was bussed from a city school to a county school. Her travel distance from 19th and Madison St to Ballard High School was approximately 11 miles. She was the second oldest of five kids. While she also had two married parents at home, her father was the one who pushed more for education. She pulled from educational experiences prior to busing as the standard of what education should look like. Went on to community college before working for the federal government. She has one daughter and one granddaughter. She is currently single, working, and pursuing an Afrocentric understanding and connection.

Gohagan

Participant Gohagan was bused from a city school to a county school. His travel distance from 24th and Market to Ballard High School was 11 miles. Gohagan was the youngest of eight kids. His older siblings reached academic glory in high school and pursued post-secondary accolades. Gohagan was in advanced placement courses. While his parents preached education to his siblings and him, he felt he knew more and rested his
academic prowess on his accomplishments. Gohagan dropped out of high school and went to the “hood” he claimed to not want anything to do with. He has never held a job for longer than seven months and dreams of opening a community farming space.

_Gloria_

Participant Gloria remained in a county system. Her residence prior to busing being on the city and county lines allowed her to remain in her county school. Her travel time to school from Penway Ave and Cane Run Rd to Butler High School was approximately 3.7 miles. While she had two older male siblings who seemed to succumb to the academic pressures of attempting to reach educational accolades in a public school system not concerned with their success, she was able to persevere due to the emphasis her father placed on education. Gloria attended college and received her degree and some professional training that has kept her gamely employed for about 40 years. She has only birthed one son but states that she has three due to children her current husband had prior to their meeting.

Based on the time frame each participant spent in their bused school to integrate and the neighborhood/family structure, they were placed within one of three socialization variation categories. The three categories are Neighborhood, family, and self. These different socialization categories will be explained during the discussion surrounding agency. Each participant used their socialized variation as a form of agency to deal with, fight against, or make it through their busing to integrate experience.
Physical Representation of Patterns of Race and Residency

While socialization variation of the participants aids in a contextual understanding and plausible explanation for how they dealt with what they experienced during busing to integrate. Figure two below shows the percentage of African Americans living within each census tract inside Jefferson County, along with point data reflective of where the participants lived and where they were bused.

The GIS map below shows Louisville’s neighborhood segregation by race and population density for 1970 (Busing was introduced in the 1975-1976 school year.). The map is designed to show the size of the county, the congested pockets of African Americans, and the overwhelming amount of the county that was majority White.

The 1970s

Figure 1 displays the African American percentage of population per census tract within Jefferson County, where Louisville, Kentucky is located. Per the 1970 census, the darker hew relates to a higher percentage of African American residents within one census tract. The map plots portions of the county that appear to have large concentrations of African American residents, but because of the landmass distribution, the density is not as high as in the areas demarcated by the darker hews. Thus, the map's shades indicate that the most concentrated populations of African Americans in 1970 resided in the West End. The Census data reports that the highest approximate number of African Americans in the darkest hewed census tracts in the West End was 6,402 African Americans. In general, Census tracts are comprised of 1,200 to 8,000 people, with 4,000 being an optimal number.
Due to these census tracts' small size, it is evident that these small landmass census tracts are overly populated with African Americans.

Fig. 2: Participants’ Home and School Neighborhood Racial Make-up and Travel Distance by Bus
Beyond just a discussion on the overly populated and high-density census tracts of the West End with African Americans, this map also tells a few other stories. First the size of the census tracts outside of the West End. The farther one goes outward from the West End and Downtown area (situated in the North Central portion of the map above), the census tract landmass size increases. As mentioned in chapter 3, the West End currently has an overabundance of its landmass space directly allocated for multi-family homes, which is why the census tracts are smaller within the West End. While every tract has approximately the same population total, smaller census tracts relay that a smaller landmass has an equivalent population to a census tract whose landmass may be three to 10 times its size.

Evident as well is that the majority of the county's landmass has less than 1% African American population. While the overall percentage of African Americans within Jefferson County may be reflective of the national percentage of African American population, it is evident that Louisville, Kentucky, and the surrounding Jefferson County at this time were highly segregated. While census tracts highly populated with African Americans are accepting of African American bodies and their experience, census tracts with less than 2% African Americans will not have the same acceptance.

The above map shows the West end as a heavily populated small census tract with larger amounts of African Americans residing within it. The other noticeable finding is the stark absence of African Americans in the South West, South, South East, and North East portions of Jefferson County. While there is some presence of African Americans in other parts of the county, the highest possible amount of the population percentage outside of the West End is 15%. The majority of the tracts outside of the West End suggest no more
than 0.99% African Americans per tract. Important is the size of these Census tracts. Most of the tracts outside of the West End could fit the West End's total landmass within them. While you have larger landmass areas outside of the West End, this map clearly shows the high-density overpopulation of African Americans in the West End while also showing more landmass per person and low populations of African Americans outside of the West End.

Figure two above provides a direct understanding of the differences in the racial make-up of participants' home census tract compared to the racial make-up of the census tract there were bused to. While the entirety of a census tract corresponding to the school participants was bused to is not reflective of the population percentage of said school, the racial breakdown of the census tract the participants were bused to allows one to see how White that census tract was prior to busing to integrate.

Benevolent’s residential census tract encompassing 40th St. and Broadway was approximately 71% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Valley High school where she was bused had only a 2% population of African Americans during the time busing to integrate. Ms. D’s residential census tract encompassing the Hallmark neighborhood was approximately 57% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Iroquois High school, where she was bused, had only a 0.3% population of African Americans during the time of busing to integrate. Skip’s residential census tract encompassing 43rd St. and Muhammad Ali Blvd was approximately 90% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Doss High school where he was bused had only a 2% population of African Americans during the time busing to integrate. Diva’s residential census tract
encompassing 19th St. and Madison Ave was approximately 100% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Ballard High school where she was bused had only 0.9% population of African Americans during the time busing to integrate. Gloria’s residential census tract encompassing Penway Ave and Cane Run Rd was approximately 96% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Butler High school where she was bused had only a .08% population of African Americans during the time busing to integrate. Gohagan’s residential census tract encompassing 24th St. and Market St. was approximately 90% African American during the time of busing to integrate. The Census tract of Ballard High school where he was bused had only 0.9% population of African Americans during the time busing to integrate.

The lowest percentage total for lived-in neighborhood African American population was 57% with 84% being the mean percentage of African Americans per participant census tract. 2% was the highest percentage of any census tract the participants were bused to. The obvious difference in lived racialized experience and bused racialized experience is drastic. Living in a neighborhood that is over 50% African American potentially leads to the acceptance that African American bodies are accepted in that setting, the actions of African Americans are accepted as well. Though there is a pocket of multiple census tracts in the West End that is heavily populated with African Americans, their proximity limits their exposure to the rest of the county and the county’s exposure to them.
Experiencing Busing & School Integration

The epistemological position adopted by the research dictated that the African American student voices of those most affected be included in the study. As a result, the narratives of 6 African Americans (Benevolent, Mrs. D, Skip, Diva, Gohagan, Gloria) who were students bused to integrate schools in 1975-1976 were captured through open response interviews and accessed through snowball sampling. The experiences of those who were part of the first wave of busing are the most important part of the triangulation method used. They situate the case study of the City of Louisville. It details the African Americans as individual actors and highlights their perceptions of racial ideologies and racial etiquette, including personal experiences linked to the racial structures and racial ideologies existing at the time of busing to integrate schools in Louisville. Three overarching themes emerged from their reported experiences and observations, as reported in the interviews of former African American students who were bused. Which were: Academic and Social Barriers Encountered, Psychological Impacts, Student Agency, and Resistance.

In order to highlight the voices of those interviewed, each participant will have their experiences discussed alone, under heading categories for each of the three overarching themes. Some of the overarching themes have subcategories that will be discussed under their respective heading category. All heading categories will cover the participant's stories that emerged during the interview process.
Academic and Social Barriers Encountered

Benevolent

These experiences were embedded in an environment where the newly integrated African American students were subjected to full-on White backlash from the Jefferson County community at large. For example, interviewee Benevolent’s assigned integrated school was Valley High, one of the largest sites of White recoil in the city during the first wave of busing in Jefferson County. Gillis’ (2010) Courier-Journal article describes a scene where mobs of White men, women, and kids were out on Dixie Highway close to Valley High School. White mobs created a standoff with National Guard members brought into the city to curb potential violence. During that altercation, one of the armed guards lost an eye. Benevolent remembered the anxiety and chaos while fear became imprinted in her memory:

“Teachers didn’t care. Students didn’t care. They were not accepting us. Of course, going to Valley, we had to endure crosses burning across the street. The parents -- they were throwing stuff at the buses -- the school buses! We had to duck. Us (Valley), Fairdale and Southern were probably the worse. I think they probably called in the National Guard. I can’t remember that. We had to stick together with our own. Black girls were getting jumped in the restroom by White girls. It’s just a shame because they get these thoughts in their heads from their parents, and it just trickled down.”

Academic and Social Barriers and Teacher-Bias

Participant Benevolent reporting of teacher-student experiences is one that will be somewhat mirrored within the other participant's recollections. She remarked:

“Obviously it was different at Valley. When I think about it, we were in a place where nobody really cared. Counselors didn’t care. Teachers didn’t care. Students didn’t care. They were not accepting us.”
Being forced to learn in a situation where the people are supposed to influence you to be your best, but instead frame you in their negative image of you, had to be a trying experience. This experience that she recalled would be congruent with Wilkinson (1996). His article discussed the intricacies of the integration of African Americans into schools that had established racist cultures. Expecting White racist teachers to somehow immediately relinquish their racist behavior and attitudes towards African American students would be as if you expected an individual who fears crocodiles to jump into a swap and befriend the first one they see.

Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias

Information hoarding or non-sharing of pertinent information by teachers with culturally or racially different students was another phenomenon that the participants linked to estranged White-teacher Black-student relationships in the integrated schools. This practice was identified as a barrier to their academic opportunities and educational performance. While teachers and school officials are expected to share information regarding classes, extracurricular activities, and post-secondary opportunities with all students, this was not the study participants’ experience at the integrated schools.

Benevolent asserted that the classes that helped the most with post-graduation adult life were not the classes counselors willingly assigned African American students. Like the other participants, Benevolent alluded to exercising agency to academically survive and succeed. "Black students had to actively search to find those classes and opportunities for themselves.” The concept of hoarding materials is well-documented in studies such as
Lewis-McCoy (2014) on race, resources, and suburban schooling. They show that social group information sharing reflects their racial and economic characteristics.

*Teacher-Parent Bias*

What has been often overlooked by teachers and school administrators from integrated schools is the existence of numerous barriers associated with parental involvement. Resulting in teachers using their understanding of a race and labeling their biases as normalizations. When in actuality, they should recognize that their vision of normalized behavior is based upon their personal life experiences. Lacking the ability to see beyond their normalized behavior speaks to the primal existence of bias and disproportionate teaching practices.

Since busing to integrate Louisville schools was forced upon the community in order to receive federal education funding, information shared with the community was provided on a "need to know" basis. This process excluded African American families and neighborhoods from necessary information, which could have better equipped their children for the coming educational experiences. For example, the participants mentioned that they did not know they were being bused until a few weeks before school was to start. Most likely, their parents may not have known about the coming changes early enough to adjust their living and work schedules to be as involved with their child's education, especially since the schools were now located outside their neighborhood.

Thus, lack of transportation, knowledge of the new school location, and/or scheduling limitations impacting reaching the new school may have dampened parental engagement by parents from the West End with their child's integrated-school teachers or
officials. Lack of parental involvement is often the reason teachers associate a child's negative performance instead of them actually teaching that child (Lewis-McCoy, 2014). Negative performance includes low levels of participation in Parent-Teacher Association meetings. It was often the case that the parents' first time in their child’s new school neighborhood was when they took said child to view the new school prior to their first day.

Benevolent remarked:

“I was one of the few Black students going to Valley High school that actually got a chance to see the school before my first day. I can remember that long car ride still with my mother and father. I thought to myself.....this is too far from home......how can my parents get here fast if I need them. Who can save me all the way out here.”

This was not the case for all of the African American students being bused to integrate. Benevolent was one of the kids whose parents had a car to do so.

Ms. D

Just as Benevolent above. Ms. D encountered some similar trauma, racism and violence. These experiences of this particular trauma, racism and violence are some things that may have never been encountered if Ms. D was not bused to integrate. Ms. D’s experience was not as harsh as others as she remembered below:

“Had I not come to form a school that had Whites and had my parents not told me how to deal with them, I’m not sure if I would have made it through Iroquois the way I did. Knowing that the situation would be tense due to their racism prepared me on how to deal with them.”
Experiencing academic and social barriers from busing and the integrated school system was the most common and pervasive theme that emerged from the interviews with the research participants. This was partly because although the integration of African Americans into White schools appeared to be a result of a seemingly thoughtful process by school districts, the planning process did not include the perspectives of African Americans. The impact of school integration on African American students entering White schools with teachers and school administrators from culturally different backgrounds located in strange and often racially hostile neighborhoods was not considered either. Therefore, it is not surprising the study participants identified teacher bias as a significant factor in their experiences in the integrated schools. Barriers arising from the students' relationship with White teachers and school officials have been well documented in prior research (Bates & Glick, 2013; Dee, 2004; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries, 2012).

Based on their sense of experiencing cultural aversion and stereotyping, the participants reflected on how isolated they felt from their White teachers. Ms. D interpreted the lack of teacher-student relationship as “not having a connection with the teacher.” She felt a significant difference between teacher-student relationships at her previous neighborhood school, which was somewhat mixed race, compared to the integrated school to which she was bused, Iroquois High School, predominantly White.

Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias

Ms. D recounted how information on college resources was not readily available to African American students in her integrated schools and that she had to aggressively seek
out that information. According to Ms. D, the White teachers and counselors she encountered “did not push that sort of information or knowledge to Black students.” While the information that was withheld from the participants was not the same in every case, all participants experienced some form of information that was prudent to their success being withheld.

The exclusion of Benevolent, Ms. D, and other African American students from information about their courses and other academic opportunities and resources could have resulted from White teacher bias toward the academic abilities of African American students (Lewis-McCoy, 2014). White teachers often associate a student's academic abilities with stereotypical characteristics associated with that student's race. The White teachers encountered by Benevolent and Ms. D are reflective of negative stereotypes associated with African Americans and their academic prowess. In doing so, these White teachers show their White superiority ideals outweigh their ability to correctly gauge and address each student where they are academically and teach them as such.

These examples of Information Hoarding and Curriculum bias thus far point to teacher-student bias that supported the withholding of important academic information and opportunities from African American students based on stereotypical assumptions of Black students’ educational abilities. However, there were other repercussions from this type of teacher bias, as Ms. D's experience showed. Ms. D, one of few African American students who attended a county school (Butler High School) before merging into an integrated city school (Iroquois High School), noted that the two systems operated under different curriculum guidelines and that those guidelines were not adjusted for African American students upon the merger.
“Once at Iroquois, I became aware that I was in fact two years ahead of the other 10th graders. I actually had enough credits to graduate upon arrival. The other Black students from the West End thought that I was being uppity, but I really just knew the material already. You would have thought that I would have been skipped or at least placed in higher-level classes.”

While Ms. D came from a school two years ahead of the school that she was placed into, the teachers in her new school still associated her abilities with her neighborhood location and its perception. The lack of consideration of the advantage that Ms. D possessed because of the curriculum difference and the adverse differential treatment that she received at Butler High School caused her to feel that her life chances would have indeed been better if she was never bused. Once again, Ms. D’s accounts could be linked to the possibility that teachers' negative perceptions of the academic abilities of students can be based on their residency in urban settings (West End of Louisville) and the assumed low income of the families who live there (Halvorsen, Lee & Andrade, 2008).

Teacher-Parent Bias

Ironically, both of Ms. D’s parents were college-educated and all but physically enrolled Ms. D in college by the time of her early adolescence. Her attendance at “a” college was suggested to her as mandatory upon graduation from secondary school by her parents. While the parents of other study participants did not have a college education, they alluded that positive parental involvement helped them overcome barriers in the school system. Fan et al. (2012) suggest that parental involvement does shape the perception that a student has of their education. Having parents who are positive reinforcements allows for a higher chance of that student succeeding in their educational
endeavors. On the other hand, parents with negative or inactive parental involvement can lead to a higher chance of students performing adversely in their educational journey.

Ms. D stated:

“My parents talked to me about college so much during my early years in school, that I figured everyone was suppose to. My time at Butler High before integration, there were other Black kids who felt the same way. Once I got to Iroquois High, I saw that was not the case at all. College may have one of the farthest thoughts on the minds of some of those other Black kids.”

Having teachers from different racial/ethnic backgrounds with preconceived notions on the abilities of the new African American students would only heighten the lack of interest in those kids' minds about college (Driessen, 2015). If the teachers saw their new African American students for who they were, their lack of interest may have turned into interest.

**Skip**

Participant Skip had little to say about any forms of racism or academic barriers he encountered while at Doss High school. He experienced more of a false sense of self (Fraser & Fisher, 1982). Due to his high accolades on the basketball court and the White teachers' understanding that they needed him to help the school win a title, they treated him as a high-performing student. In actuality, he was average at best. Skip stated:

“High school was fairly easy for me. Since I was a good ball player, the teachers really didn’t disturb me. None of the White kids on the team did either. It was just a little school work and then basketball.”

While Skip may not have experienced direct effects to the detriment of his education from the negative treatment of teachers, school staff, or students, they lack any educational motivation due to his athleticism in retrospect did affect him. During our
interview, you could almost see the despair in his eyes. There is no way of knowing if that special treatment that he received in high school is the culprit, but those occurrences of special treatment can be linked to his lack of drive and or disconnect that he related during his interview.

Academic and Social Barriers and Teacher-Bias

This isolation contributed to the participants' belief that they were not treated fairly, especially compared to their experiences in their prior Black neighborhood schools before busing. According to one of the participants, Skip, teachers at his integrated school (Doss High School) were not prepared for the influx of African American students. He noted the only time White teachers acknowledged African American students was if they had some affiliation with sports. Skip's astute observations speak to teachers' lack of professional development and understanding of the impact of racial transition in their schools. While Skip described the situation as one where teachers did not acknowledge African American students, Ms. D interpreted the same scenario as the White teachers lacking a connection to their African American students.

Below is the comment that Skip gave in regards to his feelings about teachers at Doss High:

“Most of the teachers at Doss were not ready for the influx of Black students. Some helped out, but most were not ready. Playing basketball allowed me to mix into school faster. Playing basketball, I was given different treatment, a lot of kids I knew were not that lucky.”

The lack of a teacher-student relationship between White teachers and African American students reported by Skip and Ms. D is congruent with prior studies on race and
the teacher-student relationship. For example, Dee’s (2004) research on teachers’ race and student achievement found that students have better academic success when paired with a teacher from the same race. This is not to say that achievement is not possible with a teacher of a different race, but rather that chances for that student having higher levels of achievement are more significant when the teacher is of the same race. The results of Dee's research and the participants' recount of their experiences suggest that the racial-cultural gap (connection) between the teacher and the student was essential to their achievement possibilities in the busing to integrate school project.

Bates and Glick (2013) conducted a similar study, looking at the combination of teacher and student ethnicities and their outcomes based on the same and different pairings of ethnicity with a teacher. Their study examined primary and secondary schools and used teacher evaluations of students attributing them to their possible educational outcomes. It was found that African American students with non-Hispanic White teachers received the most considerable portion of non-favorable assessments. They concluded that the same ethnicity matching of student and teacher-led to more subjective teacher evaluations than objective student outcomes. This contrasts with the lack of a teacher's ability to adjust or understand culturally different students, resulting in unfavorable treatment.

Because the study participants were enrolled in pre-and post-busing integrated school settings, they were qualified to make comparisons such as those in Dee's, Bate's, and Glick's studies. Having experience in both settings allowed the interviewees who participated in both settings to recount their experiences and explain the differences between expected and experienced.
Although the participants shared similar everyday experiences of navigating academic and social barriers at the integrated schools, variations existed. The participants noted that having specific personal characteristics did result in a different teacher-student relationship. Skip observed that if an African American student was an athlete, teachers and school officials did not ignore them. Skip was admitted to Doss High School on a full athletic scholarship (meaning his fees for participating in sports were waived) and played basketball for his integrated college after graduation. He, therefore, had a different experience from other non-athlete African American students and felt that his experiences at Doss prepared him for adulthood, though he never revealed whether he graduated from college.

*Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias*

 Again due to Skip’s special treatment, he did not express any barriers with his information holding or curriculum bias. He was very firm with his stance on not experiencing any negative treatment from the school staff, teachers, or peers. Skip remarked:

“*Beyond what I expressed about me fitting in due to basketball, I got help from my teachers, even when I may have not understood the work at first, they were willing to help me out.*”

One would think that Skip was in a different school district due to the praise and aid he received. The overwhelming difference can only be related to his prowess on the basketball court. Surely many other African American males that attended Doss High school were not receiving the same treatment.
Teacher-Parent Bias

Skip did not speak of nor want to answer any questions about his parents for reasons unknown. Once that was understood, those types of questions were not asked again.

Diva

Diva almost immediately begins the interview off with descriptions of the overtly racist treatment she remembered from high school:

“I am glad I get to do this, I have plenty of things to share about those racist motherfuckers at Ballard. From the school bus, staff, teachers, and students. From my entrance, you could tell they ain’t want us here. It was almost a cloud of hatred you could feel. Students, male and female always giving you these dirty looks, speaking clearly and under their breath at you all the time it felt like.”

Diva’s remarks describe a racist school culture and climate (Wilkinson, 1996). Too, while Michael and Marri (2010) discuss school racial climates from a K-8 perspective, the totality of the brief description given by Diva allows you to see that those racial climates seen in K-8 may very well be amplified in high school. By the age of high school, students are more likely to fully process the treatment they are experiencing and realize their assumptions of those behaviors against them are indeed, their facts. Diva continued:

“The experiences I had at Ballard were so bad, when I could I would go back to Central to see some of my old teachers. I figured, if they could somehow make me feel as good as I did while I was there, I could use some of that feeling while at Ballard. It would help for the moment, but once I walked back through those doors, it was over.”

Academic and Social Barriers and Teacher-Bias

Participant Diva, who was enrolled at the integrated Ballard High, shared Skip and Ms. D’s observations that “the teachers simply ignored you or acted as if you did not even exist,” She elaborated that “they did not even take our questions or listen to our concerns –
not even with a grain of salt.” Further, she felt that she had a very different teacher-student experience at her prior Black neighborhood school - Central High School. At Central, she remarked, "my teachers were very accessible before and after school, and Black students could talk with them, raise questions and concerns."

Prior research (Amodio & Devine, 2006; Cooper, 2003) suggests that African American students’ experiences of not being acknowledged or not feeling cared for in their interactions with their White teachers could have serious academic implications, including eventually not caring about school attendance and performance. Moreover, students internalize their teachers’ expectations of them and act accordingly. While the participants in this study did not report similar effects, they felt that the teacher-student relationship in the Black neighborhood schools was more academically encouraging. Diva believed that had she remained at Central High School (before busing), she would probably have been provided with a better educational experience and adult life preparation. She suggested that:

“The isolation she felt socially at integrated Ballard High School dampened not only her overall school experience but also impacted her social skills and relationships with individuals outside of her own cultural and social realms.”

Through further discussion with Diva in regards to the acceptance she did not see at Ballard High, she remarked:

“What do you think? That is what they use us for -- sports and entertainment. If they want to win in sports, music, or entertainment you gonna see us.”
This designation by her reflects what she saw while in high school and how she interprets the world around her now. While in high school, she was aware that differential treatment was given out to those who played sports and/or were in advance placement classes, but the rest of the African Americas were examined from a negative White superiority lens.

*Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias*

Diva’s clear understanding of the differential treatment she received at Ballard was very clear during the interview process. She remarked on her struggles with math and mentioned that she sought out help. Once the teacher decided that she was not going to help her, she looked for other options by trying to talk to her counselor:

“I tried to get the help with math that I needed. I knew I could do the work. After I was turned down by my teacher, I figured I should try and go ask the counselor. The counselor basically told me that it was up to the teacher to help and there was nothing they could do.”

Teachers failing to aid a student is one measure. When you have an individual who also needs to make sure the teachers are doing all they can to reject you as well, it lays a clear foundation for how you are seen in that environment (Ford & Harris, 1996). The student's perception of their environment is a reflection of their performance. Unwelcoming environments hinder a student's performance.
Teacher-Parent Bias

Even though teachers at the newly integrated school were aware that students were in a new system where their school was no longer in their neighborhood or close vicinity, the absence of parents in these racially-tense school environments was still perceived negatively and viewed as damaging to their children's educational success. Limited parental involvement is also used as a basis for negative perceptions, assessments, and dispositions of the African American students who potentially had psychological effects from busing (Agirdag et al., 2013).

Diva speaks to this sentiment:

“I was lucky, my father had always prepared me and my siblings as to how to deal with Whites. Though not all my siblings really heard what he was saying, I did. Not a lot of kids that I knew at that time had parents that gave them the honest truth as how to deal with Whites and their racism towards us kids. I can only imagine what they must have thought when they were slapped in the face with racism as young as we were.”

Diva's statement speaks directly to a simple form of parental involvement. The sheer act of a parent having to equip their child with the emotional support and knowledge necessary to address their educational surroundings. Most of Diva’s peers had parents who did not fully prepare them for busing. However, the parents of the students in the hyper-segregated West End of Louisville also did not have much notice or decision-making powers about the busing-to-integrate project. Thus, they could not prepare their children socially and psychologically for their first year of busing and attending integrated schools.
Gohagan

Gohagan, similar to Skip, had very few racialized experiences while at Ballard. What sets his experience apart from Skip’s is that another one of the participants was attending Ballard while he was and had several racist or White superiority experiences. Gohagan was not an athlete, but rather he was in advanced placement courses. He saw his Blackness as a tool:

“I figured most of these white kids way out here at Ballard had probably never seen a Black kid before except from maybe the new or heard something about us from their parents or other family members. I tried to do my best while I was there. I didn’t want them to get the wrong idea about me.”

Gohagan chose to attempt to use his Blackness to break barriers or change perceptions Whites held of African Americans. He felt as if he could relate the happiness, confidence, and educational prowess he had for himself to others that somehow they too would eventually see him as that also (Greenwald & Banaji, 1993).

Academic and Social Barriers and Teacher-Bias

Interviewee Gohagan attended Ballard High School at the same time as Diva. Though they were at the same school simultaneously, their experiences were completely different. Gohagan shared a similar experience to Skip. He asserted the differential treatment he received was due to his designation in the advanced placement program. The teachers that he encountered, in his eyes, believed in him and valued his academic prowess. Gohagan came from a junior high school with students of different races, African Americans and Whites of the same low socio-economic class. He felt that he was accepted faster at his new integrated school because of his prior exposure to students of a different
race and because he was in a class with students of the same “educational prowess,” that is, in an honors program. Gohagan further theorized that Ballard High School allowed for “non-homogenous” behavior, thus alleviating the possibility of him being regarded as “too hood”.

Gohagan dropped out of school and acquired a GED, but he regarded Ballard High School's educational experience as better than what he could have received at Central High School. He accredits that to him potentially being “too hood” if he went to Central. With Central being in the West End, Gohagan felt the homogeneity of the students' social dynamics at Central would have allotted him more "Hood" like characteristics. As Fraser & Fisher (1982) argue, this is probably because a psychosocial- classroom- experience focus rather than a student focus is a better prediction of higher student outcomes. With Gohagan being in advanced placement classes, his classroom is already optimized as offering him a better experience. In honors classes, teachers usually have higher credentials than those in regular classes. Besides, Gohagan’s teacher focused on furthering his academic progress at the same pace as the White honors students. Further, she did not reprimand him based on African American stereotyping, and his performance was not linked to his race and residence.

Speybroeck et al. (2012) spoke of teacher expectations based upon socio-economic status (SES). Coded within the language of SES is the assumption that SES relates to capabilities. Therefore, it can be argued that the interviewees' teachers correlated their capabilities with their supposed SES. When the teachers saw students in their newly integrated honor roll classes, unknowingly, they accepted the student based on their assumed academic abilities. They accepted them as not one of those poor African
American students from the West End, but rather a student who indeed must have been from a family of some economic stature. Students not in the honors classes were lumped into the stereotype of coming from low-income families and therefore did not possess the educational abilities or values. Therefore, Gohagan said:

“I can honestly say I only experienced racist attitudes from one person. Being in honor roll classes, the teachers were pretty cool. The students, the kids and teachers you know, left to their open devices were more flexible, less rigid, more accepting.”

Experiences such as Gohagan’s did not go unnoticed as some of the other participants noted that some African American students received better treatment and/or were accepted faster than others. The general belief was that for African American students to be accepted, they had to be "special", not so much in the honors program but more so in athleticism.

*Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias*

Due to Gohagan being in advance placement courses, he did not express any feelings or experiences where he felt information was withheld from him or that changes were made to his curriculum:

“Being in advance placement courses, I can honestly say that I felt as one with the white students that I was around. I was almost as if I was like the token Black kid, I was the only one, at least in my grade level. If there were others I didn’t see them. I got the same opportunities as anybody else in my class did.”

While Gohagan expressed that he did not receive any differential treatment from his classmates and referenced tokenism, his perception could be a false sense of self, there could have been room for him to discuss the differential treatment and curriculum between
him and his fellow African Americans that were not in advance placement; maybe he
turned a blind eye to the effect it had on others and was just happy to be there.

Teacher-Parent Bias

Gohagan still believes that he encountered no impartial treatment, nor did he speak
of any teachers reacting differently to him due to the lack of in-school parental
involvement. Cooper et al. (2009) may suggest that his presence within the advanced
placement program solidified in the minds of the teachers that he must have some form of
heavy parent involvement at least at home. Gohagan asserted that:

“Being the youngest of eight, all of my brothers and sisters before me went to
college, it was expected for me to do the same. Though my parents may not have
reached high school, they knew the importance of education and instilled it in all
of us. My father never owned a car and my mother never worked after having all
of us. I don’t think they would have been able to get to the school if they needed to.
None of the teachers ever asked where my parents were, I guessed they just assumed
they did a good job and didn’t need to be there. Other kids’ parents would show up
from time to time, but it was never an issue with how I was treated.”

Based on Gohagan’s description, it is evident that he did have heavy parent involvement
at home. Many of the participants also claimed to have that level of parental involvement
at home. Usually, parental involvement is examined by teachers through levels of seeable
involvement (Cooper, 2010; Cooper et al., 2009), which was the case for the rest of the
participants. Gohagan's parental involvement seems to be assumed based on him being in
advanced placement classes.
Gloria

Gloria had several different adversities that she went through while at Butler High school. Similar to the rest of the female participants, she recalled several encounters with teachers and students as her years there progressed:

“Teachers would purposefully not call on us when we had our hands raised. There were several times that we would get in trouble for things the white students had done. Back then they would allow kids to smoke on school grounds but not in the building or real close to it. Once we were outside close to the building and a white girl came out of the building smoking. As a staff member came out behind them, knowing they saw them smoking, they saw us by the door and blamed the smoke on us. We had to go to the principal’s office and were reprimanded. Another time a friend and I were in the bathroom. While we were in there a white girl was smoking in a stall. A staff member came in and pulled us out for smoking while the white girl was still smoking in the bathroom.”

Experiences such as these showed Gloria that there are different discipline rules depending on what race you are in school (Okonofua, 2015). Leaving her to understand that her skin color made her guilty even when the evidence was not against her favor. Situations like this also allowed her to build up microaggressions based on the multitude of these microtransactions (Mameli, 2014).

Academic and Social Barriers and Teacher Bias

While Gloria detailed various disciplinary actions that aided her to allude to the conclusion of disproportionate treatment, there were also instances that occurred in the classroom that further pushed her understanding of the effects of her schooling situation:

“I can remember on two occasions in class where the teacher openly gave out grades that the Black students did not deserve. I am not sure what the book was, but we all had to read the book and give oral reports on the book in front of the class. I know I practiced and practiced at home and with a Black friend of mine that was in the class. When it was time we were ready to present. Not only did
the teacher make us go last, but we had the best oral presentations in the class. You could tell that these white kids were just speaking as if they read a few pages and didn’t even practice. Once the grades were given out, my Black friend and I got C’s and the white kids that were unprepared got B’s or A’s.”

Gloria provided a perfect example of the results of racial discrimination in school. In the case that she described, this form of racial discrimination directly leads to the potential racial disparities in the grades received (Mickelson, 2003). Though a stark difference was explained in the quality of the oral reports given, the White teacher decided to grade the White kids higher while the Black students were the ones that prevailed on the assignment.

Information Hoarding and Curriculum Bias

Gloria did not directly speak to hoarding of academic information or bias in what was taught. However, she did speak on the hoarding and bias associated with extracurricular activities. While extracurricular activities are not necessarily academic-related when a student is partaking in them, there are beneficial when attached to college applications. Gloria explained:

“There were two instances in high school that several Black girls and myself had to fight to be allowed to be on the team. The first I can recall was to be on the track team. They openly said we were not welcome. Another time it was to be in the marching band. Same response for that too. Now while I was not interested, some of my Black girlfriends wanted to be on the cheerleading team. With that, they would only allow them to be on JV and not varsity, at least not at first. The sad part is that each of these times did not happen all at once. They happened over a matter of months or different school years. Each time, our parents came to the school and fought for us to partake in the various teams. Each time after our parents showed up they gave in, why not just let us in without them having to come out.”
Gloria provided yet another example of a White superiority school system in action shortly after busing to integrate in Louisville, KY. It would be easier to understand if the school staff members who told the students no still acted the same way when the parents came. However, to purposefully tell your students they can not do something seems an attempt to break the students' perception of their school situation down and force them to negatively associate with their school (Decker, Dona & Christenson, 2007; Speybroeck et al., 2012).

Teacher-Parent Bias

The same excerpt used above can refer to Gloria and her example of teacher-parent bias. While teachers associate parental involvement they can see at school as a good interaction, there are also parents whom they associate as negative parental involvement. Parents that come to school and force, push or go against what the school is trying to do are labeled as bad parents and seen to have negative parental involvement (Fan et al., 2012).

Psychological Impacts

The psychological impacts of integrated schools on the bused African American students were never considered in the busing plans. The African American students bused to integrated schools were of a different race than their new teachers and the demographics of the neighborhoods to which they were bused. The busing project architects, including the school board, never addressed the psychological and cultural impacts that this would have on the students bused. In contrast, prior research and the study participants
interviewed stress the psychological effects of attending schools in hostile neighborhoods with teachers, staff, administrators and students who resented their presence on their educational experiences and achievements.

**Benevolent**

Benevolent, as the other participants showed a wide variety of emotions when describing their experiences at their high schools. Several times during the interview, she began to weep. Once such occasion:

“I can remember the violence that we saw on the way into school, but I didn’t expect to see that on the inside too. Having racist parents is one thing, I didn’t understand then how easy it is for ones child to follow their parents even if its based on lies. But, once we begin to see that violence in the school was a whole nother issue. After one Black girl got jumped in the bathroom, it was no longer safe to go by ourself. We had to travel in numbers just to make sure we could make it out.”

Benevolent’s depiction may be hard to understand, but the level of violence, hatred, racism and general White superiority ideals young students possess are taught to them (King, 2015; Rothstein, 2000). The combination of false ideals being taught to you by an individual you hold in favor and trust is guaranteed to perpetuate to result in the mindset of the one you hold in favor. This is potentially the combination that these White students committing these violent acts were following.

**Self-Bias**

Benevolent did not openly admit to having any self-bias. Nevertheless, she recalled an instance that potentially revealed some level of self-bias that she internalized:
“My favorite class that I had was my typing class, I don’t know if it was because I liked typing or if it was because my new White girlfriend was in the class. Maybe it was both. I knew that typing would help me with a career after high school. The White kids in the class were able to get intern positions after they finished the course work. I didn’t really bother me though. My White girlfriend in the class got an intern position………..That same White friend would have sleepovers. Her mom told her that I could never come to her parties because she didn’t want me in her house. We remained friends though. Our second year there her sister passed. I wanted to come to the funeral but her mom said no again so I had my parents send some flowers…..Her and I are still friends to this day. Just last year when her husband and her were in a bad spot my husband and I brought them back here and put them up till they got back on their feet.”

While that detailed account from Benevolent may not seem like self-bias on the surface, we must untangle what she described. First, her White friend was allotted the ability to receive an internship from a class they shared, while she was not given a chance to do so. Even though she knew the class was important, an internship would have helped her career more. Then she attempted to attend a slumber party knowing the friend's mom would not accept her. Still, she never questioned how she could be friends with someone who has two starkly different home lifestyles. Then her friend's sister passes, and she can not attend the funeral. Still, she continues to move forward with the friendship to current times and invites the friend to her marital home once she falls into bad times. After internalizing the negative treatment Benevolent received, it is possible to assert that she believed that is how it was supposed to be and that she accepted the spot that was given to her (Agirdag et al., 2013).
Ms. D

Ms. D explained that her own neighborhood school environment before busing lifted her psychological morale. She stated it was “an all-day, everyday experience.” She would see her teachers, principal, and other school staff before and after school since they lived in the same community, and frequented the same retail spaces and churches that she did. Because of this close contact, Ms. D felt a need to perform to the high standards expected of her by her neighborhood full of same-race teachers and school principal. She acted that way in and out of school.

“Versus before busing, schools were truly about community. I mean -- your teachers, your principals, your pastors -- you know you lived, worked, and were educated together. So, the benefit was I have lived in the neighborhood where my school was. I walked to school. My principal lived in my neighborhood. My teachers lived in the neighborhood. The teacher’s assistants lived in the neighborhood. It was nothing for me to see them after school throughout the whole week.”

Stories like those of Ms. D are not often heard but are important to understanding the significance of African American children being educated in community-based schools. Morris (2001) recorded feedback from African American teachers who lost their jobs when schools were integrated to explain neighborhood schools' socio-psychological and cultural importance. The teachers in Morris’s study warned that African American children would not perform well if taken out of their neighborhood school environment. As Black teachers, they understood that White teachers and school officials would not, and could not, teach, assess, and mentor Black students in the same manner that they did in the segregated school system. They spoke of the importance of strong teacher-student relationships and the impact of the lack of care that African American students would feel from White teachers in the new integrated school environment. Their analysis and the
experiences relayed by the study participants suggest that the integration of schools was not a well-thought-out structural change.

_Self-bias_

Ms. D did not express any self-bias that she internalized. She did talk about the self-bias that other African American students had towards her once she got to Iroquois:

“Coming from Butler I had no idea that the kids from the city schools would be at different levels than I was. They all thought I was uppity because I knew the material. After they saw that I was just like them after a while the teasing pretty much stopped”

What Ms. D explained is a two-prong problem. On the one hand, you have African American students who have somehow accepted that the level of their educational knowledge is what solidifies them as being African American. On the other hand, the same African Americans are downing another one for being more astute educational-wise than them (Tyson, 2011).

_Skip_

Interestingly, while the study participants lamented about neighborhood schooling changes, not all felt that student performance could be linked to this change. For example, although participant Skip suggested that his educational experience would have been better if he had been able to stay at DuPont Manual and not been bused to Doss High School, he did not directly link his academic performance to the school's racial make-up or community-school environment. Instead, Skip believed his fellow African American students who were bused suffered because they did not try hard enough.
**Self-Bias**

While Skip's remarks were valid from his experience, his questioning of African American students not faring well reflects the arguments made by some researchers about internalized behavior emanating from teacher-biased expectations of culturally different and racialized students. Greenwald & Banaji's (1993) research reveals how individuals' priming based on certain stereotypes or biases expressed towards them influences them to display those same stereotypes. Based on their conclusion, one can assume that the negative experience or inability to cope can potentially be the culprit explaining why certain students did not, as study participant Skip put it, “try hard enough”. Experiencing adverse treatment from individuals who were supposed to care can cause some to display a negative perception and self-display.

**Diva**

From the experiences that Diva discussed during her interview, I think the biggest psychological impact she took away was a deep understanding of the White superiority mindset:

“If Ballard didn’t teach me nothing, it definitely taught me how to deal with white people. From seeing how they completely disregarded me and the other Blacks, how they looked over us, and how they mistreated us, anytime a white person act like that on my job I have to check them. Plus, just because one of them speaks to me don’t mean I owe them a response, who are they.”

While Diva’s comments could be taken as some form of animosity, it is the result of the differential treatment she was subjected to the inside of a school that operated through White superiority ideals.
Self-Bias

While the study participants did not express self-hate, they all reported deep emotional and psychological effects from their experiences of being bused to integrated schools. Their responses were scattered with tears, weary voices, anger, and verbal expressions of pain. Participant Diva lamented:

“I really wasn’t doing well in math and knew I could do better. But you couldn’t even ask the math teacher. She looked at you like you were dirt, oh Lord! She was the only one who did that, who left that lasting impression. I can never forget this woman’s face. It made you feel...I’ll take whatever grade I get in that. I’ll just take that C!”

Diva’s response reflects the psychological trauma that Brown (1992) alluded to and suggests that more attention needed to be paid to the potential psychological damage of integration. According to Brown, integration brought African American kids into Whites’ schools with the likelihood that Whites would feel that their freedom and space were being violated. The psychological effect expressed by Diva is yet another example of how the enrollment of African Americans into White schools was felt, interpreted, and acted upon by White teachers and school staff. The constant exposure by an individual to low expectations can lead to internalized negative expectations that can limit scholarly achievements (Agirdag et al., 2013; Greenwald & Banaji, 1993). The negative experiences and impact on the African American students who were forced into school integration with unprepared and unaccepting teachers and school officials were also fueled by White backlash from Louisville’s White racist community and groups.
Physical Barriers: Buses & Bus Drivers

The interviews revealed that the African American students bused also faced physical barriers that impacted their socio-psychological experiences in integrated schools outside their neighborhoods. They explained that the lack of transportation to and from after-school events prevented them from socializing at the school and developing relationships with other students and school officials. Architects and advocates for the busing project did not consider that their homes and schools' distance would limit African American students’ engagement in after-school extracurricular activities.

An unintended finding from the interviews was bus drivers' role in African American students' bused experience. The contempt that bus drivers had for the racially and culturally different bused students went unnoticed by the administration but not by the African American students. Diva recapped how her experience with a White bus driver affected her for life:

“If it (the bus) got too loud, she would stop and get a bible out. She would start preaching. We already had religion forced on us from slavery...then they want to keep forcing us because they don’t understand who we are. She was not from the same background as us. That was another thing that made me unable to wait to get out of high school.”

The school never addressed the veracity of the bus driver endangering students by stopping on the highway or when they expressed their White ideals through religious propaganda. The school's lack of reprimand to the bus driver potentially served to further damage that was done by the driver of the students. If the school had even attempted to address the situation, some faith might have been restored towards accepting that school of African American students who experienced it.
**Gohagan**

*Self-bias*

Gohagan’s psychological impact was very different from the other participants on the surface, but underneath, all of them had lasting effects due to their busing to integrate experience. While he referred to his experience at Ballard High school as more preferable to his potential experience at Central High school, he still chooses to drop out of high school and acquire a GED. The mind wonders exactly what drove him to make such a decision. It was possible for only a handful of West End students during that first year of 1975-1976 busing to integrate that was an advanced placement student. He claims to have enjoyed his time at Ballard High but still left the school without finishing. He may have failed to reach the potential of his to be a self-fulfilling prophecy of reaching his potential as an advance placement student (Agirdag et al., 2013), proclaiming to not want to be “TOO HOOD” but yet desiring it (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995) or maybe he was actually mentally beat down from dealing with microaggression within White superiority ran High school while in advance placement classes (Wilkinson, 1996).

**Gloria**

Gloria’s impact from busing placed a lasting effect on her. During her interview, she informed me of a connection that she still has with her graduating class:

"You know, even today.....I think as close as last year on our suppose to be 40th-year high school reunion, they still have segregated reunion parties. None of the whites that graduated in my class have ever reached out to invite any of us to they class reunions."

Gloria still has to deal with what happened with the busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky. Still, after 40 years, the animosity and disdain developed during those years of
early integration would cause them to want to revert to the way things were just a year before that first class of 1975-1796. Actions such as these can be used to understand the psychological mind frame of the teachers that taught those freshly integrated African Americans into a once all-White school space. The teachers' products, the ones they taught prior to integration, were their students. While those teachers had those all White classrooms in the years before busing to integrate, they never fully broke through to those kids about the possibilities of integration. If they accomplished that task, those students would not still have segregated reunion parties 40 years of graduation.

So with Gloria, I believe that still really bothers her. To continue to understand that over half your classmates were instilled with White superiority ideals and complexes.

*Physical Barriers: Buses & Bus Drivers*

Along with Diva, Gloria also reported that White bus drivers' interactions had a negative and sometimes traumatic impact on their memories and experiences. The experience she had was the only one of its sort from the participants. Gloria explained:

“They took our school bus. The bus driver said he wasn’t coming to pick us up. It was gone ten days. Ten days – we had to get a way to school for ten school days. I guess till they found somebody to replace him. But he blatantly would not pick us up. In fact, he came to our stop and drove past us, and the school had no response – just that we had to get there and back on our own”

Diva and Gloria's experiences were depictions of implicit bias and racism by district/government-employed bus drivers that did not receive anti-racism institutional responses. McConahay (1982) confirms that the prevalence of such racialized attitudes did exist in Louisville at the time of busing. His article asserts that individual racism and bias grew when the idea of busing was introduced, and Whites rallied around anti-busing.
Whites in Louisville were openly against busing and did everything to prevent it. Bus drivers that were part of the busing-to-integrate project were not exempt from these racist sentiments. The lack of action by Butler High School when Gloria's bus was taken off line, and Diva's account of the bus driver's deliberate anti-Black behavior can be seen as indicative of institutional support of racism. Overall, when presented with the opportunity to take institutional measures to address how teachers, staff, and bus drivers treated the African American students, the schools and the district instead supported White racialized norms and discriminatory actions.

Wilkinson's (1996) "Integration Dilemmas in a Racist Culture" looks at the ramifications of forced integration similar to what occurred in Louisville. Her findings were gathered from observations and first-hand experiences of African American teachers. She found the assertion that integration was a benefactor of the social association was a myth because the public education system is an institution of a racist American society with a racist modus operandi in which Black students and parents navigate.

**Agency and Resistance**

Too often, the experiences of individuals marginalized by oppressive and discriminatory forces are told in a way that depicts them as helpless victims, powerless and passive. The six study participants' perspectives, observations, analysis, and recollections serve as examples that this image could not be further from the truth. Participants in this research gave numerous cases where they had to exercise personal agency to resist and navigate busing conditions and attend integrated schools outside their neighborhoods. Throughout the many conversations, the participants were adamant that they were keenly
aware that their educational outcomes were in their hands. Their actions and personal agency were the only options to survive as young people in unfamiliar, isolated, and hostile environments and succeeded in their education and post-secondary life chances.

Although ripped away from their neighborhoods and with parents now distanced from their schools and teachers, the participants identified parents' role as important in helping them negotiate their circumstances. The parents' position to aid their youth was through the installation of knowledge and agency instilled within their home setting.

From the discussion earlier in this chapter surrounding participant socialization variation, a link can now be made to agency. The three categories stated earlier. (1) neighborhood, (2) Family, and (3) self morph into (1) “good school” / “good neighborhood”, (2) parental involvement, and (3) internal power. Participants Ms. D and Diva fit within agency category (1) “good school” / “Good neighborhood”. Both of these individuals proclaimed how their experience with education before being bused showed them that education and their experienced while being educated should reflect one that is accepting. They both based their source of power to overcome and fight through their harsh busing to integrate experience on their communal school experience in a segregated public school system. They drew from the love, acceptance, and understanding they felt at their segregated school as a power to deal with the disparities within their integrated schools. While they spoke of other forms of agency they used while being bused to integrate, they both asserted that their previous experience showed them school should be a place of acceptance, which they did not feel at their integrated school.

Participants Benevolent and Gloria associated their true source of agency with that of (2) parental involvement. These participants proclaimed that the knowledge,
information and socialization they received at home allowed them to navigate through their disproportionate experiences while being bused to integrate. The participants who proclaimed these to be their main mode of agency spoke of how the reassurance and self-esteem they received from their parents aided them with the ability to persevere through their integrated experiences.

Participants Skip, and Gohagan associated their source of agency with the power they felt within, (3) internal power. Unique to both of these participants from the remainder of the participants is the different levels of socialization they both were placed in once they were bused. Skip was a basketball star and Gohagan was in advanced placement sources. These two participants had individual earned accolades that separated them from the bulk of African American students within Louisville that were bused to integrate. The accomplishment of these individual accolades is plausible to suggest as the reasoning behind these individuals proclaiming their ability to overcome and push through their busing to integrate experience within their own internal power.

**Benevolent**

Benevolent recounted that her experience at the integrated Valley High would not have been similar to her neighborhood Shawnee High school's experience if her parents had not been as involved in her education. She attributed her academic success at the integrated school to parental involvement and her desire to achieve. Fan et al. (2012) suggest that student performance is based on parents' real and perceived involvement in their children. In Benevolent's case, positive parental involvement aided her with a strong sense of self-purpose and enabled her to utilize her agency to be unbeaten. Thus, she stated,
“triggered by my parents' encouragement, I knew that the choice to be successful was mine, and mine alone”.

Ms. D

During Ms. D’s interview process and through the description of her stories and encounters as a youth was and is a very confident woman. She frequently spoke during our interview process about her parents and what they instilled in her; she also spoke highly of her all-African American neighborhood school zone so to speak. One conversation she shared:

“I remember my school years in elementary, I saw my teachers every day of the week. They really didn’t have to get on me, my parents already had me. They let me know that I can go as far as I want to go, and how to get there.”

Gloria is giving credit to her parents for teaching her how to act in public and the seriousness you need to attach to your education. Gloria was at a county school prior to integration. Butler high school, which was mixed with Whites and African Americans. She and Gloria were there at the same time. So exceeded all of the roadblocks at Butler, and when she got to Iroquois, she had enough credits to graduate. The other African Americans she began to know once at Iroquois see her as “acting white” because she came off as very smart (Tyson, 2011). With the knowledge of her parents, she simply laughed off and became friends with them. Her parents instilled her with agency.
Skip

Skip seemed almost too lethargic to provide any actual moments of agency. His nonchalant demeanor almost seemed like I was doing a reverse interview for a job. His experiences were valid, but the conversation never got beyond a surface-level discussion. Maybe the connection was not there during the interview process for him to choose to share some of the memories he may choose to forget or that he highlights and holds the personal.

Diva

Participant Diva conveyed that her agency's strength stemmed from her desire to reject Ballard High School's negative experiences and not let them inform her decisions about her future. Moreover, Diva believed that her integrated Ballard High School experience provided helpful life skills for her adulthood because it taught her how to understand Whites' perceptions and their lack of understanding or acceptance of you as an equal. She gave the example of how the racism, isolation, and general indifference she experienced helped prepare her for life after high school in workplace relationships with Whites. Diva further expressed that enduring the absence or estranged relationships with the White school staff while in high school prompted her to make sure her work relationships with Whites after high school were just that -- work relationships.

The analyses by Diva of how her experiences with Whites at an early age prepared her for racial relationships as an adult have been addressed by Bobo (1993). His research on the expansion or newly developed group dynamics that busing to integrate established, concluded that integration did not have the intended effect of familiarizing Whites and African Americans but instead resulted in more significant adverse effects. In reality, Bobo
argues, busing and school integration strengthened intragroup relations among Whites to ostracize the other group (Blacks). Whites' unifying interest was the desire to oppose busing to racially integrate schools, keep communities segregated, and keep the city students out of their suburban neighborhoods.

**Gohagan**

Gohagan informed me that his parents were from the deep south. He also shared that they only had a grade school education. 7 out of 8 of their kids graduated from college, all of that withstanding. For his parents to raise their children that way, they had to instill a sense of pride from within. Not just about yourself, but also be willing to help those in need when you can. Gohagan shared a story that depicts that:

“My background living in Portland (a mix race poor community in West Louisville), I was used to dealing with racial slangs, we would throw them back and forth at each other all the time while we played outside and such. Once at Ballard I noticed this little white kid that kept getting picked on. I wasn’t the biggest kid by far, but I knew those other white kids in the advanced placement courses had probably never seen a Black dude before. So I approached them as they were picking on him and told em to stop. I guess they thought I was gonna beat them up or something. From that day forward, that little Jewish boy never got picked on again, and he and I became friends. It was crazy, the next day he came to school with two lunches his mom made. One for him and one for me. He told me his mom thanked me for what I did and wanted to show me. That was my first time tasting Lox’n Bagels, I think that helped me develop my love for different foods as well.”

Not only did Gohagan develop a friend due to his Blackness, but he was also able to use his Blackness in this new school as a tool to aid others.
Gloria

Participant Gloria also linked her agency as emanating from a parent. She frequently referred to her father as an instrumental figure in her education and that out of her three siblings, she was the only one who acted on the words of wisdom he provided. According to Gloria, her father insisted that if there was anything she wanted and someone kept her from it, she needed to push and fight for her desires.

“When we had issues with Blacks cheerleading, the students spoke up and our parents and everyone was out there. Look at me. If I had not taken the initiative to run track, be in the band, be in the drama club -- had I never made that.”

Gloria explained further that her “drive and ability to struggle through, knock down barriers, and do whatever she desired after high school was based on her racial experiences at the integrated high school.” The long bus drive from her home to school also created the space and opportunity for a plethora of Gloria's racist experiences. These racist experiences did not make Gloria passive or traumatized but instead gave her the tools to use when barraged with racism (see also Picca & Feagin, 2007). For example, after high school and while at the University of Kentucky Dental School, Gloria said that the skills and strength gained from resisting and navigating racism at her high school gave her the “gumption ammunition” to act when African American students were continuously looked over for co-op opportunities. Gloria also drew on the same life skills learned at the integrated Butler High School in her interactions with Whites who were prejudiced and/or who attempted to discriminate against others when she was a working professional. Although Gloria's harsh experiences at Butler High School may have been hard to muddle through, they aided her in developing the ability to navigate racist expressions and actions
performed on subtle and not-so-subtle frontstage spaces (see also Goffman, 1978; Picca & Feagin, 2007). These instances of agency described by the participants are only a bird’s eye view into the totality of possible forms of agency by African Americans who were bused across the country in an attempt to achieve educational, and racial harmony.

**Archival Research and Rationalizations of Decision Makers**

The 1975 court-ordered school integration policy through forced busing in Louisville, Kentucky, like other cities, saw massive resistance. Many, mainly White parents, opposed using school assignments and transportation to desegregate classrooms. Concerns about educational quality and freedom lead to forms of resistance, including violence, riots, and boycotts. Nevertheless, African American kids were bused from their urban West End Black neighborhoods to White suburban communities. How did this decision come about, and what issues were the key decision-makers who were the all-White members of the Jefferson County Public School (JCPS) Board deliberating? By using the archival notes from the Education Board meetings, this information was accessed and analyzed. The archival research findings revealed the influence of White anti-busing sentiments expressed by individuals on the board and the anti-school-integration organizations they allowed to be present while matters of integration were being discussed during Public School Board meetings. The findings from the archival materials corroborated the literature on the impact of White ideology and privilege in opposing school integration (King, 2015; Wilkinson, 1996; Williams & Land, 2006), but it also uncovered some of the nuances of the Busing Project that is not found in the literature or prior research.
Organizational Expression of White Backlash

Many of the Whites that showed up to oppose the busing project and school integration by race, social class and residency did belong to certain all-White neighborhoods in the city's suburbs. However, many were also members of all-White organizations or clubs that openly expressed their negative and hostile feelings associated with busing and integrating White schools in their neighborhoods. Members of the Jefferson County Public School Board came from these same neighborhoods, organizations and/or clubs. School Boards play an important role in setting the policies, goals and objectives for the district. They are expected to draw upon the community for a shared vision and develop standards and strategies to transform the vision into reality.

In 1975-1976, while there may have been additional school officials or teachers present at the School Board meetings, Louisville had an all-White Jefferson County Public School Board that held the power of voting on any policy or issue that arose during the board meetings. The members consisted of one White female and four White males: Roberta B. Tully (Board Chairwoman), Don M Randolph (Vice-Chairman), Orville R Miller, Earl J Hartlage, and Fred Pranneschmidt, Jr. The Board’s lack of diversity suggests that the White community’s shared vision was used to develop policies and strategies for the school district. The Board did, however, in many instances abide by federal government mandates. For example, a year after busing to integrate, the ground was broken to honor Chairwoman Roberta B. Tully with a school in her name. It is unsure if that school was constructed due to her service as an educator and public figure or as compensation for pressing forward with the federal mandate, which called for integrating the two school systems.
The archival research on the JCPS Board meeting notes reveals that anti-busing/anti-school integration groups were present and made their views heard at the Board meetings. The prevalence of White backlash discerned from the archival materials alludes to a sense of entitlement by the White communities, groups, and organizations. Using the search term "Black" I uncovered meeting notes from the Board on 04/22/1974, and there were some discussions on an article written by Mrs. Jones Fenton. The article appeared in the “Voice Jeffersonian” (a secondary newspaper from St. Matthews, Jefferson County, Kentucky) in which concerns about the Black/White ratio in schools were expressed. The article suggested that integration was one-sided and in favor of Blacks. The perspectives of Board members were exposed in the discussions that ensued as Mrs. Fenton suggested that "we" (Whites) of Jefferson County want equal rights too -- meaning they want to have their schools remain the way they (Whites) want them to be.

This position reflects White resistance to busing and their confused, resentful notion that somehow equal rights for African Americans result in unequal rights for Whites. Gillis (2010) used articles from the newspapers in Louisville, KY (Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times) from the 1975-1976 school year to examine multiple occurrences where White groups, clubs, organizations, and the general White public cried out to make sure their anti-busing voices were heard. The remarks from this particular board meeting are yet another example of Gillis's findings and represent evidence of Whites' collective memory and expressions of horror, hostility and resentment for school integration.

Rothstein (2000) describes this notion of "collective memory" as the continuance of an unfactual memory. However, it becomes a truth for those who repeatedly hear it because it is shared in a family or group setting, such as in the JCPS Board meetings. In
essence, although the African American schoolchildren were trying to get to school and acquire an education, the collective memory of the supposed negative ramifications of African Americans’ presence in White spaces was exaggerated within the mob mentality surrounding the decision on busing to integrate and infiltrated the all-White JCPS Board’s deliberations and discussions.

Evidence that Whites opposed bussing and school integration was also found in the archived minutes from the Public-School Board meetings held on 12/10 & 12/16/1974. The minutes uncovered a telegram sent by Mrs. Sue Connor and read by Mr. Tully (Board member) that revealed strong resistance to busing and school integration. Mrs. Connor was the president of Concerned Parents Incorporated, and the telegram read as follows:

“As President of Concerned Parents Incorporated, I speak for 6,000 members as of this morning. We demand that you appeal to the Supreme Court immediately to afford relief to all children in the City of Louisville and Jefferson County. No forced bussing now or August of 75-76. No merger. The choice is your responsibility. If you do not appeal then we must take other action.”

Sue Connor (12/10 & 12/16/1974 Board meeting Pg. 36)

The message is clear, the White parents of this organization had no intention of allowing their kids to be subjected to the integration of city and county school districts.

Another example is where Mrs. Ray Brewster (a member of Save Our Community Schools-SOCS, a segregationist organization) lamented that her group of Whites speaking out against integration had been unfairly criticized (Board meeting, 04/02/1975). Mrs. Brewster’s sentiment is consistent with that of White resentment towards integration and suggests some level of collective memory, as mentioned above. Wilkinson (1996) explains that attempts to integrate the public school within an extensive social system that subscribes
to a racist culture cannot be thoroughly made without any attempt to acknowledge, plan for, or break down the racist structure that surrounds the public school system. To even allow Whites to address their falsely formulated assumptions within the board's space responsible for protecting students and having the students' best interest at heart shows that the school system was not ready to step down or acknowledge that its’ system was steeped in racist rhetoric.

Using the search term “county” in the archival materials from the School Board meeting notes revealed several other examples where arguments were made against school integration by Whites. For instance, in the minutes of 04/22/1975, Professor Sedler, a Louisville post-secondary educator, claimed that the Supreme Court appeal filed by Jefferson County Schools was intended to protect an education policy. In actuality, the appeal was filed to challenge the court mandate as Professor Sedler was attempting to have the busing for integration policy overturned. In his view, it violated various education policies that existed at the time. Other community members in attendance at the same meeting shared the identical sentiment and spoke out rancorously opposing busing to bring Black students into their all-White schools and neighborhoods.

In Board meetings, it is a common practice to have open sessions or "in camera" and closed sessions. A careful reading of the school board meetings reveals that whenever the issue of busing, desegregation, or merger came up, there were some discussions and a vote on the measure followed immediately by a recess. It is somewhat intriguing as to why when sensitive issues of this nature were discussed and decisions made, there was a need to vacate the room and note-taking stopped. Either the recesses were just coincidental,
or there was a need for Board members to step outside of the room and discuss their true feelings and thoughts about the federal mandate for school integration in their districts.

Another "coincidental" pattern noted was the way names of board attendees were recorded in the minutes. There were two distinct archetypes used in recording the prefix of people's names. One archetype was one in which "Mr." and "Mrs." were used but only when the speaker was not supporting busing to integrate the school districts. For example, when a White woman from an openly segregationist organization was either present at the meetings or sent a telegram, her name was listed with the prefix "Mrs." followed by her husband's name. On the other hand, it was more common to use the given names without a prefix for anyone who did not openly oppose desegregation or supported the busing project for integrated schools. It was never mentioned in the minutes who the note taker or transcriber was-- or if multiple note-takers were present.

White Measures of Resistance

The School Board and the public school system in Louisville allowed Whites to openly and vehemently express their objections, and the Board accepted some of their suggested measures and acted upon them. For example, searching under the keyword “merger”, the minutes of the 05/20/1974 board meeting divulged that a community member, Mrs. Ed Womack of the League of Women Voters, reread a statement given at a previous meeting regarding what the “community” wanted to see in the integration plan stipulations. These were:

i. The flexibility of educational programs;

ii. Socio-economic integration;
iii. Promotion of citizen involvement and administrative responsiveness to citizens’ concerns;

iv. Administrative decentralization and local autonomy, and

v. Fiscal soundness, the efficient collecting of revenue from all available sources, and the efficient use of the money collected.

Based on this list of concerns, the community sought to give each school more autonomy on rules, influence regarding how money was collected to fund that school, influence regarding use of that money within the school, and a voice and direct influence concerning how their child's school would run. While the meeting minutes do not record a vote following Mrs. Womack's presentation, JCPS schools currently operate with some of these same demanded measures.

One of the measures used to advocate against school integration support was the collection and disposition of school funding. Today, while there are strict guidelines concerning minimum funding for schools in Kentucky, there is no limit for the maximum. Each school district typically funds its schools evenly based on state funding. Although it is expected that accumulated property tax should be used to fund schools equally throughout the district, JCPS has schools within its district that receive more funds because schools can control how it collects and distributes/allocates money. Disproportionate funding occurs throughout the JCPS district with state funding and property taxes from the district. Based on Baumann's (2017) explanation of how state money and property taxes are to be divided through the state, it is clear that the funding process for JCPS is inconsistent with state guidelines.
Due to the massive population and landmass of Jefferson County, some leeway is given regarding how property tax dollars are divided throughout the county's public schools that may be operating outside of the state's regulations. Fenwick (1998) discusses the use of property taxes to fund public education. While some may say that this practice is fair, Fenwick discusses property taxes to fund schools on both economic-scale sides, inferring that schools within economically deprived neighborhoods are offset and their students are undereducated compared to more economically stable schools within their district. Perhaps "community" members and or organizations such as the one Mrs. Ed Womack spoke for are still having their voice heard beyond the ability of the general public?

Embedded in the archived minutes of the JCPS Board was a description of the resistance of the bus drivers to the project. Although not elaborated, the notes of the meeting (in all of the ones acquired for the school year of 1974-1975) reported that a massive number of Jefferson County School District bus drivers were either quitting or retiring early. While there is no information in the minutes stating the literal reason for their demise, one can associate White outrage and backlash against traveling long distances into Black neighborhoods to transport African American students as possible reasons. This was made evident in the accounts of the former African American students in their interviews.

The common practice of voicing what one would suspect were antagonist views and aggression to busing outside the space where official notes were being recorded, showing respect by use of prefixes only to those who were against school integration, and the actions by bus drivers are only three examples of unintended observations from the archival research. These observations, nevertheless, spotlight the meaning behind specific
critical but overlooked characteristics around racial etiquette, agency and decision-making, including the power of those whose jobs are to simply document those decisions and discussions.

**White Support**

The archival materials also show that not all Whites or African Americans were against the busing project and school integration. A careful search through the archived School Board meeting minutes reveals some support for integrated schools. In the minutes of 04/22/1974, a student organization's perspectives within a racially mixed county school were found to advocate for public school integration. The students' message was from Seneca High School and was presented by Kate Cunningham, a board member of the Louisville Civil Liberties Union. Ms. Cunningham argued that students at Seneca (and others) did not have the opportunity to have their voices heard on busing to integrate. The notation referenced White students in agreement with busing to integrate. The voices that were not heard at the JCPS meetings were those of the African American students who were assigned to integrate schools and had to be bused.

This particular motion to allow the voices of White students from Seneca High School to speak had the chance to potentially persuade the board into understanding the views of the White students and not their own. The notion was simply voted on and added to the agenda for a future meeting. At the same meeting, the minutes reported that Lyman T. Johnson, an influential African American educator in desegregated Kentucky, also spoke. Johnson, at the time, was a retired Louisville public school teacher and gave a presentation in favor of busing to integrate schools based on the rationale that *every child*
should have an opportunity to develop. His statement was one full of hope for a smooth transition and an expectation that this new integrated school system would bring equal education to Louisville.

Additionally, there were sections of the Board minutes that simply did not openly oppose the busing project and school integration. For example, the board meeting minutes on 05/20/1974 regarding the integration plan were not exclusively supportive, but the minutes also did not display direct aggression against busing to integrate. Instead, the action taken was for Board members to support the Court's Order that the Jefferson County Board of Education, on May 13, 1974, was to implement "Plan C" for integration. The board made a special notation that "Plan C" directly correlated with U.S. District Court requirements and that "Plan A" and "Plan B" had been previously denied. Board meeting minutes of 11/25/1974 reported that the merger would occur and that the Louisville Board of Education (the inner-city African American school district within Jefferson County) had been formally notified that it would be joining the Jefferson County School District on or near January 15, 1975.

The Louisville Board of Education was allowed to take part in picking the new superintendent; however, the Jefferson County School District let it be known that regardless of the date the merger was to take place the Louisville School District would join the Jefferson County District. It was almost as if the merger was a consolidation and not an actual merger which would have allowed equal power rather than controlling power by one group. Brasington (1999), warned of these types of mergers suggesting that they were more of a “winner take all situation.” With the White-controlled Jefferson County School District holding all of the power, the Louisville School District would have to
succumb to the powers that be if they wanted to take part in the federally mandated merger. While the Federal court called for a complete merger or an absolute integration, the controlling Whites still choose to withhold and remain in power rather than share all the decision-making within the soon-to-be integrated school district. From the minutes, the concern focused on the impact of the merger on school officials and consolidation of power rather than on how the merger would affect the students.

In the same board meeting (11/25/1974), Mrs. Barbara Ballenger Smith, representing the Louisville Public Schools Assembly (LPSA), spoke of the effort and aid present within her organization to facilitate the merger and their support even after the merger was to take place. She stated that “we acknowledge your political posture, but we ask you to take cognizance of the needs of all the children of the community. We offer all our resources and enthusiastically look forward to working with you.” The organization, LPSA, was made up of representatives from neighborhood school boards and elected delegates from city schools. However, Brasington (1999) warned of the issues surrounding the consolidation of public goods, including school districts. The claim is rarely if ever has equal power-sharing existed when either of the consolidating institutions has to mix race or socio-economic classes. Both of these institutions were seeking the merger of different levels of socio-economic class and racialized individuals. Accordingly, the merger was most likely doomed to fail, based on the totality of the institutions' existing differentiations as they operated before their merger.

From the excerpts of the November 25, 1974 board meeting minutes, it appears the Louisville School District had several layers of bureaucracy, including layers at the neighborhood level and even additional elected representatives at the individual school
level. These levels do not currently exist, and they were not seen in the years immediately following the merger. This infers that the Jefferson County School District completely absolved the Louisville School district's whole bureaucratic structure. Board members now come from designated districts throughout Louisville, Kentucky. There is one representative per geographic district area. There is no longer a justified, multilevel connection to the community's needs beyond what one representative has to report to the Board. Also, that single representative's position on the board is established first by a public vote and is kept in place via the relationships they develop within the board. Perhaps a more inclusive board with members of all races and social classes would have better served the African American students residing in the City of Louisville who were bused.

Summary

The triangulation methodology findings give a comprehensive understanding of the physical representations and patterns as well as the rationalization behind busing, and the experience of busing and school integration by those directly impacted. GIS was used to map housing segregation, school resides, and disparity in education in the 1970s and in 21st century Louisville, Kentucky. The maps show that over the 40-plus years since the advent of busing, the City of Louisville has become more segregated than ever. Drawing on prior research, the implications of these demographics help explain school funding's financial ramifications on educational disparities based on race and social class. Thus, it seemed like a rational decision to bus students from their neighborhood schools in the city to integrated schools in the predominantly White suburbs as a means to address education disparity and improve social relations between African Americans and Whites. But the
decision to bus students to integrate schools was made by an all-White Jefferson County School Board amidst White rage in communities, organizations, and individuals.

The archival materials retrieved from the JCPS Board meetings showed that Board members did not widely support busing to integrate schools. Instead, there was commonly shared resistance to the concept. However, busing was implemented as recommended by the Federal government. This decision was void of African American input, and the African American students bused experienced negative academic, physical, social, and psychological impacts. Current data shows that busing did not result in closing the education achievement gap to the extent anticipated, nor have the educational opportunities, resources, and achievements for Louisville’s African American students been enhanced. The bused students reported that busing did not help improve race relations between African Americans and Whites; they did learn of tolerance rather than acceptance. Interviewee Benevolent has some memories that aligned with this sentiment:

“I had a close friend that was a White girl. I can remember when she would have sleepovers. Her mother knew we were close friends and would never let me attend. I can even remember her sister or another close relative that died while we were at Valley. Her mother wouldn’t even let me attend the services to give my condolences.”

Gohagan reported a similar example:

“There was this one White Jewish kid. He seemed to have gotten picked on long before I entered Ballard. The kids that picked on him saw me and him become friends so they left him alone. After the kid saw that I was like him and wanted humanism, we became friends. Before I knew it, his mom would send me a lunch to school along with his. That was my first time having lox and cream cheese.”

In sum, the GIS maps highlight what structural racism looks like in Louisville, the archival data speaks to the ideological racism held and allowed within JCPS during busing
to integrate, and the semi-structured interviews speak to the racial experiences of busing. Collectively, these research findings illustrate the power of structural racism and its intersectionality with social class on the education, life chances, and outcomes for low-income, urban African Americans who are often depicted as having no agency. The African American/Black epistemological research approach purposely seeks the lens and voices of the "other" to understand the human interactions that support and are supported by institutional racism as well as to understand the human interactions of those who resist. By adopting a non-Eurocentric lens, dialectical relationships between oppression and resistance emerge, and the vital role human agency plays in navigating, negotiating, and resisting human oppression can be seen.

**Contextual Analyses**

While the earlier sections in chapter 5 discussed each triangulation component separately, this section will provide a contextual analysis of all three components together. Each of the components serves to aid in the true picture of what was going in Louisville, Kentucky before and during and the effects of busing to integrate. While the open response interviews provide the center point of the analyses for this dissertation, a true understanding of what was unearth can only be realized through an in-depth contextual analysis of the intermixing of each of the three components.

**School Board Members Creating a Culture of Lack of Humanity**

Making this claim of a sense of humanity or lack thereof, it is necessary to situate the conversation surrounding the issues that various individuals stated would be the effect
of integration. Brown (1992) and Goodman (1972) discuss the potential psychological harm of integration. While Goodman (1972) was pre-1975-1976 busing to integrate Louisville, Kentucky, there was no consideration given as to how that would impact the integration process of its students. Bell (1980) would argue the lack of consideration is due to interest convergence. This suggests that those in power chose to allow the decision but needed to maintain their interest above all other interests. In this case, it was to maintain a White superiority school climate (Wilkinson, 1996). Through bypassing the direct needs of others when in a position to do so, one must ask, do they see the other as a person of humility. The lack of actions would suggest they do not.

Clear from the school board archival research results is a tale of an all-White school board who had no interest in fully attempting to integrate the county's two school systems. A whole year leading up to the busing to integrate, no discussion had the slightest chance at providing any fruitful analysis of what was to come. When individuals came to address the issue of integration, it was usually a white community member providing threats of what was to come. Never did the board members seek to address nor correct these threatful statements. When there is no rebuttal, there is compliance with what was said.

The lack of addressing or attempting to counter the White backlash allows one to assume the board members shared the same White superiority ideals. The board member's lack of humanity towards their African American students signifies the school system as a whole sharing these White superiority ideals (Wilkinson, 1996). The head of a system operating under White superiority ideals allows the members within that system to operate from those same ideals. Bolman and Deal (2003) and Northouse (2016) discuss various ways of leadership, both alluding that the heads of organizations affect the members within
that organization. The behaviors of the heads of organizations, beliefs, and ideals become
normalized and operationalized within the organization's members. The practice of the
school board not showing any empathy towards their incoming African American students
is something that was internalized throughout the school system.

The evidence of these ideals is clear within the discussion produced from the open
response interviews. Whether the participants reported their integrated school to be suiting
their needs or one that was un-suiting to their needs, all spoke of their perception of self-
related to the bias they felt from the teachers. Understanding a teacher's treatment of you
based on their biases leaves an effect on you. One may not be sure how to judge themselves
within an environment such as that (Pronin, E., Gilovich, T., & Ross, L., 2004). It is more
certain that an individual who experiences that dynamic of treatment versus self-worth will
develop issues with their self-esteem (Greenwald & Banji, 1995).

Resting on the idea that school board members created and allowed for a culture
filled with the lack of humanity for the “other” can be dissected in numerous ways. Griffin
(2004) suggests that Whites experience racial injustice or social justice movements of
African Americans, and others are situated within their ideals. It is logical to suggest that
a White teacher raised in a society engulfed in White superiority ideals and then working
in a job that upholds those same ideals is more likely to assume their approach to changing
that environment is the right approach.

Picower (2009) examined how White teachers from the South expressed their
concerns about teaching African Americans from various socio-economic groups. The
participants consistently spoke of how they got a sense of being unwanted at their
integrated schools, how they were not treated with humanity, or how their teachers would
simply give them diverse treatment. There was some level of discretion or biases expressed
by those White teachers in all instances. Even the teachers who felt as if they could do
some good with their soon to be African Americans students, their lack of previous
understanding and exposure to African American culture combined with their learned
White superiority ideals disabled them to have a humanistic approach to teaching.

Carter (2003) would go a step further and suggest this differential treatment is based
on the Whites' understanding of dominant and non-dominant cultural capital. Due to the
school board's lack of teacher training prior to integration, the teachers were allowed to
carry in the ideals of their dominance over African Americans during that first year of
busing to integrate in the 1975-1976 school year. Teachers assumed that their incoming
African Americans students who came from the West End of Louisville; a neighborhood
environment label was immediately attached to them. That label was that of non-dominant
cultural capital. That label also allowed the teachers to justify the treatment of their new
African American students. Look at Ms. D’s story; she came to her newly integrated high
school with enough credits to graduate and was still treated by her new White teachers as
inapt.

Segregation and Student Treatment

Segregation in America was developed under the assumption that African
Americans were subpar and did not deserve to live in the same space as Whites. To develop
and enact these White superiority ideals laws, regulations and justifications were developed
(Pearcy, 2015; Seguin et al., 2016). Louisville was not exempt from these notions of
residential segregation (Wright, 1980). Residential segregation was and is multi-leveled, comprised of social, economic, privilege, and education.

The social component predicts whom one socializes with, what social knowledge is gained, and how one is examined socially based on their location. From figure 1., it is obvious that Louisville, Kentucky, at the time of busing to integrate was full of several different highly condensed pockets of African Americans, mostly relegated to one portion of the city. With segregation having numerous components, the socialization of those segregated African Americans within the West End was fairly similar. Along with socialization within those segregated communities, Whites who lived in their own segregated communities looked upon all who inhabited those African American spaces as the same. Enabling them to treat all and think of all within those segregated African American spaces as the same.

Economic segregation based on residential segregation revolves around the ideal of spatial mismatch. Spatial mismatch details how public goods such as jobs, schools, and other resources are taken out of the urban cores and sent to the periphery of cities (Anas et al., 1998). As Anas et al. (1998) discuss, spatial mismatch occurred during White flight from certain neighborhoods. As whites left the urban cores of large metropolises, the economic resources, including funds for schools, were transferred to the schools or used to build new ones in the periphery of cities where the whites settled. The fear of integrated neighborhoods and the desire to remain racially segregated fueled the establishment of new “White societies” and simultaneously snuffed the economic support for schools in what became African American inner-city neighborhoods. This spatial mismatch based on an
ideology of White superiority and preferences were supported by the country’s constitutional law and regulations and seen as justifiable and natural.

Along with pulling out funding for school, jobs were also taken out. Spatial mismatch allows for the examination of deindustrialization. Urban cores, highly populated or in close proximity to African American populations, were once full of suitable factory jobs. Pulling those types of jobs away from the access of African Americans caused huge despair in financial access. Whites, seeing these changes in African American populations, attached to them the association of poverty (Galster & Carr, 1991; Gorski, 2008). This association allowed them to label their African Americans suspected poverty as a suspected lack of knowledge or ability to learn.

This idea of privilege is somewhat heightened due to what happens to African Americans under spatial mismatch. Not only are Whites taught and allowed to believe that their ideals are truth and facts (Griffin, 2004; Picower, 2009), the social apparatus of America provide parameters to aid that perception. With spatial mismatch, the sources taken out of the urban core are transferred to the periphery of cities (Anas et al., 1998). In doing so, one can develop a preference that can cause them to think these resources are here because I deserve them or they are in their natural space. Developing a sense of privilege for those who can access those resources. In turn, those who do not have access to those resources are then looked down upon since they do not live in the “natural space” those resources exist in.

Education speaks out as the most damaging aspect of residential segregation. One who has a good education can potentially change their social status, change their socioeconomic status and acquire access to goods that would be life-changing. However,
through segregation, education has been used as a tool to under-educate, causing a cyclic effect of reproduction of an African American urban underclass (Fischer, Stockmayer, Stiles & Hout, 2004; Gotham, 1998; Massey & Denton, 1993). Residential segregation has been used as a tool to allow for unjust treatment. Regulations, laws, and policies were created to relegate African Americans into residential spaces. Then those residential spaces are systematically deprived of social aid, and economic development and begin to crumble. Once they begin to crumble, the African American inhabitants of that space are blamed for the condition, even though no assistance or ability to make changes within those communities was possible.

Understanding these components of residential segregation allows for the connection of figure 1.’s context. The city of Louisville, Kentucky, was highly segregated at the time of busing to integrate. With that segregation comes these assumptions. It is more likely that the differential treatment the participants received was also due to the assumptions their White teachers placed on them due to their residential locals. Having teachers with various levels of bias associated with you purely on your place of residence can cause the differential treatment the participants discussed.

The participant's open response interviews allowed them to tell their stories in their own words, from their own stance. While the experiences they discussed were theirs, other African Americans who were part of integrations across the country may have similar experiences. The archival and GIS map allows one to not only see the system in which these participants were placed in, and their level of segregation within the city, it also allows you to understand the mindset of those teachers and school officials who did nothing to prepare for a landmark decision. Had the school officials taken their task to heart, these
instances of differential teacher and peer treatment may not have reached the levels they did. Professional development for the teacher on how to handle the situation of integration may have possibly yielded some knowledge to help the transition. Not to say that all of the collective memory of White teachers’ falsities being labeled as facts would decimate with one professional development, at least there would have been a documented effort from the school board to attempt to brunt the blow of bussing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The overall purpose of this dissertation was to examine the racial structures and ideologies that shaped neighborhood segregation, neighborhood stratification, support for and resistance to school integration, and efforts to achieve educational equity required as the result of federal court orders. These racial structures, ideologies, and their impact were investigated through an examination of relevant literature and by performing a case study of selected adults bused for the purpose of school integration in Louisville, Kentucky during the early 1970s. This dissertation examined racialized structures in terms of shared individual ideologies, which progressed into group policies and later city, state, and federal laws. As Leachman et al. (2018) suggest, in earlier parts of post-slavery American history, the individuals with the most monetary power were the ones controlling state laws and policies. Their discussion surrounding the creation of state tax systems beyond property tax details how individual ideals become group ideals, and then those ideals can lead to governmental structural change, by examining the wealthy White landowners in several states, Leachman et al. (2018) detail how individuals with wealth can have their ideals forced on those without economic status. The state tax initiative Leachman et al. analyzed showed Whites’ unwillingness to pay the boatload of state taxes and their willingness to make those with less money pay the brunt of the state taxes.
As Atkinson (2006) details in his timeline of JCPS’ racialized school attendance thresholds, such thresholds changed over time, with a higher incentive for White students not to be in African American-dominated schools. This example shows how the Whites’ individual ideals turned into a shared group interest, with a resultant racialized attendance school population change. While the White parents of JCPS may not all hold economic weight, they hold the power of the vote within the city. Prior to the fiscal merger of Louisville, Kentucky with Jefferson County Kentucky, there were White district strongholds within the county whose votes counted when determining JCPS matters.

When Whites begin to leave the city’s urban core (White flight), the African Americans now residing in that core held the voting power over other city core interests. However, after the merger of the two governments, the voting power of African Americans that existed within the city was swallowed up through gerrymandering city districts, and the already existing White stronghold districts within the county now counted for city matters. In essence, the voting power (and some of their economic power) of the White parents within JCPS has allowed them to thrust their standards and values on the rest of the parents and JCPS students. The evidence presented within this dissertation show the ramifications of the power of the White vote in imposing their ideologies in the public school system in Louisville, Kentucky.

Grounding this research heavily within the realm of CRT, the findings are demonstrative of the tenets of CRT. For example, regarding tenet one that argues racism exists in every form and facet of society, the findings and discussions of the dissertation illustrated how racism in the form of group shared ideology was used to construct racist policies, laws, and regulations in both the structuring of segregated neighborhoods based
on race and social class, bussing to integrate schools and the resultant impact on persistent educational disadvantages for African Americans in Louisville, Kentucky.

Tenet two of CRT suggests that interest convergence or the necessary acceptance of White normality is definite in any attempt toward equality. In this dissertation, the archival research findings revealed how the process of busing to integrate within the newly formed JCPS was willfully bombarded by White voices of resistance. The stipulations allowed into the record by Mrs. Ed Womack from the League of Women Voters is an example of White normality. The five stipulations provided by Mrs. Womack seem harmless on the surface, critical analysis of the stipulations reveal otherwise. Stipulation (1) the flexibility of educational programs. This stipulation is calling for the parents of the neighborhoods surrounding the school to have control over academic programs within the school. Stipulation (2) socio-economic integration. Here the White parents are suggesting that they would like the newly forming JCPS to consider the mixing of poor White and the White kids that live closer to the school. Which can be seen as a blatant attempt to exclude African Americans from integrating and instead integrate poor Whites. Stipulation (3) call for the promotion of citizen involvement and administrative responsiveness to citizen concerns. This stipulation can re examined as an attempt of the White parents to not only have control over the administrative activities at the schools, but to have a structural arm that makes sure they are given control and their concerns are addressed. Stipulation (4) administrative decentralization and local autonomy. JCPS is already decentralized from the Kentucky Department of Education. JCPS has to follow state department of education guidelines but has its own local autonomy. This stipulation can been seen as an attempt for the White parents to further their wanted control over the schools, asking for this level
of autonomy would give the parents surround the county schools the ability to have organizational control over their neighborhood school. Stipulation (5) asked for fiscal soundness, the efficient collecting of revenue from all available sources and efficient use of money collected. Here the parents can been seen as asking to not only have administrative and organizational control, they are asking to have control over how the money collected for the schools is spent and what it is spent on.

Further, from figure 2 we can clearly see that most of Jefferson County that was outside of the Hyper-Segregated West End was majority White and because African Americans were prevented from being educated in these majority White neighborhoods this guaranteed the normality of white protected spaces. Even when the decision to integrate schools was unwillingly made by the Board of Education, White community members attempted to maintain the normalcy of White privilege living spaces and segregated education by influencing the structuring of busing to integrate process and guidelines.

The research findings also concurred with the third tenet of CRT that states there is a social impact of racial structures that negatively impacts Blacks. The expressions and academic and social outcomes of the racial biases of White teacher and other school officials were described by the African American study participants who were bussed. In particular, that of Diva and Gloria's experiences on the school bus provided rarely known examples. Diva’s bible reading bus driver associated the negative aspects of African Americans with the social aspect of their supposed lack of faith. Gloria’s bus driver refused to stop for her and her peers for ten consecutive days, driving past their bus stop. The narratives of the study participants about the roles bus drivers played in the bus to integrate
schools project alludes that White bus drivers at that time believed that the Black students, especially those living in the West Louisville neighborhoods were socially undesirable for the bus ride to school. In both of these instances, the bus drivers did not see the humanity of their African American bus riders. Equally important to note is that the White bus drivers also felt empowered to act on their racist assumptions and did.

Tenet four of CRT focuses on the importance of having the voices of those most affected heard. This research purposively sought out the experiences, perspectives and narratives of those most affected and who have been systematically and historically left out of policies linked to housing and education. Specifically, interviewing of African Americans who were part of the first attempt to bussing-to-integrate is a clear example of this tenet. Moreover, the study focus, theoretical perspectives, methodological and epistemological framework sought to empower African Americans and reveal the boundaries of White privilege and and the importance of researching the racialized experiences from a CRT perspective.

Lastly, CRT purports that racialized experiences are not homogenous but reflect varied outcomes based on the intersectionality of different social variables. This was most evident in this research as the experiences of this study participants were based on the intersection of race and social class manifested in the neighborhoods in which they lived and the educational opportunities that were availed to them... This intersectionality historically kept most West End African Americans in low-income situations was a result of industries leaving the West End as African Americans moved in and Whites moved out. Consequently, the West End was and continue to be challenged as a neighborhood with economic functionality. From the earlier conversation associated with impoverished
individuals (Fan et al., 2011; Glaster & Carr, 1991; Seguin et al., 2016), we know that educational disparities are exacerbated when one is non-White impoverished.

**Did Busing to Integrate Work**

Before this question can be answered, we have to understand the intent of busing nationally and in Louisville, Kentucky. The stated goal of bussing-to-integrate was to offer better school choices for African American students. The idea was that allowing them into White school spaces would somehow afford them the same opportunities as White students. Based on the archival research and lack of a clear message in Louisville, we can assume the city of Louisville was abiding by the federal mandate that proclaimed they must integrate their school systems or lose federal funding. Since the clear presentation of their desires for busing to integrate, we can assume they wanted to meet the same National standards and keep their federal funding.

Based on the national standards, the desire for integration was not met with this first wave of busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky. While students were able to attend once all-White schools, the atmosphere and school climates did not afford them the same type of education as their White counterparts. All of the trauma the participants spoke of during their time at an integrated school does not allow a conscious agreement to meet the National standards for integration. As mentioned, they could be in the same space and use some of the same facilities, but they did not receive the same education tutelage as their White counterparts.

However, busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky, did allow for the city to meet the federal mandate to secure funding. Again, when individuals have the potential
to be affected the most, they are not thought of in the decisions as to how to do so
(Lopez, 2003). While the African American students were being subjected to the
possibility of harm, the White establishment only sought to keep their federal funding by
any means necessary. From the interviews and archival research, we see that no African
American students were given consideration.

Beyond the generic National standards of school inclusion, there is the concept of
the same opportunities for Whites. These opportunities include socio-economic status
and the improvement of race relations. These components were also not meant. Dee
(2004) informs us of teacher and student race make-up dynamic. Having White teachers
in Louisville, Kentucky, teaching African American students whom they have no cultural
understanding of, alludes them to revert back to their learned notions of dominant and
non-dominant cultural capital (Carter, 2003). Again, the circumstances may have been
different if there had been some type of training leading up to busing to integrate.

Gillborn (2006) speaks of racism and anti-racism in education. While there may
be individuals on both sides of this coin, the result remains the same. Through CRT, we
understand that racism is effervescent in society. The institution of education is not
beyond the reach of this racist White superiority ideal. Ladson-Billings (1998) informs
us of the need to examine education through this critical lens. Too often, the
disadvantages African Americans receive in education are looked at from an individual
level and not a structural level. Vaught and Castagno (2008) inform us that learned
teacher attitudes prior to teaching aid to the structural racism that exists within the
institution of education.
The participants in this study experienced a combination of the aspects mentioned above. Teachers came to them with extreme racism, and teachers allowed them to pass without aid due to their athletic ability. They experience racism and anti-racism that did not benefit them or their socio-economic status in both instances. Allowing these students to speak of their experiences aids in the understanding of how educational research needs to be conducted. All of the students proclaimed that their teachers seemed to not understand them or attempt to understand them. It was obvious, that the teachers learned bias before meeting their new African American students aided in the negative perception they had of them. While these experiences and encounters the participants had with their White teachers did not initially impact their socioeconomic status. Their experiences taught them how to navigate racism and excel after graduation.

Williams and Land (2006) claim there is the subordination of Blacks in education through legitimizing color-blind policies. The teachers who taught this first wave of students seemed to be under the perception of the illusion of conclusion. They felt as if the presence of these African American students alongside White students would somehow level the racial playing field. With no historical understanding of race or socio-historical components, these teachers believe that sharing school space would erase generations of White superiority ideals. Even though they seemed to be actively not helping.

Matias and Zembylas (2014) discuss the learning process that teachers go through prior to becoming teachers. They detain a postsecondary education that spews off Whiteness ideologies. The participants had to interact with teachers from different cultural backgrounds, teachers who self-proscribe to White superiority ideals, and
teachers who were taught how to teach under the scope of Whiteness. All of the
information discussed in this section sheds more light on the experiences had by the participants:

"the bus driver simply passed us up.....they said I am not picking you all up”
Gloria

“I can remember the look on that teachers face to this day.....she did not care for us”
Diva

“They wouldn’t let the Black kids do internships”
Benevolent

“I knew them teacher didn’t like me, I didn’t care”
Ms. D

“Since I played basketball, I assimilated faster”
Skip

“Since I was in advanced placement courses, the teachers treated me different.....I still chose to drop out”
Gohagan

Each participant had several components of their open response interviews that expressed their ability to navigate through racism during high school and after. Some of them were able to eventually change their socioeconomic status. However, this was not done through the amazing academic education they received after integration. It was due to the education of racism they experienced after integration, which taught them how to handle themselves and how to navigate through racist structures. In conclusion, no, busing to integrate in Louisville, Kentucky did not achieve what it was meant to do. There was no breakdown of racist ideologies, African Americans did not receive higher levels of education, and their integration into “American society” was not sped up. Integration in the instance of the participants showed them what the world was going to
be like, full of systems and structures that strive on White superiority ideals and how to navigate through them.

**Implications and Further Research**

This dissertation’s triangulation alone lays out possible implications. Drawing parallels between local, state, and federal policies, ordinances, regulations, and laws on racialized segregation to the implications for their impact on public education through structural measures creates a framework for potential work of this nature. One can use similar methods, examining local laws related to federal laws and their implications on any existing social issues.

Linking local and federal laws to social issues allows the conversation of accountability to be discussed. Suppose you are able to fully establish governmental fault for the creation and the fruition of social issues. In that case, one should be able to lobby for correction to those social issues through governmental aid. However, it is key to make sure that the new government aid to right the social issues does not mirror the initial government aid that created said social issue.

Solorzano and Yosso (2002) would firmly agree. Beyond the importance of connecting historical laws, regulations and policies to disadvantages that still persist today, this dissertation showed the importance and need to include the voice of those who have been the most hurt throughout our history. The storytelling of experiences within education needs to be told to fully understand what is going on in our schools. Taking what the teacher, principal, counselor or administrator said as the honest gospel truth further subordinates the individuals whose voice is already less heard. Allowing the
inclusion of the voices of the disadvantaged, subordinated and deprived students will only seek to offer a new way to educate the teachers and one that will change the structure of our schools. This research should be used as a framework on how to gain prudent information from students who have experienced hardships. Their wounds will not heal until their stories have been expressed and heard.

Based on these suggestions associated with implications, there are four categories of possible implications; psychological experience of participants, community school vs. busing, board composition and message to JCPS.

**Psychological Experience of the Participants**

To better understand the psychological effects attached to busing to integrate, locating other African Americans who were the first in their area to be bused or to integrate is a must. In doing so one can examine the ways in which the claim of psychological damage may or may not have been experienced. Taking the results of their instances or reference to psychological impact will enable the researcher to measure the levels of the same impacts that exist in today's public system. If such a study takes place, it can potentially be used to levy educational policies to make public schools suitable for all. If such a connection still exists, the institution of public education could possibly be shown to have a continued lack of concern for African Americans in public education.

**Community School vs. Busing**

Interviewing other African Americans across the country who encountered both segregated community-based schools and integrated schools can deepen the
understanding of the benefits of each system. A few participants mentioned their school pre busing to integrate consisted of a climate that was more reflective of a homely community feel compared to the isolation they felt after busing. Further, suppose those African Americans have similar experiences to those discussed in this dissertation. In that case, studies can be compiled to address how the saturation of White superiority ideals in our institution of public education has served to continue stagnant racial relations and the potential for the advancement of African Americans through public education.

*Board Composition*

Based on the findings from the archival board meeting minutes, there is evidence that can portray the board's members as operating suspiciously within the real of white superiority. To further check these measures of potential suspicion, studies can be developed to examine the racial, social, and gender demographics of the board and see if the policies they pass, discussions held, and topics not mentioned are reflective of support for White superiority ideals or if they seem more in support for the rights for all. The boards' homogenous White composition within this dissertation could be labeled as such a group suspected to have the most declaration towards those White superiority ideals.

Based on the participant's information and findings recovered through the archival research, policies can be created that seek a school board to be more reflective of the students’ racial make-up. The city's African American school system also operated with a board and administrator positions within its educational institution. If those African American administrators and ranking school officials were permitted to join the newly
structured JCPS, the experiences of the bused African Americans may not have been as traumatic as they were.

*Message to JCPS*

Though JCPS is about 47 years past its creation of busing to integrate, racial disparities still exist. The schools that were once deemed county schools prior to busing to integrate are still revered in the city as the high schools offering a higher quality educational experience. These schools were continually pursued through White backlash developed during integration. As a result of that White backlash, JCPS deemed these schools to be magnet schools and offered other modes of admission that were more specific to the magnet program associated with the said school. After years of African Americans attempting to have their kids sent to these schools that offer these lustrous magnet programs, White backlash has persisted. JCPS, due to parents of these magnet schools complaining of an “unwanted” element in their school, has decided to undo busing and offer mirror magnet programs within the old city's limits. Enabling African Americans to have shorter travel time to high school and magnet programs close to them as well.

What JCPS has not done is effectively sought after and asked the community within the West End if this is a school choice they agree with. The mirror magnet program was originally initiated through White backlash due to African American bodies being in their spaces. JCPS has also not acknowledged that if they did not strategically dismantle African American schoolhouses within the West End boundaries while busing
to integrate, there would still be a viable educational aspect left within the city’s West End boundaries. Placing magnet programs within close proximity of the West End will not automatically give these West End kids access to the proficient magnet school model that exists in schools further out from the West End. The newly placed magnet programs will not share the same tangible connections as magnet programs that have been in operation for decades.

Through years of differential treatment within JCPS, there has also been a climate of disapproval set on Louisville’s West End residents. The once used racialized bias that empowered Whites to fight against busing to integrate has been transformed into actual racialized characteristics by some Whites in the city. Offering mirror magnet programs developed in the school for integration in the once county school system within the West End or close proximity will result in a further resegregation of JCPS school and dismantle the possibility of racialized social understanding due to separation of separation possible inter-racial conversations.

To conclude on the system of busing in our American school systems. It is too late to reverse the hands of time by merely stopping the practice of bussing. Too many schools that once existed within our African American communities are no longer there or no longer schools. The internal infrastructure needed to handle community-based schools would need a community revitalization and funding to go to those schools. Finding African American teachers to teach our African American kids is yet another obstacle. There are far too many African Americans that have turmoil at school and lose any desire to be an educator. Staring with a CRT research perspective of our educational system can potentially lead to its rehab.
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07/23/2021  SIMMONS COLLEGE OF KENTUCKY
CURRENT
I received a position as an adjunct faculty member at Simmons College of Kentucky. The position that I acquired is within the General Education Depart. I was hired to teach a Methods of Research course. Within this course I inform the students of the Epistemology, Theory and the Method choosing prior to picking a topic, the importance of picking a topic with some connections, and then how to write or report on that topic.

03/30/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
With my appointment on the SBDM committee of J. Graham Brown School, I have been allowed to use my skills from my background in Human Resources. On this day I participated with the hiring process in a second interview for a school wide P.E./Health Teacher

03/21/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process in a screening interview (2nd wave of candidates) for an 8th grade ELA (English & Language Arts) teacher.

03/21/2022  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process in a second interview (1st wave of candidates) for an 8th grade ELA Social Studies Teacher.

03/16/2022  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process in a second interview for a 7th & 8th grade Math teacher.

03/14/2022  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process in a first interview for a 7th & 8th grade Math teacher.

10/19/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE
Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process for a Middle School retired floating teacher.

08/17/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE

Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process for a 7th & 8th grade Social Studies Teacher.

07/23/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE

Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process for a school wide Mental Health Professional.

07/14/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL INTERVIEW COMMITTEE

Operating through my position on the SBDM committee at J. Graham Brown School; on this date I participated with the hiring process for a Middle & High school counselor position.

05/27/2021  J. GRAHAM BROWN SCHOOL SBDM

From the parent and staff base of J. Graham School I was elected to the Site Based Decision (SBDM) making Council. As a member must receive yearly training on the standards per the Kentucky department of education. My responsibilities coincide with my ability to offer my honest opinion in regards to how the student body and the parents of the school are addressed and to make sure that J. graham Brown School is in regulations of the Jefferson County Public School’s Diversity, Equity and Poverty plan. The plan calls for more inclusivity of curriculum and well as school related activities.

03/27/2021  Is College for me PWI or HBCU

Sponsored by The 412 Movement Youth Group
IG: _412movement_
www.thelifedc.org
12650 Darby Brook Ct
Woodbridge, Virginia

Took part in a virtual roundabout geared to providing high school students who are members of the church listed above. I provided information on my experience at a PWI (predominantly white institution). Beyond detail of how to find your own space as a non-white at a PWI, I informed the students of the importance of their decision making while at college, offered additional post-secondary options besides two and four-year colleges, and stressed the importance of utilizing the support staff that is there to help them if and when they do enroll in college.

07/23/2020  BLACKS R.O.C Incorporated

Appointed to Co-Director and Secretary
Non Profit 501c3 organization
BLACKS R.O.C. is a non-profit organization that is committed to the empowerment of the Black Culture. Its mission is achieved through its four fundamental principles: Financial Literacy, Knowing One's History, Comradery & Expansion. Our principles of focus are Knowing One's History and Comradery. I have been blessed with a space to share the knowledge acquired through my extensive graduate education on the history of Black people throughout the world and the comradery essential to anyone who prescribes to the beliefs of Pan-Africanism.

2/6/2020 Civil Rights in the South
Sponsored by Dr. Monica Lakhwani
Diversity, Equity and Poverty Programs Jefferson County Public Schools
Muhammad Ali Center, 144 N 6th St
Louisville, Kentucky

The panel was conducted as professional development for Jefferson County Public School teachers. The conversation revolved around civil rights in the South spring boarded by the following documentary: “A Time for Justice”. As the only Panel member, I discussed my experience and research that reflects Civil Rights. My discussion was tailored around forced busing to integrate Louisville public school and Jefferson County District school in the 1976-1976 school year into Jefferson County Public Schools, the effects that residential segregation had on the busing experience of the African American students, and the continued miseducation of Louisville's African Americans students in public schools. Due to the other panel members' absence, I conducted the panel by myself. I was not aware of this until I arrived and was still able to hold the discussion well past its time with my ability to adapt, shift focus and keep the audience engaged.

10/17/19 Civil Rights in the South
Sponsored by Dr. Monica Lakhwani
Diversity, Equity and Poverty Programs Jefferson County Public Schools
Muhammad Ali Center, 144 N 6th St
Louisville, Kentucky

The panel was conducted as professional development for Jefferson County Public School teachers. The conversation revolved around civil rights in the South spring boarded by the following documentary: “A Time for Justice”. As the only Panel member, I discussed my experience and research that reflects Civil Rights. My discussion was tailored around forced busing to integrate Louisville public school and Jefferson County District school in the 1976-1976
school year into Jefferson County Public Schools, the effects that residential segregation had on the busing experience of the African American students, and the continued miseducation of Louisville's African Americans students in public schools

11/12/17  A Superintendents Voice: Black Male Academics
Sponsored by University of Louisville/Yearlings Club Forum Series
The Yearlings Club, 4309 W. Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky
Panel discussion on African American male achievement within Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). The panel was host to the JCPS superintendent, JCPS Board members, and the new Principal of W. E. B DuBois Academy (an all-male and predominantly African American school within JCPS). As the academic in the panel, my objective was to inform and relate how research on African American males in school face adverse and receive disproportionate education due to ideologies held towards them.

9/29/17  Graduate Student Panel
Sponsored by the 102nd Annual Meeting and Conference of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History (ASALH)
Cincinnati, Ohio
Graduate panel where each member discussed their research and potential paper(s) they were working towards. The paper discussed was "Residential Segregation is Not Just a Thing of the Past", from which the focus of my dissertation was derived.

3/30/17  “13Th” Screening and Panel discussion
Sponsored by Anne Braden Institute
Gheens Science Hall and Rauch Planetarium, University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky
Discussion followed a screening of the documentary: “13th”. The forum comprised panelist opinions of the prison industrial complex, school to prison pipeline, and the current similarities of incarceration to older American modes of Slavery. The panelist also answered questions from the audience.

2/9/17  Finding Your Activist Voice Panelist Participant
Sponsored by BGSA of the University of Louisville
Red Barn, University of Louisville Campus
Louisville, Kentucky
The discussion detailed how students on campus can actuate their activist voice amidst a campus and society, displaying an anti-activism tone. The topic also discussed what activism means to participants, as well as questions from the audience.

12/6/16

Men’s Forum Panelist Participant

Sponsored by Cordia Pickerill, Counselor at J. Graham Brown School

J. Graham Brown School
Louisville, Kentucky

Discussed the Racialization of society based on Minstrels' falsities and other societal developed stereotypes, which have continued to play a part in American society due to the non-recognition of their significance and the racial contract that continues to aid to the disproportional treatment of African Americans.

EDUCATION

8/16 – 05/21

CANDIDATE, DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN PAN AFRICAN STUDIES

University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

Research Area: Continued historical residential segregation trends rooted in Redlining and the ramifications of residential segregation on African Americans' educational attainment.

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department Pan African Studies

8/14 – 8/16

MASTERS OF SCIENCE, PAN AFRICAN STUDIES

University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

Thesis Title: Teacher Bias in Elementary School and the Factors that Aid it

Research Assistant, Department of Pan African Studies
Treasurer, Pan African Studies Graduate Student Council

8/05 – 5/07

COMPLETED COURSE WORK, MASTERS OF SOCIOLOGY

University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

Golden Key Honor Society, inducted October 2006

Research Assistant, Department of Sociology. Assisted Dr. Clarence Talley with a Department of Juvenile Justice research project examining
Disproportionate Minority Confinement. Extensive data gathering and data analysis required

8/00 – 5/05  **BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN SOCIOLOGY**

University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky
Dean’s List
Porter Scholar
Peer Counselor

**SKILLS**

Advanced math skills
Advanced skills with SPSS (Similar to SAS)
Experienced with survey construction, research methods and data reduction
Advanced computer skills
Qualitative research methods
Geographic Information System (GIS) data manipulation and map production
Ability to exercises sound judgement and handle sensitive situations with a high degree
Excellent written and verbal communication
Enthusiastic and driven self-starter
Developed sense or empathy and understanding
Respond appropriately to positive or negative feedback
Design an experiment, plan, or model that defines a problem, tests potential resolutions and implements a solution
Navigate complex bureaucratic environments
Identify goals and/or tasks to be accomplished and a realistic timeline for completion.
Develop organizing principles to effectively sort and evaluate data
Comprehend new material and subject matter quickly
Explain complex or difficult concepts in basic terms and language