

Not Obligated to be Obliging: A Case Study of Jamaican and South Carolinian Educational Leaders

by

Travis D. Boyce, Ph.D.

travis.boyce@unco.edu

Assistant Professor of Africana Studies and Social Sciences
University of Northern Colorado

&

Winsome Chunnu-Brayda, Ph.D.

chunnu@ohio.edu

Associate Director of Multicultural Programs
Ohio University

Abstract

This case study examines the leadership of two controversial figures in education: Benner C. Turner, president of South Carolina State College and Mavis Gilmour, minister of education of Jamaica. Both Turner and Gilmour are remembered historically as being autocratic leaders. But this study reveals that there were times when these two leaders exhibited transformational qualities that led to social change. While the study is theoretical tenable, it contrast sharply to other leadership studies that are approached from an abstract or conceptual understanding of leadership. This study focuses predominately on the practical application of leadership theory by situating the subjects within a historical timeframe and substantiating how they led.

Introduction

This article looks at the leadership styles of two highly influential educational administrators: Benner C. Turner, president of South Carolina State College (SCSC) from 1950 to 1967, and Mavis Gilmour, minister of education of Jamaica from 1980 to 1984. They were in important positions at times of considerable social upheaval and change. History has viewed these leaders' styles solely as autocratic, paternalistic, and transactional. However, research data suggest that these two leaders' methods also had transformational qualities, which led to progress.

Turner, a 1930 Harvard law school graduate, was selected as president by an all-White board in the office of Governor Strom Thurmond. They believed that he would not challenge the racial status quo of the school (Grose, 2006; Hine, 1992, 1996). During his tenure, Turner faced student unrest because the country was in turmoil about civil rights. Turner expelled students and dismissed faculty members who were viewed as threatening to the school's reputation and to the progress of the school. Although Turner significantly improved the school's academic structure, physical plant, and quality of the faculty, by the time he retired in 1967, his reputation was that of an autocratic leader who did not care about civil rights (Grose, 2006; Hine, 1996; Potts, 1978). In contrast to Benner Turner's privileged upbringing, Mavis Gilmour was born and raised in rural Jamaica. During the 1930s and 1940s, she attended a rural primary school headed by a woman who became her role model:

She gave me the impetus to do the best always with whatever I was doing. [Gilmour, personal communication (PC), June 30, 200]

Gilmour graduated with a BS in 1947 and with a doctorate in medicine in 1951. She was the first female surgeon specialist in the Caribbean. She noted that her entrance into politics was driven by a desire to serve in a larger capacity:

I looked at what I was doing on the operating table: I was looking after one person. If I could sit down and make a decision, I could influence the whole society. Therefore, I changed and entered into politics. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

Gilmour served for four years in the early 1980s as the education minister for Jamaica. After her term, Gilmour's critics said that her goals to upgrade the system had not been met. They said that her autocratic style detracted from the achievement of these goals.

Statement of the Problem and Study Purpose

The effectiveness of historical leaders can be evaluated in respect to the climate of their era. To do so, it is useful to examine them by leadership theories. Such theories allow us to evaluate them objectively to see if they were productive. This study evaluates the leadership tasks of Turner and Gilmour, in light of their times.

History currently views college presidents such as Turner as authoritarian collaborators who aimed to please their White boards (Fairclough, 2007). For example, they harshly punished any student or faculty member involved in insurrection against the school (Ellison, 1953; Gasman, 2007; Williamson, 2008). Similarly, some critics have panned Gilmour's effort to upgrade education in Jamaica and viewed her personality as contentious. This study evaluates the leadership styles of Turner and Gilmour, focusing on policies that they implemented during their administrations that reflect characteristics of transactional and transformational leadership.

Significance of the Study

No prior study incorporates leadership theory in relation to Turner's administration (Grose, 2006; Hine, 1992, 1996). Further, this study covers the first time that Jamaica had ever focused its policies on primary education. Gilmour, who articulated these policies, was the first woman to serve as minister of education (Lee, 1977).

Review of Significant Literature

In *Leadership*, Burns (1978) examines two management styles, transactional and transformational. This study will mainly use these leadership theories to evaluate Turner and Gilmour.

History has viewed Turner and Gilmour as transactional. Transactional leadership rules from the top, down. Leaders with this style may rule selfishly, or they may lead with paternalistic concern. Paternalistic leaders may at times consult with their subordinates and listen to their concerns; but in the end, such leaders act based on what they think is best for their subordinates. Bargaining is an essential tool of transactional leaders (Bass, 1985; Howell, 1988). In this bargain, followers work for security rather than achievement and self-actualization (Bass, 1985; Howell, 1988; Burns, 1978). Even a paternalistic, benevolent leader operates by bargaining. He is like a father who provides a safe place for his children but with restrictions. Paternalistic leaders hold themselves up as a role model for integrity. Transactional leaders maintain social distance and work in relative isolation (Burns, 1978).

In contrast, a transformational manager, according to Burns, "seeks to satisfy higher needs and engages the full person of the follower" (1978, p. 4). He says that such managers, instead of exercising power over people, "champion and inspire people" (2003, p. 26). Bass and Avolio (1994) further suggest that the transformational leader's goal is to encourage, motivate, and inspire the followers to "do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible" (p. 3). Although Turner and Gilmour are not considered historically as being transformational, this article will show that their styles did show some transformational qualities and that leaders can use more than one style.

Methodology

This case study adopted a qualitative research methodology design. As such, it is based on a bounded system. It consisted of an analysis of historical documents and semi-structured interviews (Creswell, 1998). As researchers, we collected and analyzed historical data from various archives and repositories, including the following:

Using snowball sampling to identify participants for our study, we were able to interview Turner's children (Benner, II and Elizabeth Turner Klimas), Mavis Gilmour, as well as a variety of other significant information-rich participants.

Findings

Transactional Leadership: Turner

Research shows that Turner exhibited many qualities of a transactional leader. Clearly, he exercised his leadership in an authoritarian, paternalistic style. A paternalistic system has been common at universities since the mid-1800s. For example, in 1885 in Princeton, there was a rule that students could not have their laundry done in town. It had to be done at the college, assumedly so that students would not be in town causing trouble (Altschuler & Kramnick, 1999). Yet schools usually provide students with more comforts than enforced restrictions. As mentioned earlier, a transactional manager works through bargaining (in an "exchange of valued things"; Burns, 1978, p. 19). Such transactions are clearly part of college life, in which there are restrictions meant to provide order and safety for students, faculty, and employees. For this kind of autocratic paternalism to work, there must be respect on both sides. But as a leader makes decisions that their subordinates do not like, respect on the subordinates' side degenerates to a focus merely on what they are getting out of the deal (such as pay). Finally, the subordinates may decide that the provided benefits, care, and resources are not worth the cost.

Several interviewees in this study had strong opinions about Turner's leadership style, such as faculty wife Gracie Dawson. Dawson characterized Turner as "our Adolf Hitler." Student Liz Zimmerman Keitt called him a dictator. Geraldine Zimmerman, faculty, reminisced: "Whatever Turner said, was the law!" (Turner had told her to get her doctorate or get another job.) His children Benner and Elizabeth related that their father's style was standard for many African American administrators at the time. Turner's daughter said that her father's role model was Howard University's president Mordecai Johnson. Further, as to his father's determination, Turner's son stated,

"The buck stops here." He'd say exactly that. "If I take responsibility for it, then it's gonna be my decision and vice versa. It's my decision; I take responsibility for it." (Benner C. Turner, II, PC, September 8, 2008)

Turner's leadership style was to take final responsibility for everything, making him highly isolated from others working at the school. Transactional leaders commonly maintain social distance, and President Turner was no exception. He devoted much to the school but was aloof, introverted, and kept to himself. He related primarily to his top staff (Reid, 2008).

The literature does not specifically explain why college presidents administered in this manner (Grose, 2006; Hine, 1992, 1996). As Turner's daughter noted, prior to the 1960s (the civil rights era), administrators at colleges and universities were primarily authoritarian (Fairclough, 2007). College presidents like Turner had to run their schools in an environment of civil unrest. In Turner's case, the ruling board of SCSC was not highly supportive of him. Yet he had to try to hold on to public funding for the school, which required him to work with the board. In this pressure-cooker atmosphere, when faced with student unrest, he probably felt justified in maintaining tight control. His job was to preserve backing for his institution (Willie, Reddick, & Brown, 2006, p. 12). According to professor Tobe Johnson (1971), "Strong personal authority was necessary for ... survival" (p. 801). Maceo Nance, who later succeeded Turner as president of SCSC in 1967, explained the board's unsupportive, intractable nature:

In that period of time, once the Board of Trustees made a decision, that was it.... So once it was done, there was no recourse other than to pout. (Maceo Nance, William C. Hine Oral History, March 14, 1989)

Archival documents show that Turner obeyed the board. But after that, he had the final say on school issues, no matter how minor. He made final decisions that could have been handled by his subordinates. For an example, he approved a student to be allowed to file for graduation, although the youth missed the deadline. In another instance, he personally communicated with a student and her family after that student withdrew from college as a result of health problems. His correspondence was prompt and written in a very pleasant and professional manner.

But despite the tone of his correspondence, many of his decisions were highly unpopular. For example, Turner refused to name Rudolph Pyatt as editor of the school's newspaper because Pyatt was deemed a troublemaker. In another instance, Turner rescinded the scholarship of student photographer Cecil Williams. Williams (1995) had taken a photo of Turner hanging in effigy (an act of angry students), and that picture was subsequently published in *Jet* magazine, along with an article saying Turner provided poor leadership. In yet another example, Franklin Roosevelt Jackson (a 1953 graduate and former student council president) indicated that Turner displayed a very dismissive attitude toward him. Jackson wrote a letter to advise him about something. Jackson explained Turner's reaction:

He (Turner) was grossly offended. ... Advice may have meant something else to him. He may have interpreted it in a legal sense. (Dr. Franklin Roosevelt Jackson, William C. Hine Oral History, July 20, 1990)

In the wake of the 1956 student economic boycott of downtown Orangeburg (and of the college cafeteria), Turner strongly exhibited his power. He censored any controversial topics in the college's newspaper that could embarrass the institution (Turner, 1956). Moreover, he expelled student government president Fred Moore for not urging students to stop their boycott:

Fred ... we don't owe anything to those people out there. My job is to look out for the well being and the welfare of 1,200 faculty, staff, and students, and you are the president of the student body. But if you think you're going to take over my job, I won't hesitate to send you home. (Fred Moore, PC, July, 16, 2008)

Angered over this particular decision, several faculty members resigned in protest. He constantly clashed with faculty members and when necessary, disciplined them through dismissal. There were many who either voluntarily resigned or were fired. History professor Lewis McMillan, for example, published a book (McMillan, 1952) that criticized the state of Black colleges in South Carolina, especially SCSC. In this book, McMillan criticized the leadership of SCSC for being authoritarian. Nance indicated that although McMillan's book was factual, "It isn't what you say; it's how you say it" (Maceo Nance, William C. Hine Oral History, March 14, 1989). McMillan, at the time, was one of the few faculty members who held a PhD. Nevertheless, and without approval from the board, Turner fired McMillan.

In the aftermath of the 1956 student boycott, the board praised Turner for his "sane" leadership during this crisis. The board further unanimously adopted a resolution that students and faculty members who engaged in insurrection would be dismissed immediately:

Any student who engages in any future student insurrection or other form(s) of defiance of authority shall be expelled ... Any member of the faculty who encourages or instigates any future student insurrection or other form(s) of defiance against authority shall be immediately dismissed. (minutes, April 25, 1956)

The context of the time was that the school was dependent on appropriations from the state legislature. As mentioned previously, transactional leaders use bargaining as a tool. It is not surprising, then, that Turner is seen making trade-offs. In this case, he may have felt that keeping disruptive people at the school would damage the school's future funding. The greater good of the college, Turner may have decided, required these funds (Bell, 1995). Turner was willing (and the board gave him the power) to expel any student, faculty, or staff member at SCSC who openly challenged the racial status quo. These challenges, he may have believed, could have hurt the school's chances of obtaining more appropriation from the legislature.

Four years later, the board passed a similar resolution giving Turner the power to expel any student who participated in off-campus protests (minutes, March 17, 1960). Five months later, the board rescinded this resolution because they felt that it had “served its purpose and that President Turner had ample authority to deal with any situation under the General Rules and Regulations as shown in the college catalogue” (minutes, August 4, 1960).

Matthew Perry, a 1951 graduate of SCSC’s law school, was the lawyer for three students who were expelled by Turner in 1967 for their rebellion. Turner refused to reinstate the students and told Perry, “Well ... you’re going around suing everybody, I suppose. ... Go ahead and sue if that’s what you’re feeling you’ve got to do” (Matthew Perry, William C. Hine Oral History, June 19, 1995).

He was not much different than many of his contemporaries (Fairclough, 2007). For example, Mississippi's Jackson State College’s president Jacob Reddix administered as an authoritarian (Williamson, 2008). According to Williamson,

Reddix ruled the student body with an iron hand to ensure that students remained aloof from the societal issues of the time and warned that a violation of campus policies would result in suspension or expulsion. Reddix similarly ruled the faculty, all of whom were African American ... the president could fire members of the faculty without due process. (p. 119)

Fisher and Koch (1996) maintain that in a post-Civil Rights era, college presidents have had the luxury to create more transparency. As they administer their schools, they can be more open with faculty members about their decision process. Presidents can work more closely with students, welcoming their input. They can share more with faculty and students about how issues are presented to the governing boards. Policy and budgetary matters, once hidden from view, can be presented plainly to the public.

Transformational Leadership: Turner

In contrast to his authoritarian methods, Turner does show a transformational side. It seems reasonable that a leader may use, at times, different styles in order to fulfill a task (Lippitt, 2002). Remember that leadership scholar G. M. Burns describes a transformational style as one in which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (1978, p. 20). Burns (2003) thought that a leader could be transformational within a transactional structure. We suggest that this idea very much applies to Turner and Gilmour. For example, Turner’s daughter said that her father tried to help the office staff become more sensitive to the students’ parents, which is an aim that is certainly transformational in outlook. She stated,

My father heard a student switchboard operator being curt and rather rude to parents who had called the school. My father ... gave her what must have been for her a very unpleasant talking-to. He [told us] that he did not want SCS to be a frightening place for students' parents.... This particular student kept on working on the switchboard and ended up not only doing a great job, but after she graduated, she went on to do very well, working for a business in a northern city. ... On a visit back to South Carolina as an alumnus, she came to see my father and thanked him for helping her learn about conducting herself in a business-like manner. (Elizabeth Turner Klimas, PC, November 6, 2008)

Turner was aware of the power structure of South Carolina and how African Americans were the least to benefit in this type of structure. In the case of the young lady who worked for the switchboard, Turner saw it would be detrimental for her to develop a habit of speaking to people in such a curt manner. Therefore, he provided her with a lesson on business etiquette as a wedge to break open the door to her for future opportunity. In this case, this student would later benefit materially (she was subsequently successful in her career endeavors once she graduated from South Carolina State College).

According to Hickman (1998), "Transformational leadership is expected to contribute to an organization's effort to improve its operations and the *best* use of its human resources" (p. 138). This definition reflects the notion of Turner's transformational leadership as exercised at SCSC. The evidence shows that the school had improved significantly by the time Turner retired in 1967 (Grose, 2006; Hine, 1996; Potts, 1978). There were new dorms, new classroom buildings, a new cafeteria, a stadium, a new student union, higher salaries for faculty, better accreditation, and significantly more faculty with doctorates. One of the ways he achieved these results was by using the *Brown* decision to lobby the State of South Carolina for more money. He purposely did this because he was angered that the state of South Carolina made no provisions to desegregate its schools. The state legislature appropriated more money in return for Turner's silence. Turner's son recalls that his father provided a vivid analogy for the situation: he saw himself as the vampire and the state legislature as the victims. In essence, Turner used that era's socio-political structure of segregation as a tool to seek benefits for the students and faculty.

Turner wanted the best for his students. John H. Corbitt felt that Turner "had the school at heart and that he was good for the school. In that context, he was good for the school" (John H. Corbitt, PC, July 5, 2008).

Turner was a long-term planner who was able to produce positive results (minutes, 1950–1967). Like his father, who was a doctor, Turner believed in Black self-help, where the community works together for the greater good (Benner C. Turner, II, PC, September 8, 2008).

Transactional Leadership: Gilmour

Similar to the top-down leadership approach of Turner, the style of Jamaican minister of education Mavis Gilmour exhibited authoritarian tones. She was certain that primary education should be compulsory. However, she stressed that teachers were not very cooperative and that she had very limited help from the teacher's union on this matter. Gilmour insisted that the Jamaica Teachers' Association (JTA) operated like a trade union. This group, she believed, had promoted a less-than-professional environment for teachers. Teachers, she felt, did not adequately prepare for class and did not see themselves as respectable leaders in the community. Gilmour stressed,

Now these teachers of today, they are only teaching for 45 minutes (because for 15 minutes they are preparing for that class). Well, in my day that was not done. The work preparation was done outside of the classroom time. They do not see the profession in the same light as older teachers saw their profession. It was a calling, a profession, a commitment. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

Gilmour thought that she might sound very hard on teachers. She did, in fact, believe that 70% of teachers work professionally. The rest, she said, did not want to take on their responsibilities as teachers.

Gilmour stated that she had a very difficult relationship with the JTA: "Was not a love fest at all." She mentions that at the beginning of her term, the secretary of the JTA told her that the purpose of the JTA was to fight the ministers of education! In her monthly meetings with the JTA, she told them exactly what she wanted to do. She insisted that all her decisions were data driven, but that her personality added to her unpopularity:

My personality does not go for buttering-up people or saying things I do not believe just because I think it would please them. The JTA's obstruction of my policies was based on my personality. Let's put it in a sentence: I think they were fighting my personality rather than my wisdom or my work. (Gilmour, PC, August 1, 2008)

What did others think of her? Cabinet members, as well as two high-ranking officials from the JTA, confirmed Gilmour's assessment of her personality and her relationship with the JTA:

She stood for change and she was an outspoken person. Her words were never sugar-coated. ... the shifts and the changes that she wanted would definitely affect the status quo, and so that is why to me they lobbied against her. (Confidential source, PC, July 1, 2008)

A former JTA official stated that the relationship between the ministry and the JTA was stormy. The official said that Gilmour was abrasive and she would have strong disagreements with people in their monthly meetings.

Because Dr. Gilmour wanted to do many things on her own without proper consultation; like for example, school closings. ... It was stormy. ... There were many quarrels between Dr. Gilmour and us. (Confidential source, PC, July 28, 2008)

Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) note that the “personal component” (p. 169) of leadership is critical to policy implementation. They further state, “If leaders are rigid, inflexible, and unimaginative in adjusting their preferred styles to the political challenges they face, they have very seriously limited their chances of implementing their policy options” (p. 169). While it is not entirely clear that Gilmour’s confrontational leadership style influenced the implementation of her policies, it is evident that she was a controversial figure and many participants indicated that she was not a team player. A cabinet member stated that Gilmour was dynamic, and that dynamic people always fall to criticism: “Mavis was strong and wanted things to happen quickly” (confidential source, PC, July 6, 2008). Another cabinet member noted that the JTA is a very large and powerful, yet difficult, organization, which had to be carefully managed (confidential source, PC, July 1, 2008). By 1983, a UNESCO study reported that there was no improvement, and primary education had even lost ground. Gilmour explained that she had a vision that could not be completely achieved in a short time.

Transformational Leadership: Gilmour

Just as Turner’s style had some transformational qualities, Gilmour also managed in some transformational ways. Like Turner, Gilmour was disciplined and dedicated. She also felt that her country should use education to build up its people and that the nation needed to build a people with a respect for authority, law and order, and discipline. She sounded much like Turner when she says,

Without discipline, people become uncontrollable, the animal instincts take over, so this psychological atmosphere of respect for law and order and discipline and self-worth has to be achieved to make human progress. ... I have never made a decision to affect the people of my country on a political basis, it is always what is best for my people. ... Education makes you able to take care of yourself; our people are particularly brilliant and if we spent the time to develop and train them, we wouldn’t be in this economic and social crisis. (Ellington, 2001)

For example, in 1980, Gilmour was appointed minister of education and at once emphasized the need for stronger primary education. There was a good reason why the country needed better primary education: an earlier, well-meaning government plan had pulled primary teachers to its secondary system. At the time, Jamaica had come out of a colonial period, in which very few primary schools had been built. When Jamaica became independent in 1962, many underserved communities wanted free secondary education, because up to that point, secondary education had to be completely paid for by the parents.

The then-minister acceded to the cry of the nation, and he instituted what was called the 70/30 program, which meant that 70% of the students who went to secondary schools had to come from government primary schools.

In order to recruit the teachers for the increased number of students at the secondary level, the best of the teachers at the primary level were taken into the secondary system. The primary school system was therefore deprived of its best teachers. To deal with this ill effect, there was a crash training program of primary school teachers: a program called the 2 + 1, where the teachers-in-training had just two years in classroom training and by the third year they were suddenly teachers in the classroom. Gilmour saw that this method resulted in a great deficiency in teaching skills. Consequently, she put an emphasis on improving primary school teacher training. She stressed,

It was my idea that the teacher college training should be three years—three full years in the classroom. That one of the teacher colleges ... should take the people who had 2 + 1 and bring them back for six to nine months ... And, secondly, one of the teacher's colleges, in their final year, should do some specialization ... So that if I were a student at Bethlehem and I wanted to teach mathematics, I would then come to Mico for the last six months of my training. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

After a policy was articulated for teachers, Gilmour stated that other aspects of primary schools had to be addressed. She noted that too many primary school students were in large rooms divided by chalkboards. Teaching and learning under those conditions was very difficult, especially for children who were sensitive to noise. Gilmour said,

We started a school-building program. We were supposed to build fifty primary schools, with the basics of a classroom for each teacher, and with similar things like a sick bay for the children, a library, a staff room, and a principal's office. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

In the end, she did not get all fifty schools, but at the least each teacher now had a classroom. Further, the children had uniforms, each school had a piano, and there was a school textbook program (Ellington, 2001). After the physical structures were improved, she turned her attention to designing a better way of seating. Gilmour noted,

The children were seated on benches that were often made for three; and there would be five children on the benches instead of three. What we did was put a bench with a writing surface for each child. ... I wanted [students] to begin finding independence, a personal identity, a personal development. They had a seat of their own, it was theirs, they could put their name on it. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

She stated that this seat design was driven by her personal experiences as a child.

I used to write ... and the child beside me bounced my hand when I wrote. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

In addition to providing adequate seating, she indicated that the financial situation in most of the homes dictated that children might come to school sometimes not well fed. Therefore, she introduced a nutribun and milk program. Gilmour stated, [There had been] inadequate sanitation—[the school] washed the dishes with the same water with flies ... A nutribun and milk feeding program replaced ... cooking meals outside. (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008)

She stressed that it was a good program because in terms of emergencies like a hurricane, this was food that could be easily prepared and dropped by helicopter to people who were stranded. Gilmour felt that her policy initiatives were aimed at fighting ingrained social conditions: “It is not just improving what knowledge they get, it’s improving the social condition and attitude of the parents and the teachers themselves” (Gilmour, PC, June 30, 2008).

Conclusion

Benner Turner was primarily a transactional leader who administered with a top-down approach. However, Turner exhibited some of the qualities of a transformational leader, because he held the best interests of students and its faculty when making decisions. This task was particularly trying at a time when segregation in education was being challenged.

Like Turner, Mavis Gilmour showed a transactional leadership style. She also had a top-down approach. She said that she did not compromise a lot because she anticipated that there would be resistance to change. However, one cabinet member noted that some of Gilmour’s decisions did bring greater efficiency and better use of personnel in the school system. As such, Gilmour also showed characteristics of a transformational leader. Her policies did bring positive changes to Jamaica’s education system. Many of these changes have been endorsed by successive administrations.

Unfortunately, the literature often portrays both transactional and transformational styles as mutually exclusive. In reality, leaders can use both styles, and leadership is a spectrum (Burns, 1978, 2003; Lippitt, 2002). Methods of leadership can interrelate, so that a person’s leadership style uses a multidimensional paradigm. The findings suggest that Turner and Gilmour’s legacies should not be viewed as one-dimensional, but rather as multidimensional.

The dilemmas of Turner and Gilmour were not unique. There are many leaders whose administrations can be viewed in a similar lens. Mordecai Johnson, former president of Howard University (1926–1960) and Edwin Allen, former minister of education in Jamaica (1962-1972), introduced sweeping reforms to their respective institutions; but they were constantly criticized along the way.

Mordecai Johnson, for example, worked in an era of racial segregation. Yet he was able to move Howard University forward; he improved the physical plant, guided the institution toward becoming fiscally sound, and enhanced the quality of the faculty (McKinney, 1997). Like Turner, Johnson had a strong administrative hand and as such made some bitter enemies and was maligned by people with conflicting interests.

In Jamaica, Edwin Allen was faced with an educational system that was still haunted by colonial, hierarchical policies. He introduced large changes aimed at providing a right to secondary educational access to the lower-socioeconomic class (Cogan, 1983). Prior to his efforts, secondary education was awarded only to the elite. But the civil servants who worked with him considered him domineering and inflexible (Univ. of the West Indies, 1976, p. 188).

This study provides a framework for future research on historical leaders. In this framework, a leader can be seen in the context of his or her era. One can then examine how they led, based on a practical application of leadership theory.

References

Oral Histories

Oral history interviews with William C. Hine, professor of history at South Carolina State University, by
Jackson, F. R. (June, 1990).
Nance, M. M. (March, 1989).
Perry, M. (June 19, 1995).

Documents

President B. C. Turner file.

Minutes of the South Carolina State College Board of Trustees meetings: April 25, 1956; March 17, 1960; August 4, 1960.
Turner, B. C. (April 19, 1956). *Factors related to student unrest*. A speech given to the faculty and staff at South Carolina State College.

Secondary Sources

Altschuler, G. C., & Kramnick, I. (November, 1999). A better idea has replaced “in loco parentis.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, <http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/wheelstory.html>

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bell, D. (1995). Racial realism. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, and K. Thomas (Eds). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 302–315). New York: The New Press.

Burns, G. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Burns, G. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Cogan, J. J. (1983). Jamaica: Education and the maintenance of the social class system. In R. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Politics and education: Case studies from eleven nations*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ellison, R. (1953). *The invisible man*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Ellington, B. (2001). Dr. Mavis Gilmour talks about her life. *Jamaica-Gleaner*, <http://jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20011104/focus/focus2.html>
- Fairclough, A. (2007). The Black College Presidents Who Tried to Thwart the Racial Integration of Higher Education. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, (55): pp. 71-75.
- Fisher, J. L., & Koch, J. V. (1996). *Presidential leadership: Making a difference*. New York: American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.
- Gasman, M. B. (2007). *Reading against the literature: Black college presidents' perception of self, 1950–1975*. Paper presented at the History of Education annual meeting, Cleveland, OH.
- Grose, P. G. (2006). *South Carolina at the brink: Robert McNair and the politics of civil rights*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Hickman, G. R. (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hine, W. C. (winter, 1992). South Carolina's challenge to civil rights: The case of South Carolina State College, 1945–1954. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 9:38–50.
- Hine, W. C. (1996). Civil rights and campus wrongs: South Carolina State College student protest, 1955–1968. *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 4(97): 310–331.
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & associates (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, T. (summer, 1971). The black college as system. *Daedalus*, 100(3), 798–812. ERIC EJO 41669.
- Lee, S. (February, 1977). Top women in politics. *Jamaica Gleaner*.
- Lippitt, M. B. (2002). *The leadership spectrum: 6 business priorities that get results*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Nakamura, R. T., & Smallwood, F. (1980). *The politics of policy implementation*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McKinney, R. I. (1997). *Mordecai, the man and his message: The story of Mordecai Wyatt Johnson*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- McMillan, L. K. (1952). *Negro higher education in the state of South Carolina*. Orangeburg, SC: author.
- Reid, R. (June 11, 2008). S.C. State's fourth president, Dr. Benner C. Turner. *The Times and Democrat*.
- Potts, J. F. (1978). *A history of South Carolina State College, 1896–1978*. Columbia, SC: The R. L. Bryan Company.

- UNESCO. (1983). *Jamaica development of secondary education*. No. 36. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- University of the West Indies. (1976). *Caribbean Journal of Education*, 3–8. Mona, Jamaica.
- Williams, C. (1995). *Freedom & justice: Four decades of the civil rights struggle as seen by a Black photographer of the deep South*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Willie, C. V., Reddick, R., & Brown, R. (2006). *The Black college mystique*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- Williamson, J. A. (2008). Black colleges and civil rights: Organizing and mobilizing in Jackson, Mississippi. In P. Wallenstein (Ed.), *Higher education and the civil rights movement: White supremacy, Black southerners, and college campuses* (pp. 116–137). Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.