

120

AN EXPLORATION OF THE FIRST-YEAR EFFECTS OF
RACIAL INTEGRATION OF THE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOLS IN A UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT

BY

ROGER BRASEL MARCUM
B.S., Southern Illinois University, 1954
Ed.M., University of Illinois, 1956

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois, 1968

Urbana, Illinois

371.394
M 34e

7200-23

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

October, 1968

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY
SUPERVISION BY ROGER BRASEL MARCUM
ENTITLED AN EXPLORATION OF THE FIRST-YEAR EFFECTS OF RACIAL
INTEGRATION OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN A UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT
BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

M. R. Sumption

In Charge of Thesis

August H. Evans

Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in†

Robert E. Pingry
Joe R. Burnett
Ray H. Simpson
J. W. Kubiages

Committee
on
Final Examination†

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

FEB 25 1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer is indebted to many persons for the development of the ideas in this thesis. A special acknowledgment is extended to Doctor Merle R. Sumption, this student's advisor, for his patience and effort in offering constructive suggestions as well as proof reading the draft copy as it was completed chapter by chapter. To Doctor Robert Pingry, acknowledgment is offered for his help and suggestions concerning the statistical approach to the problem. Doctor Ray Simpson was invaluable in his assistance with the attitude inventory for the community. Gratitude is offered to my other two committee members, Doctor Fred Raubinger and Doctor Joe Burnett for their interest in my topic.

To my wife, Iris, who typed the first draft copies, a special thanks is given. She has been a patient and understanding person throughout the entire time that this study has taken.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| I THE PROBLEM..... | 1 |
| II RELATED RESEARCH AND SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE..... | 15 |
| III METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF RESEARCH..... | 60 |
| IV SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA..... | 69 |
| V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 110 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 120 |
| APPENDIX A: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE..... | 124 |
| B: LETTER TO SCHOOL BOARD FROM NEGRO COMMUNITY..... | 132 |
| C: COVER LETTER AND COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE..... | 134 |
| D: EXPLANATION FOR ACHIEVEMENT DECREASE..... | 137 |
| VITA..... | 138 |

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

"Racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional and all provisions of federal, state or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle."¹

Thus ruled the United States Supreme Court in a momentous decision in May, 1954. In its desegregation decision, the Court held that separate schools for Negro and white children are inherently unequal. The Coleman survey, Equality of Educational Opportunity, found that American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country, including all those where Negroes form any significant proportion of the population.²

Harold Howe II, the commissioner of education, reported at a national conference on the disadvantaged that over two-thirds of all Negro pupils in the first grade go to schools that are 90 to 100 per cent Negro and that only a handful of the Nation's Negro first graders are getting the benefit of desegregated education.³ In light of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, and Coleman's finding that segregated education is likely to be of lower

¹Brown, et al. V. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

²James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Harold Howe II, Commissioner, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1966.

³Harold Howe II, remarks made at the National Conference on the Education of the Disadvantaged, Washington, D. C., July 18-20, 1966.

quality for minority group children than for the majority, those who are in the business of educating the youth of our country must be willing to give this problem top priority in their considerations.

However, achievement of disadvantaged pupils, compared to achievement of children of the white majority, clearly depends to a significantly greater degree on the schools they attend. Colman's study also revealed that many of the obvious differences among schools do not have a major bearing on differences in student achievement.⁴ Put another way, advantaged students are less affected one way or the other by the quality of their schools. It is for the most disadvantaged children that improvements in school quality mean the most.

James Colman, professor of social relations at the Johns Hopkins University and consultant to the USOE for the study cited earlier, reported in the summer of 1966:

Findings of the study suggest that internal changes in the Negro, changes in his conception of himself in relation to his environment may have more effect on Negro achievement than any other single factor. The determination to overcome relevant obstacles, and the belief that he will overcome them may be the most crucial elements in achieving equality of opportunity--not because of changes they will create in the white community, but principally because of the changes they create in the Negro himself.⁵

Findings of the study Equality of Educational Opportunity indicate that the quality of school buildings, books, libraries, and equipment has considerably less impact on educational performance than does the economic and social composition of the school. As Coleman reports:

⁴Coleman, p. 21.

⁵Coleman, p. 21.

It is important to reduce the social and racial homogeneity of the school environment, so that those agents of education that do show some effectiveness--teachers and other students--are not mere replicas of the student himself.⁶

Therefore, upgrading the alum schools must be accompanied by a far greater effort than we have ever made in the past to eliminate racial and economic segregation.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF PROBLEM

Many school districts have complied with the legislative decrees and the judicial rulings. The results of many of these efforts will be reported later in this thesis. Several states have emulated the federal pattern, and the state legislatures have placed similar rulings in state school codes.

Legislative action by the General Assembly in 1963 placed a similar ruling in the School Code of the State of Illinois. Section 10: 21.3 stated that it is the duty of the local school board:

To establish one or more attendance units within the district. As soon as practicable, and from time to time thereafter, the board shall change or revise existing units or create new units in a manner which will take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race, or nationality. All records pertaining to the creation, alteration or revision of attendance units shall be open to the public.⁷

This was commonly known as the Armstrong Act. The Armstrong Act was invalidated and declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois in August, 1965.⁸ This ruling was the result of a case

⁶Coleman, p. 21.

⁷State of Illinois, School Code, Sec. 10: 21.3, (Springfield, Illinois, 1965).

⁸Tometz et al. v. Board of Education, Waukegan City School District No. 61, 1 Ill. 2d (1965).

in Waukegan, Illinois, in which the Circuit Court of Lake County had ruled that the Armstrong Act was constitutional and the Waukegan School Board must take prompt action to desegregate the schools within the district. The case was then appealed to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. The principal question presented by this appeal was whether the provision required school boards to prevent and eliminate de facto segregation or racial imbalance and whether such a requirement violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Section 22 of Article IV of our Constitution.

The original case was brought by seven minor children in August, 1965. The superintendent, at the request of the School Board, prepared a comprehensive report which was accepted by the Board in June, 1966. This report recommended that no change be made. The Board accepted the report and voted to make no boundary changes. The Board contended that the racial imbalance was not created by deliberate intent on the part of the defendants and that there had been no intentional racial discrimination by the defendants.

The Circuit Court of Lake County held that the Armstrong Act was constitutional and that it applied to de facto segregation as well as de jure segregation. The Court ordered the defendants to file a plan ameliorating racial imbalance.

The Waukegan School Board, in filing its appeal, argued that the Armstrong Act applies only to de jure segregation. They also contended that the Armstrong Act required elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, and children in Waukegan clearly were not separated because of color.

The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois ruled in favor of the School Board, holding that the Armstrong Act was unconstitutional, and the judgment of the Circuit Court in Lake County was reversed. The Court further stated that programs to create equal educational opportunities must, under the equal protection clause, be administered without regard to race. The Armstrong Act was not sufficiently explicit in defining what the school board's duty was.

As this chapter is being revised in June, 1968, a decision from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois on review has been rendered concerning the constitutionality of the Armstrong Act. In a four to three decision, the Supreme Court reversed itself and upheld the Circuit Court of Lake County which had ruled earlier that the act was valid. The Supreme Court said the issue was whether the equal protection and due process clauses of the Constitution permit, rather than prohibit, voluntary state action aimed toward reducing and eventually eliminating de facto segregation of children in the schools. The Court ruled that the Constitution did so permit.

The majority opinion said every court which has considered the issue has upheld state laws or administration policies and voluntary programs of local school authorities directed toward alleviation or eventual elimination of de facto segregation.

Some districts in Illinois have complied with the Armstrong ruling. Urbana Community School District #116 is one of those districts. The Urbana School District desegregated its nine elementary schools, by order of the Urbana School Board, on July 19, 1966, to be implemented in September, 1966. Prior to this action by the Board, de facto segregation was in existence. One elementary school, the J. W. Hays School, located

in the northwest section of Urbana, had 95 per cent of its pupil population comprised of Negro students. The other eight elementary schools throughout the district had pupil population of 100 per cent or almost 100 per cent white students. The directive from the school board, which was published in the local newspapers, was issued as a formal prepared statement:

The constant goal of the Urbana School District has been to provide an educational program to best serve the individual student within available financial resources of the District. To implement this goal, the Board of Education established the policy several years ago providing the J. W. Hays School with superior staff and facilities and with reduced class size. Although this policy has proved effective, the Board of Education, after careful review, has determined that racial balance in our school system is not only desirable, but the racial balance can be achieved now preserving the quality of the educational program without waste of existing facilities and without crippling financial expenditure. Convinced that racial balance in all schools of the District is educationally sound as well as morally right, the Board has decided to place the majority of Hays School area pupils in other schools. Although it has heretofore been a policy of District Number 116 to plan for neighborhood schools and to transport pupils only for special classes and because of lack of space, the Board recognized that there is no other feasible way to achieve racial balance in all Urbana Schools under the present conditions. The Hays School area pupils will be enrolled in all grades of all elementary schools. To make use of the space thus vacated at Hays School, all pupils living in University-owned housing south of Florida Avenue and west of Race Street will be transported to Hays to join a core of Hays-area pupils in an enriched program. In addition, several special education classes, including Head Start, will meet at Hays School. The group of approximately 180 pupils living in that University-owned housing south of Florida Avenue and west of Race Street resides in a compact housing area and can board school buses without loss of time in making numerous stops. Some pupils from this area were transported to other schools in 1965-1966 because of overcrowded conditions at Yankee Ridge School. Most of these pupils are children of graduate students attending the University of Illinois for one to three years.

As a group they are able children and would benefit from a special enriched curriculum such as will be provided for them at Hays. The hot lunch program for pupils attending Hays, Washington, and Thomas Paine Schools will be continued. All other pupils in the elementary schools who are transported by bus will be asked to bring sack lunches. Milk will be available at all schools. It is expected that there will be about 1,255 students at Urbana High School and about 1,350 at Urbana Junior High School. There will be no change in the use of bus transportation to these schools. The cafeterias will operate as before.⁹

What prompted the School Board to take this bold action? In July, 1966, the Urbana School Board was comprised of seven members who had been vitally interested in the education of all children for many years. Some of the Board members had been re-elected several times. Thus, they had been faced with the problem of providing equal educational opportunities for all Urbana pupils in the elementary schools over an extended period of time.

At the Board of Education meeting on July 19, 1966, a group of interested Negro citizens appeared on behalf of the Negro community to petition the School Board to take immediate action to provide equal educational opportunities for the Negro pupils and to end segregated schools in Urbana. They insisted that, even though the District had provided a superior physical plant at Hays School, a favorable pupil-teacher ratio was established at Hays School, and more money was being spent per pupil at Hays School than for pupils in other schools, the segregated school was still a deterrent to a sound education for their children.

⁹Board of Education, Urbana School District #116, Urbana, Illinois. Official action taken as prescribed by law, July 19, 1966.

A letter, sent to all Board members one week prior to the Board meeting, was read publicly at the official meeting. The group of militant but reasonable Negro citizens insisted that something be done by the time school opened in September. A copy of this letter is in the Appendix. A spirited discussion took place in the open meeting. The members of the Board agreed that a plan of racial integration in the elementary schools was desirable and also such an action would comply with the School Code of Illinois. The Board gave ample opportunities for the various individuals in the group attending the meeting to voice their opinions. Many plans were offered, but the Board assured the group that each of these suggested plans had been considered at length during the past few years. No plan suggested in the open meeting nor any plan considered previously by the Board had been sufficiently feasible to warrant implementation. The Board offered to meet with a representative group of the Negro parents at the close of the regular meeting.

Several such meetings were held within the next few days. The prepared statement issued by the Board through the two local newspapers quoted earlier in this paper was the Negotiated Agreement with the parent group. One Board member did not approve of the action, and he cast the only negative vote. However, he voiced his support of the decision and promised full cooperation in implementing the decision. Another Board member was in Europe at the time. The president of the Board telephoned him at regular intervals to keep him aware of the situation. The superintendent of schools had made plans months earlier to leave for Europe on July 20, the day after the official Board meeting. He was also contacted daily to keep apprised of the situation. The month

preceding the opening of school was a hectic month of planning and organizing by the administrative staff to implement the policy established by the Board.

All did not go smoothly, although the school administration was well-pleased with the overall procedures used to carry out the decision of the Board. One group of influential businessmen hired an attorney and planned to take the case to court. Many lay people, and some members of the teaching staff expressed anxieties about the plan. As school began, many anxieties were expressed throughout the community both verbally and in the local newspapers. The next School Board election reflected many of these concerns. Three of the incumbent School Board members were seriously challenged at the polls. This type of contest was extremely unusual in traditional School Board elections in Urbana. The major issue was busing to achieve racial integration.

However, as the school year progressed and the second year began, the anxieties began to be dispelled. The plan seemed to be working even better than anticipated.

The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of racial integration in the elementary schools of the Urbana School District after its first year of operation. If integration of the public schools is desirable, then there must be educational advantages in implementing such a plan. Much has been said and written concerning the advantages as well as the disadvantages in desegregating the schools. The proponents of racial integration in the public schools contend that racial integration is vital to the welfare of our nation. They insist that Negro children living in culturally disadvantaged environments must attend school with children living in neighborhoods in which deprived conditions do not exist

to be able to compete in and out of school. Those who oppose racial integration in the public schools contend that racial integration will lower academic standards and achievement levels, and that their children will not be adequately prepared for high school and higher education. They also insist that the teaching staff and the community do not favor such a plan.

The purpose of this research is to ascertain which of these advantages and disadvantages do, in fact, exist after racial integration has been implemented in a specific school system. The study will be concerned with four variables.

1. Standardized intelligence test scores
2. Standardized achievement test scores in reading, mathematics, spelling, mechanics of language, and total achievement
3. Teacher attitudes toward racial integration in the public schools
4. Community attitudes toward racial integration in the public schools

More specifically, this study will concern itself with the academic achievement of both Negro and white elementary pupils before and after one year of integration. The same comparison will be used with intelligence test scores. Teacher attitudes and community attitudes will be assessed by use of questionnaires. Inasmuch as there was no assessment of these last two variables prior to the implementation of racial integration, before and after comparisons can not be made.

DEPARTURE POINTS

The departure points for this study are the Coleman study and the immediate urgency and concern which face local school districts in carrying

out the courts' mandates. In the monumental two-year study by Coleman, completed in 1966 in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, many findings concerning the relationship between school achievement and the racial composition of the schools were expounded.

The Coleman report documents a long-respected generalization in the sociology of education:

School to school variations in achievement, from whatever source (community differences, variations in the average home background of the student body or variations in school factors), are much smaller than individual variations within the school, at all grade levels for all racial and ethnic groups....Over 70 per cent of the variation in achievement...is variation within the same student body.¹⁰

When the analysis is restricted to differences in achievement between Negroes and whites, only about 10 to 20 per cent of the total variation in achievement for the groups that are numerically most important lies between different schools. Our schools have great uniformity insofar as their effect on the learning of pupils is concerned. Variations in school quality are not highly related to variations in the achievement of pupils.

Coleman proceeds to note:

Attributes of other students account for far more variations in the achievement of minority group children than do any attributes of school facilities and slightly more than do attributes of staff.¹¹

Individual achievement is facilitated when a student attends school with peers who are socioeconomically advantaged, whose parents are more interested in school success, and whose mobility is low. Students whose classmates are relatively less advantaged, whose parents are less

¹⁰Coleman, p. 296.

¹¹Coleman, p. 302.

interested, and whose movement from school to school or community to community is great are less motivated to achieve well in school. Negro students are more affected than white students by this peer influence.

One of the central themes arising from the Coleman report concerning school achievement and the integration problem is this:

What the child brings with him to school as strengths or weaknesses determined by his social class is the prime correlate of school achievement. It is influenced--off set or reinforced--most substantially not by facilities, curriculum, or teachers but by what other pupils bring with them as class-shaped interests and abilities. In practical terms, as the proportion of white pupils increases in a school, achievement among Negroes increases because of the association between white ethnicity and socioeconomic advantage.¹²

The Coleman report makes crystal clear that:

Desegregation does affect factors of immediate relevance to student achievement. These factors are: individual academic motivation and peer environment.¹³

In considering standardized intelligence test scores, we again turn to the section of the Coleman study concerning the measure of intelligence as it relates to the racial composition of the school. Coleman administered four basic standardized tests: non-verbal ability, verbal ability, reading comprehension, and mathematics achievement. Schools have traditionally used achievement tests to measure ability to learn. The ability tests have been, and often are, termed intelligence tests or IQ tests, and seen as measures of more fundamental and stable mental abilities; recent research does not support that view. Ability tests are simply broader and more general measures of education, while achievement tests are narrower measures directed to a restricted subject area.

¹²Coleman, p. 312.

¹³Coleman, p. 202.

Coleman's survey provided additional evidence that the "ability" tests are at least as much affected by school differences as the "achievement" tests. The specific results are as follows:

1. If the variation in individual test scores is separated into two components, within schools and between schools, the per cent of variance that lies between schools is slightly greater for ability tests than for achievement tests. The school-to-school variance is generally greatest for the verbal ability test, next for the non-verbal ability test, next for reading comprehension, and last for mathematics achievement. This is indirect evidence that variations among schools have as much or more effect on the ability scores as on the achievement test scores.

2. Some considerable part of the school-to-school variation is attributable to differences in the composition of the student body in different schools and not to differences in school effectiveness. Such initial student body differences should show up most strongly in the early grades, and if the results of school effects were upon achievement test scores, the school-to-school variation in achievement test scores should be larger, relative to that of the ability test scores. However, this study demonstrated that the achievement tests showed the most decline from grade 3 to grade 12 in school-to-school differences. This suggests that the ability tests are even more responsive to school differences than are achievement tests.

3. When we attempt to explain the variance in individual achievement by use of school characteristics, holding family background constant, a higher proportion of the ability test score is explained than that of the achievement test score. Coleman concludes that the verbal-ability

test constitutes the best measure of differences in achievement affected by differences between schools.¹⁴

With Coleman's survey being used as the major departure point, this study will be an exploration of some of the first-year effects of racial integration in the Urbana Community Schools in Urbana, Illinois. It is anticipated that the results of this study will produce evidence on the issue of racial integration in the elementary schools and its educational implications.

¹⁴Coleman, p. 293.

CHAPTER II
RELATED RESEARCH AND SURVEY
OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will be divided into three basic sections. The first part will be a summary of the court cases involving racial integration in the public schools and will also include a general discussion of the legal aspects of the problem.

The second portion of the chapter will be a survey of the most significant literature dealing with the topic. Many volumes have been written about racial integration in the public schools, and many individuals have expressed varied ideas and concepts. Except for one or two excerpts, all of the material in this chapter is abstracted from the recent sources and is, therefore, of a contemporary nature.

The third and last portion of the chapter will be a review of the research actually conducted on the subject of racial integration. Although much has been written, very little research has been completed. An attempt will also be made in this chapter to review the efforts made by several school districts throughout the nation to implement plans of racial integration.

COURT CASES AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF PROBLEM

Racial separation of pupils by law, de jure segregation, was declared unconstitutional in 1954 by the United States Supreme Court. The Court, in making its decision, overruled previous decisions by five district courts throughout the nation. A starting point in any discussion of

racial imbalance in the schools is the basic principle, established by the United State Supreme Court in its decision in the 1954 case of Brown Vs. Board of Education of Topeka, that racial discrimination in public education is contrary to the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. State or local school authorities are therefore prohibited from maintaining racially segregated schools.¹⁴

The Brown decision is, of course, a landmark in the field of school segregation litigation. A brief further examination of it will be worthwhile.

In this case, Brown and other Negro children living in Topeka, Kansas, had been denied admission to certain elementary schools attended by white children on the basis of a Kansas statute which permitted cities to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. On the strength of this statute, the Topeka Board of Education had chosen to segregate its elementary schools.

In bringing their suit, the Brown children contended, essentially, that segregated public schools were not, and could not be, "equal" to non-segregated schools; therefore, the children were being deprived of equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the Fourteenth Amendment. By a unanimous vote, the Supreme Court agreed with this contention.

It is perhaps important to note that the highest federal court specifically described the issue in this case in these words: "Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race

¹⁴347 U.S. 483 (1954).

deprive the children...so segregated, of equal educational opportunities?" To this query the court answered: "We believe that it does."¹⁵

The Brown case, as brought, clearly dealt with de jure segregation in public schools, i.e., segregation overtly forced or imposed by the action of governmental authority, in this instance, by the resolution of the local school board. The Brown case, however, did not involve de facto segregation. Even though the case did not involve de facto segregation, the court uses the term segregation unmodified by either de jure or de facto throughout its opinion. For example, the opinion says:

Our decision...must look...to the effect of segregation itself on public education...We must consider...if segregation in public schools deprives these children of the equal protection of the laws... Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group...We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal...Segregation in public education is a denial of the equal protection of the laws.¹⁶

There had been four previous cases which had been reviewed by judges at the district court level involving racial discrimination in the assignment of pupils to schools. These were:

1. Briggs et al. V. Elliott et al. This case had been brought to the Eastern District of South Carolina.
2. Davis et al. V. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al. Eastern District of Virginia.

¹⁵347 U.S. p. 489.

¹⁶347 U.S. pp. 492-495.

3. *Bolling et al. v. The District of Columbia.*

4. *Gebhart et al. v. Belton et al.* on certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware.

All of these cases had been appealed to the Supreme Court and were awaiting a ruling at the same time as the Brown case. Even though all of these cases were different, they all contained the similar element of racial discrimination. In each of these four cases, the courts had ruled in favor of the defendants. In overruling these judgments, the Supreme Court stated:

All judgments in the five cases are reversed and remanded to the district courts to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit the parties to these cases to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed.¹⁷

The rationale behind this basic principle would appear to be that segregation based on race is an unlawful denial of equal educational opportunity. It will help if this rationale is kept in mind as we turn our attention to what the next highest federal courts, the several U.S. Courts of Appeals, have recently said concerning racial imbalance in northern and western public school systems. In 1964 and 1965 these courts were asked to rule with regard to school racial imbalance litigation arising in Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, and New York.

The first case arose in Gary, Indiana, where, under the public school system's neighborhood school policy, pupils residing within a particular school's attendance zone were expected to attend that school. Requests for the transfer of students between schools were handled, generally,

¹⁷347 U.S. p. 496.

on an individual basis. A request was allowed, or denied, depending upon the apparent reasonableness and desirability of the transfer. The Negro children contested this policy, stating that the attendance zone boundaries were drawn in such a way as to promote segregation in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit eventually affirmed a lower federal (district) court judgment that the Gary Board of Education was not required, under the Federal Constitution, to take steps to eliminate or reduce the racial imbalance which admittedly existed in the Gary public school system. The Court of Appeals made the following significant comments:¹⁸

1. The United States Constitution does not compel integration or racial balance in the schools; it merely forbids discrimination.
2. The mere fact that certain schools in a public school system are completely or predominantly Negro does not necessarily mean that the school authorities are maintaining a segregated school system.
3. A neighborhood school plan, honestly and conscientiously constructed with no intention to segregate the races, need not be abandoned because a resulting effect is to have a racial imbalance in certain schools.

In May, 1964, The U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the Court of Appeals decision.

The next case originated in a public school system in Kansas City, Kansas, which also operated under a neighborhood school plan. In addition, a "feeder school" policy was also in effect, under which students from a particular elementary school, upon graduation, were required to

¹⁸Bell V. Board of Education, Gary, Indiana, 324 F.2d 209 (October, 1963).

attend a designated junior high school. In 1960, in order to equalize the student load, the Kansas City Board divided the attendance zone for one of its predominantly Negro elementary schools in such a way that those graduates residing in that zone were assigned to a predominantly Negro junior high school. Previously, all the elementary school's graduates were fed into a predominantly white junior high school. Along with the 1960 order, the Board adopted a policy of granting transfer permits to students who wished to transfer from a school where a majority of the students were of a different race.

Negro children living in the areas which, under the new Board order, would feed into the predominantly Negro junior high school (rather than into a predominantly white one, as theretofore), sued to enjoin the Board from carrying out the change. The case was decided in the U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, in September, 1964.

Basically, the Tenth Circuit ruling reiterated the October, 1963, Seventh Circuit decision in the Gary case and held that the Kansas City Board of Education was under no obligation, under the Federal Constitution, to correct racial imbalance. This court made the following noteworthy comment:

A neighborhood school plan is not objectionable in the absence of a showing that it is being operated so as to discriminate against students because of their race or color.¹⁹

It is of interest to note that this court also enunciated three significant restrictions on local board procedures relating to racial imbalance in its schools:

¹⁹Downs et al. V. Board of Education, Kansas City, Kansas, 336 F.2d 988 (September, 1964).

1. The local board could not justify continuing the unlawful segregation of Negro students on the ground that the classrooms in a predominantly white school, to which the Negro students could conceivably be transferred, were already overcrowded.

2. The local board could not operate a "feeder" policy under which Negro elementary pupils were routinely promoted to predominantly Negro junior high schools and which required such pupils, when they applied for transfers to predominantly white schools, to meet criteria to which white transferees were not subject.

3. The local board could not classify students by race, for transfer purposes, by adopting a rule under which a student might transfer out of a desegregated school if a majority of the students in that school were of a different race.

The court made two other significant comments:

1. The school authorities, rather than the courts, must assume the burden of initiating desegregation in the public schools since it is the former who have the primary responsibility for assessing and solving the local school problems thus arising.

2. The constitutional right of a student not to be discriminated against in the public schools on grounds of race or color can neither be nullified openly and directly by state legislators or judicial officers, nor nullified indirectly by them through evasive schemes for segregation whether attempted ingeniously or not ingeniously.²⁰

²⁰Stephen F. Roach, "The Federal Courts and Racial Imbalance in Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 254-256, (January, 1966).

In March, 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the decision.

The third case originated in Springfield, Massachusetts, where the elementary and junior high schools were operated under a neighborhood school policy. The children were generally required to attend the school within the attendance zone in which they lived.

Negro children residing in areas with a heavy racial concentration brought suit to bar the school Board from assigning them to schools with predominantly Negro enrollments. The children contended that the Springfield School Committee's continued rigid adherence to its neighborhood school policy, in combination with the existing racial imbalance in certain schools, was tantamount to governmentally imposed segregation.

The testimony showed that in September, 1963, prior to the institution of this suit, the Springfield School Committee had recognized that integrated education was desirable and had resolved to take whatever action is necessary to eliminate, to the fullest extent possible, racial concentration in these schools within the framework of effective educational procedures.

A First Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in July, 1965, that the federal Constitution does not require, as an absolute right, the removal of racial imbalance in the public schools as being tantamount to segregation.

It is significant that the U.S. Court of Appeals, though not agreeing with the earlier U.S. District Court decision that the Springfield school authorities be ordered to present a plan to eliminate, to the fullest extent possible, racial concentration, did make the following comment:

If defendants (Springfield School Committee) permanently disregard their previously announced purpose to reduce imbalance so far as educationally feasible, a new

action may be brought to determine whether the plaintiffs are, in that event, entitled to relief.²¹

It was the view of the U.S. Court of Appeals here that no such local school committee plan was necessary at this time, since the committee had, prior to the suit, recognized the necessity for such a plan.

Thus, if we summarize the controlling legal principles which were advanced in 1964-65 by the three U.S. Courts of Appeals cited, we might add these four additional principles to the one previously mentioned:²²

1. Because a particular public school is completely or predominantly Negro does not necessarily mean that the school authorities are unlawfully maintaining a segregated school system.

2. The U.S. Constitution does not compel racial balance in the public schools; hence, a local school board is under no constitutional obligation to correct existing racial imbalance in the schools.

3. A neighborhood school plan, constructed originally with no intention to segregate the races, need not later be abandoned because it results in racial imbalance in certain schools unless it can be shown to be operating so as to discriminate against students because of their race or color.

4. School authorities, rather than the courts, must initiate actions to correct the racial imbalance in the schools.

As we have already seen, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that governmentally imposed racial segregation is unconstitutional. It has not yet spoken directly concerning racial imbalance in the schools, per se, though

²¹Springfield School Committee et al. V. Abraham Barksdale Jr. et al., 348 F.2d 261.

²²Roach, p. 257.

we have seen that it refused to review the U.S. Courts of Appeals decisions in two of the three cases we have discussed.

Though we must not read more into the U.S. Supreme Court's refusal to review than is justified, it cannot be denied that the practical effect of these refusals--one in May, 1964, the other in March, 1965--was to leave standing the pertinent U.S. Court of Appeals decisions. The thrust of these earlier decisions--as is evident from the controlling principles enumerated above--is that local school authorities are under no federal constitutional duty to correct racial imbalance in the public schools.

On the other hand, it should be noted that on three other occasions--in October, 1964,²³ in October, 1965,²⁴ and in November, 1965,²⁵ the Supreme Court also refused to review still other lower court decisions relating to racial imbalance in the schools. In each of these cases, the lower court rulings had held that there was no constitutional bar to local or state school authorities taking steps, if they wished, to correct racial imbalance.

In the first case, the New York City Board of Education had determined to take the factor of racial balance into account in establishing the attendance zone boundaries for a new school; in the second, the state school authorities had ordered the Malverne, New York, School Board to reorganize its attendance zone boundaries so as to eliminate racial imbalance; and

²³Schultz V. Board of Education, New York City, New York, 379 U.S. 881 (1964).

²⁴34 Law Week p. 3113 (1965).

²⁵34 Law Week p. 3113 (1965).

in the third, the New York City Board determined to pair a predominantly Negro elementary school with a nearby predominantly white school in order to correct racial imbalance.

As has been pointed out, it is misleading and often erroneous to attempt to read any positive significance into the refusal of the U.S. Supreme Court to review a case. This precaution most assuredly applies here. However, in refusing to review the five cases mentioned, a sixth controlling principle is implied. While local school authorities may have no affirmative constitutional duty to correct racial imbalance in the schools, there is no constitutional bar to prevent them from taking reasonable steps to do so should they so desire.

This last principle is obviously not as firmly grounded as the other five, being based only on what are considered to be the logical implications of the U.S. Supreme Court's refusal to review certain cases during 1964 and 1965.

Recently, the U.S. Supreme Court rejected another challenge to de facto segregation which prevails in all-Negro neighborhoods of American cities. This recent case came from Cincinnati, Ohio. In a brief order, the court refused to hear an appeal from a group of Cincinnati Negroes. This case could come before the high court again because the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, which ruled against the Negroes on December 6, 1966, returned the dispute to federal district court in Cincinnati.

The trial court was instructed to find out whether the Cincinnati School Board gerrymandered school boundary lines or otherwise intentionally discriminated against Negroes in districting the schools.

The opinion specifically mentioned the site of Sawyer Junior High School, which excludes children living across the street in a largely

white neighborhood. The 6th Circuit ruled that if the School Board's acts were not racially motivated, the Negroes did not have a case.

The Negroes argued that a system-wide racial imbalance is harmful to Negro children and therefore constitutionally impermissible whether intentional or not. They said the School Board did not act positively to remedy the situation.

The Brown case opened the floodgates of judicial imagination. It is now possible to contradict almost any legal ruling with another ruling of equal rank. This sets the scene for a jurisprudential numbers game.

For ten days one could cite the opinion of the Los Angeles County Counsel that race might not be used as a criterion for drawing school boundaries. On June 27, 1963, however, the California Supreme Court ruled otherwise. On September 6, 1963, the New York Supreme Court ruled it impermissible to exclude white students in order to achieve a better racial balance. On March 11, 1964, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court reversed the September 6 ruling.²⁶

On January 29, 1963, U.S. District Judge George Beamer ruled in the Gary case that the School Board had no affirmative duty to desegregate where the school segregation was due to housing segregation; a U.S. Court of Appeals later affirmed the Beamer opinion. On January 4, 1964, U.S. District Judge Joseph C. Zavatt ruled in the Manhassat case that the school board had an affirmative duty to desegregate.²⁷

²⁶Meyer Weinberg, "Civil Rights and the Schoolmen," Phi Delta Kappan, (May, 1964), Vol. XLV No. 8, p. 162.

²⁷Weinberg, p. 162.

The U.S. Supreme Court will have to settle the issue. The question has been raised concerning the wisdom of seeking a solution in the courts.

John Kaplan comments:

The battle over de facto segregation is now moving into the political arena where it belongs....In order to bring the administration of our schools in line with our fundamental values, the greater part of the action in this area will have to be taken by the political process.²⁸

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

Inasmuch as the major problems involving racial integration in the public schools arise from de facto segregation in housing and residential patterns in the community, a portion of this section must deal with this issue.

De facto segregation is a complex phenomenon with many ramifications and apparently no simple solutions. Up to the present, no large school district has been able to eliminate de facto segregation. In fact, despite extensive efforts, the number of pupils in racially imbalanced schools has been increasing in most of the large cities. In the report, "Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City,"²⁹ prepared by the State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions (May 12, 1964), the following statements appear:

²⁸John Kaplan, "Segregation Litigation and the Schools, Part II: The General Northern Problem," Northwestern University Law Review, (May-June, 1963), pp. 211, 214.

²⁹The State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, "Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City," (May 12, 1964).

Despite open enrollment, rezoning, and associated efforts, segregation, city-wide, has not been reduced. On the contrary, the overall level of segregation has increased. No act of the Board of Education from 1958 through 1962, with a single small exception, has had a measurable effect on the degree of school segregation. Our impression is that not a single elementary or junior high school that was changing toward segregation after 1958 by virtue of residential changes and the transfer of whites into parochial and private schools was prevented from becoming segregated by board action.

The State Department of Education in New York, which for several years has pressed for racial balance in the state's schools, has found more racially imbalanced elementary schools outside New York City now than six years ago. Among the findings of a state-wide race-ethnic census for the 1966-1967 school year were these:

1. In 1961-1962, some forty-one school districts outside New York City had 103 elementary schools that were racially imbalanced. Approximately 31 per cent or more of their students were non-white. Today the total is 129 schools.

2. New York City schools are now 50.2 per cent Negro and Puerto Rican and 49.8 per cent white.

This same story can be repeated in many of the large cities throughout our nation. In a book entitled School Children in Urban Slums, edited by Joan I. Roberts, David Ausubel has written a chapter, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children."³⁰

Included in that chapter is much of the rationale which supports the theory that racial integration in the public schools is educationally

³⁰David Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in School Children in Urban Slums, readings in Social Science Research, ed. by Joan I. Roberts.

sound and desirable. Ausubel summarizes much of the social science research which has been completed involving the ego development of Negro students.

Partly as a result of unequal educational opportunities, Negro children show serious academic retardation. They attend school for fewer years and, on the average, learn much less than white children do. One of the chief reasons for this discrepancy is the inferior educational training of Negro teachers who themselves are usually products of segregated education.³¹

Inequality of educational facilities exists not only in the South but graduates in one southern high school scored below the national mean on the Scholastic Aptitude Test.³²

Teachers in segregated schools tend to be overly permissive and to emphasize play skills over academic achievement; they are perceived by their pupils as evaluating them negatively and as being more concerned with behavior than with schoolwork.³³

Negro pupils are undoubtedly handicapped in academic attainment by a lower average level of intellectual functioning than is characteristic of comparable white pupils. In both northern and southern areas, particularly the latter, Negro pupils have significantly lower IQ's and are

³¹H. Angelino, J. Dollins, and E. V. Mech, "Trends in the Fears and Worries of School Children as Related to Socioeconomic Status and Age," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 89: 1956, pp. 263-276.

³²H. A. Bullock, "A Comparison of the Academic Achievements of White and Negro High School Graduates," Journal of Educational Research, 44: 1950, pp. 179-192.

³³Martin P. Deutsch, et al., "Some Considerations as to the Contributions of Social Personality and Racial Factors to School Retardation in Minority Group Children," paper read at American Psychology Association, Chicago, September, 1956.

retarded in arithmetic, reading, language usage, and ability to handle abstract concepts.³⁴

The destructive impacts of prejudice, discrimination, segregation, an inferior caste status on self-esteem, in addition to the usual mental hygiene consequences of lower social class membership, results in a much higher incidence of behavior disorders in Negroes than in whites.³⁵

Before Negroes can assume their rightful place in a desegregated American culture, important changes in the ego structure of Negro children must first take place.

They must shed feelings of inferiority and self-derogation, acquire feelings of self-confidence and racial pride, develop realistic aspirations for occupations requiring greater education and training, and develop the personality traits necessary for implementing these aspirations. Such changes in ego structure can be accomplished in two different but complementary ways.³⁶

1. All manifestations of the Negro's inferior and segregated caste status must be swept away in education, housing, employment, religion, travel, and exercise of civil rights.
2. Various measures instituted in the family, school and community, the character structure, levels of aspiration, and actual standards of achievement can be altered in ways that will further enhance his self esteem and make it possible for him to take advantage of new opportunities.

³⁴A. S. Carson, and A. I. Rubin, "Verbal Comprehension and Communication in Negro and White Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 1960, pp. 47-51.

³⁵H. Greenberg, A. L. Chase, and T. M. Cannon, "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Toward School Integration," Journal of Applied Psychology, 41: 1957, pp. 27-31.

³⁶Ausubel, pp. 236-238.

Ausubel expresses his ideas on desegregation in the following manner:³⁷

1. Desegregation of the public schools is no panacea. It tends to create new problems of social adjustment.
2. The schools cannot overcome various long-standing handicaps which Negro children bring with them to school such as cultural impoverishment, apathy toward learning, and distrust toward majority-group and middle-class teachers.
3. Desegregated schools cannot compensate for oversized classes, inappropriate curricula, inadequate counseling services, or poorly trained or demoralized teachers.

Yet, it is an important and indispensable first step in the reconstitution of Negro personality since the school is the most strategically placed social institution for effecting rapid change both in ego structure and in social status. A desegregated school offers the Negro child his first taste of social equality and his first experience of first-class citizenship. He can enjoy the stimulating effect of competition with white children and can use them as realistic yard sticks in measuring his own worth and chances for academic and vocational success.

Prejudice against Negroes is deeply rooted in the American culture. Racial prejudice is most pronounced in lower social class groups, and these groups constitute the hard core of resistance to desegregation. Anti-white prejudice is similarly most pronounced among lower class Negroes.³⁸

³⁷Ausubel, pp. 248-250.

³⁸T. C. Cothran, "Negro Conceptions of White People," American Journal of Sociology, 56: 1951, pp. 458-467.

Increased physical contact per se between white and Negro children does little to reduce prejudice, but more intimate personal interaction under favorable circumstances significantly reduces social distance between the two groups.^{39,40}

Artificial attempts to end de facto school segregation, caused by neighborhood segregation of Negroes in particular urban slums, are socially and psychologically unsound.⁴¹

It is not only impractical to transport white children to schools in distant, predominantly Negro neighborhoods just for the purpose of maintaining the principle of racially mixed classes, but it also victimizes individual white children and thereby increases racial tensions. Unless de facto segregation is accomplished by the gerrymandering of school districts, and unless schools in Negro districts are actually inferior, it seems more reasonable to work for the elimination of this type of school segregation by directly attacking its underlying cause, neighborhood segregation.

The support of parents and of the Negro community at large must be enlisted if we hope to make permanent progress in the education of Negro children.

One needs only to visit...a slum school to be convinced that the nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to

³⁹J. A. Neprash, "Minority Group Contacts and Social Distance," Phylon, 14: 1953, pp. 207-212.

⁴⁰S. W. Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, 52: 1961, pp. 292-296.

⁴¹James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas, (New York, 1961) McGraw-Hill, pp. 158, 159.

policies that could wreak havoc with the school and the lives of children.⁴²

Whatever can be done to strengthen family life and to give fathers a more important role in it will make a significant contribution to the development of Negro potential.⁴³

Working with mothers to get them to adopt a more positive attitude toward school is an important first step in improving the educational achievement of urban Negro children. Typically, only 10 per cent of Negro parents are high-school graduates, and only 33 per cent complete elementary school.⁴⁴ Thus enrollment of parents in adult-education programs would significantly raise the cultural level of the Negro home and stimulate an interest in newspapers, magazines and books. "One of the troubles... is that when children leave the school they never see anyone read anything—not even newspapers."⁴⁵

Because of current grave inadequacies in the structure of the lower-class urban Negro family, the school must be prepared to compensate, at least in part, for the deficiencies of the home, to act, so to speak, in loco parentis. Teachers in predominantly Negro schools actually perform much of this role at the present time.⁴⁶

As one Negro teacher said to Conant:

⁴²Conant, p. 20.

⁴³R. W. Smuts, "The Negro Community and the Development of Negro Potential," Journal of Negro Education, 26: 1957, pp. 456-465.

⁴⁴Conant, p. 24.

⁴⁵Conant, p. 26.

⁴⁶Conant, p. 27.

We do quite well with these children in the lower grades. Each of us is, for the few hours of the school day, an acceptable substitute for the mother. But when they reach about 10, 11, or 12 years of age, we lose them. At that time the "street" takes over. In terms of schoolwork progress ceases; indeed, many pupils begin to go backward in their studies.⁴⁷

In summarizing Ausubel's chapter on the ego development of Negro children, the following statements are offered:

School desegregation is an indispensable prerequisite for raising aspiration and achievement levels, but obviously cannot compensate, in and of itself, for the longstanding educational handicaps of the Negro child or for existing inadequacies in schools, teachers, curricula, and counseling services. Before we can expect any permanent improvement in the educational performance of Negro children, we must strengthen Negro family life, combat the cultural impoverishment of the Negro home and enlist the support and cooperation of Negro parents in accomplishing this objective.⁴⁸

Jonathan Kozol, a former slum school teacher, and Robert Coles, a Harvard child psychiatrist, are authors of a new book, Death at an Early Age. They cite many examples of teachers' racial prejudice to demonstrate that this may be a basic reason why Negro children fail to achieve in school. It could be that they are unmotivated and handicapped by cultural deprivation, as many educators and child-serving professionals believe. But Kozol and Coles are beginning to question these notions. These authors have asserted that the Negro is not really culturally deprived, but in fact has a rich culture, different though it may be from

⁴⁷Conant, p. 21.

⁴⁸Ausubel, pp. 267-268.

that of the white middle-class suburbanite. They also contend that the lack of motivation is the result of dull teaching by racially prejudiced teachers.⁴⁹

According to Kozol, "The greater number of Negro parents I've known in Boston don't lead lives lacking in real values. The trouble is that white teachers attempt to replace these values with their own."⁵⁰

Dr. Coles depicts Negro children as anything but dull, shallow youngsters: "Many ghetto children I know have a flesh and blood loyalty to one another, a disarming code of honor, a sharp critical eye for the fake and pretentious, a delightful capacity to laugh, yell, shout, sing, congratulate themselves, and tickle others. Their language is often strong and expressive...their drawings full of action, feeling, and even searing social criticism."⁵¹

The hammering home to lively, normal Negro children that they ought to be like someone else--the whites--indicates racial prejudice among teachers.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights asked for new federal legislation, unspecified in detail, to eliminate racial isolation of children in public schools attended primarily by Negroes. In its two volume report, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, the federal agency told President Johnson, who had ordered the study, that Negro children suffer serious harm, regardless of whether segregation has been brought about by

⁴⁹Jonathan Kozol, and Robert Coles, Death at an Early Age, (New York, 1967).

⁵⁰Kozol and Coles, p. 74.

⁵¹Kozol and Coles, p. 78.

design or through residential patterns. Their aspirations are more restricted than those of other children, and they lack confidence in influencing their own futures.

This report aimed its demand for integration at the de facto segregation in northern cities as much as at the deliberate segregation of the South. The Commission introduced two elements which are likely to stir debate:⁵²

1. It asked Congress to consider legislation that would establish a uniform standard for the elimination of isolation in the schools. It suggested as a reasonable standard the criterion already adopted by the legislature in Massachusetts and the New York State Commissioner of Education, defining as racially imbalanced those schools in which Negro pupils constitute more than 50 per cent of the total enrollment.

2. It concluded that programs of compensatory education, special efforts to upgrade the education of children in ghetto schools, have been of limited effectiveness.

Two basic questions were raised by the Commission.

1. Can desegregation be brought about under a suggested criterion enrollment?

2. Should compensatory education be discounted in the future?

In determining whether or not a school district was following the guidelines, a major obstacle was apparent. In the nation's metropolitan areas where two-thirds of both Negro and white population now live, 75 per cent of the Negro elementary school students are in schools that are

⁵²Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, a two volume report by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Volume I, p. 325, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., February, 1967.

nearly all Negro. This documentation of widespread de facto segregation is convincing beyond a doubt. An example of this obstacle is in New York City. The non-white population in Manhattan is 80 per cent while that in the Bronx is 65 per cent. The creation of anything approaching a balance, without moving children between boroughs or distant suburbs, is rendered impossible by the population statistics.

Boundary changes and location of schools at the fringes of the ghettos can bring about greater integration, provided de facto segregation does not creep beyond existing boundaries. The massive core of racial isolation in the deep ghetto areas remains.

Although the 50 per cent formula, attributed to New York State Education Commissioner James E. Allan Jr., is recommended by the Commission, the formula is something of a misunderstanding of Dr. Allen's original proclamation. He subsequently said that what he intended to show was that the half-way mark is a storm warning: once a school is more than 50 per cent Negro, it is on the way to becoming ghettoized.⁵³

A middle-class school can readily absorb a minority of children from substantially lower socio-economic backgrounds without depressing academic standards and without raising parental objections to the effect of "lower class" mores.

But when the lower-class group becomes too large to be readily assimilated, middle-class parents--and teachers--object and, if possible, withdraw their children. This would happen even if no question of color were involved, though it is naive to pretend that color does not aggravate matters.

⁵³Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, p. 118.

This is why many education leaders and a growing number of civil rights experts have shifted their attention to compensatory programs. Many advocates of compensatory education, who would like to see integration of the schools become a reality, are convinced that it is not likely to happen in many urban areas soon; so they maintain that extraordinary efforts are needed at once at whatever cost and with all available educational radicalism to rush them into the mainstream of opportunity.

There are six types of compensatory educational programs: 1. Headstart 2. National Teachers Corp. 3. After school and Saturday classes 4. Private tutoring 5. Additional superior facilities 6. Better trained teachers.

The United States Commission on Civil Rights was quite lukewarm to these efforts. Its reasoning appeared to be based on its disappointment over some compensatory programs it reviewed. It consisted of more showmanship than solid education. It may have been fraudulent window dressing to divert Negro parents who wanted a fair deal for their children.⁵⁴

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

This is a review of the evidence regarding the effects of educational desegregation on the scholastic achievement of Negroes. It focuses on the problem of identifying the important situational determinants of Negro performance in the racially-mixed classroom. Only a few studies have dealt directly with this problem, so much of the evidence to be surveyed is only inferential.

⁵⁴Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, p. 257.

The review includes reports on the academic progress of Negro children attending integrated schools, evidence on aspects of the minority child's experience in desegregation presumably affecting his motivation to learn, relevant research on the behavioral effects of psychological stress, and, finally, a series of experiments on Negro productivity in bi-racial settings.

Educational desegregation is a politico-legal concept referring to the elimination of racial separation within school systems. As such it embraces a great variety of transitional situations having diverse effects upon the scholastic performance of Negro children. The meaning of desegregation has been broadened in recent years to include the reduction of racial clustering due to factors other than legal discrimination, i.e., de facto segregation. A number of recent court decisions in the North have ruled that "racial imbalance" in a school constitutes de facto segregation. Also described as de facto segregation by various social scientists are the racially homogeneous classes often found in schools where children are grouped according to ability.^{55,56,57}

The present concern is mainly with instances of desegregation that are marked by a substantial increase in the proportion of white peers, or

⁵⁵M. Deutsch, "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement," Society for Applied Anthropology Monograph, 1960, No. 2.

⁵⁶D. Dodson, Statement read at Conference before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: Fourth Annual Education Conference on Problems of Segregation and Desegregation of Public Schools, Washington, D. C. United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1962, pp. 137-141.

⁵⁷M. Tumon, "The Process of Integration," in G. J. Klopff and I. A. Lester (eds.) Integrating the Urban School, (New York, 1936), Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, pp. 13-28.

both white peers and adult authorities, in the immediate environment of the Negro student.

Almost invariably in this type of desegregation experience, the minority group child is confronted with higher educational standards than prevail in segregated Negro schools. Both aspects of the Negro's experience--change in the racial environment and exposure to relatively high academic standards--are likely to have important influences on his scholastic motivation.

When the minority newcomer in a desegregated school is accepted socially by his white classmates, his scholastic motivation should be influenced favorably. It was noted earlier that achievement standards tend to be higher in previously all-white schools than in Negro schools. From studies based on white subjects, it is apparent that individuals are responsive to the standards of those with whom they desire to associate.⁵⁸

A study by Criswell⁵⁹ in 1939 suggested that Negro children in racially-mixed classrooms accept white prestige but increasingly withdraw into their own group as a response to white rejection. Thus, if their desire for acceptance is not inhibited or destroyed by sustained unfriendliness from white children, Negro pupils should tend to adopt the scholastic norms of the high-status majority group.

Friendliness and approval on the part of white teachers should be beneficial to Negro motivation by increasing the incentive strength of

⁵⁸B. M. Bass, "Conformity Deviation and a General Theory of Interpersonal Behavior," in I. A. Berg and B. M. Bass (eds.) Conformity and Deviation, (New York, 1961) Harper, pp. 38-100.

⁵⁹Joan H. Criswell, "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom," Archives of Psychology, New York, 1939, p. 235.

scholastic success. Assuming that white teachers have more prestige for the minority child than do Negro teachers, the prospect of winning their approval should be more attractive. Hence, when such approval can be expected as a reward for good performance, motivation should be favorably influenced.⁶⁰

When the minority child is placed in a school that has substantially higher scholastic standards than he knew previously, he may become discouraged and not try to succeed. This common sense proposition is derived from Atkinson's theory of the motivational determinants of risk taking and performance.⁶¹

If the Negro newcomer perceives that the standards of excellence in a desegregated school are substantially higher than those he encountered previously so that the likelihood of his attaining them is low, his scholastic motivation will decline.

There is a dearth of unequivocal information about Negro performance in desegregated schools. A number of factors have contributed to this situation.

1. Many desegregated school systems have a policy of racial non-classification so that separate data for Negroes and whites are not available.
2. Where total elimination of legal segregation has occurred, it has usually been accompanied by vigorous efforts to raise educational

⁶⁰Irwin Katz, "The Effects of Desegregation on the Performance of Negroes," in School Children in the Urban Slum, ed. by Joan I. Roberts, (New York, 1967), pp. 261-292.

⁶¹J. W. Atkinson, "Motivational Determinants of Risk Taking Behavior," in J. W. Atkinson (ed.) Motives in Fantasy Action and Society, (New York, 1958), pp. 322-340.

standards in all schools; hence the effects of desegregation per se are confounded with the effects of improved teaching and facilities.

3. In several southern states, only small numbers of carefully selected Negro pupils have been admitted to previously all-white schools, and since before-after comparisons of achievement are not usually presented, reports of satisfactory adjustment by these Negro children shed little light on the question of relative performance.

Most published information presents a favorable picture of Negro academic achievement in racially mixed settings. Stallings⁶² reported on the results of achievement testing in the Louisville school system in 1955-56, the year prior to total elimination of legal segregation, and again two years later. Gains were found in the median scores of all pupils for the grades tested, with Negroes showing greater improvement than whites. The report gave no indication of whether the gains for Negroes were related to amount of actual change in the racial composition of schools. Indeed, Stallings stated, "The gains were greater where Negro pupils remained by choice with Negro teachers."

A later Louisville survey by Knowles⁶³ indicated that Negro teachers had not been assigned to classrooms having white students during the period covered by Stallings' research. This means that the best Negro gains observed by Stallings were made by children who remained in segregated classrooms and can only be attributed to factors other than desegregation, such as a general improvement in educational standards.

⁶²F. H. Stallings, "A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, 28: 1959, pp. 439-444.

⁶³L. W. Knowles, "Part I, Kentucky," in United States Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, U.S. Government Printing Office, (Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 19-56.

In both Washington and Baltimore, where legal segregation was totally abolished in 1954, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found some evidence that the scholastic achievement of Negroes in such schools has improved and no evidence that a resultant reduction occurred in the achievement of white students.⁶⁴

A detailed account of academic progress in the Washington schools since 1954 was prepared by Hanson.⁶⁵ The results of a city-wide testing program begun in 1955 indicated year-to-year gains in achievement on every academic subject tested at every grade level where the tests were given. The data was not broken down by race. As in the case of Louisville, it seems reasonable to attribute these gains primarily to an ambitious program of educational improvement rather than to racial mixing.

For several years the Washington schools have had a steadily increasing predominance of Negro pupils (over 76 per cent in 1960); this, combined with a four-track system of homogeneous ability grouping which has had the effect of concentrating Negroes in the lower tracks, has resulted in a minimal desegregation experience for the majority of Negro children.

Recently the four-track system of ability grouping in Washington, D. C., was declared unconstitutional, and United States Court of Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright, presiding in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in June, 1967, ordered the Washington, D. C. schools to abandon the "track" system.

⁶⁴Southern School News (Untitled article) 1960 (Aug.) Vol. 7, p. 6 and 1963 (April) Vol. 9, p. 11.

⁶⁵C. F. Hanson, "The Scholastic Performances of Negro and white Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, 30: 1960, pp. 216-236.

The superintendent of the Washington, D. C. schools, Carl F. Hansen, resigned his position because the school board would not permit him to appeal this decision.

How far can a court go in dictating the administrative operations of a school system? Hansen is going to court to get an answer to that question, and he is being joined by a school board member and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). The AASA states that the decree usurps the prerogatives of boards of education and school administrators, and it is a serious threat to local and state management of the public schools. The NEA and the AASA support the intent of Judge Wright's decision to implement equal educational opportunity, but the legal prerogatives of local school boards and administrators must be preserved.

A generally favorable picture of race relations in southern integrated schools is presented in an article by journalist J. C. Tanner:

On the social side, younger white and Negro children attending desegregated classes seem to accept each other better than the older ones. Negro and white youngsters can be seen playing together on the slides and swings of almost any desegregated southern elementary school's playground. At Nashville's Buena Vista Elementary School, Negro boys have won two of the three positions of captain on the school's safety patrol. And in Birmingham, often called the most segregated U.S. city, a Negro boy was chosen vice-president of a sixth-grade class that was desegregated last fall.⁶⁶

One investigation has shown that experiences of social acceptance are associated with academic success. It seems reasonable to conclude that acceptance by white peers is beneficial to the achievement motivation of Negro students.

⁶⁶J. C. Tanner, "Integration in Action," Wall Street Journal, January 26, 1964: 64, p. 1.

The evidence is strong that low expectation of success is an important detrimental factor in the performance of minority children attending integrated schools. Negro students have feelings of intellectual inferiority which arise from an awareness of actual differences in racial achievement or from irrational acceptance of the white group's stereotype of Negroes.

The low quality of segregated Negro education is well documented. Plaut⁶⁷ has summarized the overall situation:

Negroes, furthermore, have long been aware that most of their schools in the South and often the de facto segregated schools in the North, are rundown, poorly staffed, and short-handed. Second- and third-rate schooling for Negroes leaves them without the ability to compete with white students and robs them of the initiative to compete. Even the 1955 Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives admitted recently that Negro education in Georgia is a disgrace. What the Negro child gets in the sixth grade, the white child gets in the third.

A few specific instances of educational disparity at the grade-school level will be cited. Findley⁶⁸ found, in testing for achievement in the Atlanta schools, that from 40 to 60 per cent of white pupils met the standards set by the top 50 per cent of a national sample on the different tests; but only 2 per cent to 10 per cent of Negro pupils met this standard. In Tennessee, according to Wyatt,⁶⁹ Negro students averaged 1 1/2 to 2 years behind grade level when transferred to biracial schools in the upper grades.

⁶⁷R. L. Plaut, Blueprints for Talent Searching, New York National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1947, pp. 83-85.

⁶⁸W. G. Findley, "Learning and Teaching in Atlanta Public Schools," Princeton, New Jersey, Educational Testing Service, 1956.

⁶⁹E. Wyatt, "Part I, Tennessee," In U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights, U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962, pp. 19-56.

In earlier grades transfers performed satisfactorily. The same report described the status of Negro and white teachers in a Tennessee urban area. Only 49 per cent of 901 academically qualified Negro teachers passed the National Teachers' Examination; among white teachers, more than 97 per cent of 783 qualified teachers passed the test. The Tennessee survey showed that the academic retardation of the segregated Negro elementary-school pupil is progressive.

The situation in northern Virginia was summarized by Mearns⁷⁰ in a report written for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

The Negroes themselves have recognized that the achievement gap exists, but the only obvious reaction among most Negroes is reluctance to transfer to white schools. The question is raised as to whether Negroes really obtain a better education in desegregated schools where they must compete with better prepared highly motivated white-students. Frustration and failure engulf the ill-prepared Negro pupils....

Other data indicate that the racial gap in achievement continues to widen through high school and college. Roberts⁷¹ pointed out that less than 3 per cent of Negro graduates of segregated high schools would meet the standards of non-segregated colleges.

Roberts estimated that not more than 10 to 15 per cent of Negro American college youth were capable of exceeding the threshold-level score on the American Council on Education test that was recommended by the President's Commission.

⁷⁰E. A. Mearns Jr., "Part IV, Virginia," In U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights, U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1962, p. 182-183.

⁷¹S. O. Roberts, "Test Performance in Relation to Ethnic Group and Social Class," Mimeographed Report made in 1963 at Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Even in the urban North, where schools are legally integrated, the education afforded Negroes tends to be inadequate. Deutsch,⁷² for example, found that in time samples of classroom activity from 50 per cent to 80 per cent of all classroom time in New York elementary schools with predominantly Negro, lower-class children was devoted to disciplining and various essentially non-academic tasks. By comparison, only 30 per cent of classroom time was given over to such activities in elementary schools attended mainly by white children of roughly similar economic status.

The foregoing material indicates that when grade-a-year plans of desegregation are adopted, it is obviously desirable from an educational standpoint to begin integration at the lowest grade and work upward. However, many southern school systems are on grade-a-year plans of reverse order, with integration starting in the twelfth grade and proceeding down.

In summarizing the research and the preceding material, it is crucial to note that where there is a marked discrepancy in the educational standards of Negro and white schools or where feelings of inferiority are acquired by Negro children outside the school, minority-group newcomers in integrated classrooms are likely to have a low expectancy of academic success; consequently, their achievement motivation should be low.⁷³

⁷²M. Deutsch, p. 86..

⁷³I. Katz, p. 290.

Given the prestige and power of the white majority group, rejection of Negro students by white class-mates or teachers should tend to elicit fear, anger, and humiliation detrimental to intellectual functioning.⁷⁴ When academic failure entails disapproval by significant others (parent, teachers, and perhaps classmates), low expectancy of success should elicit emotional responses that are detrimental to performance.

On the other hand, acceptance of Negroes by white peers and adults should have a social facilitation effect upon their ability to learn, by motivating them to adhere to white standards of academic performance; anticipation that high performance will win white approval should endow scholastic success with high-incentive value.

Reports on the academic progress of Negro children in desegregated schools are on the whole inadequate for drawing any conclusions about the effects of biracial environments upon Negro performance. However, other types of evidence indicate that any or all of the situational factors mentioned above may be operative in specific instances. Research on psychological stress generally supports the assumption that social threat and failure threat are detrimental to complex learning.

Herbert Wey conducted a study involving many school systems which had desegregated their schools.⁷⁵ His study showed that in 1958 many teachers and principals felt that desegregation had necessitated a lowering of some academic standards. Evidently this feeling is no longer

⁷⁴Katz, p. 291.

⁷⁵Herbert Wey, "Desegregation--It Works," an article in Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964, Vol. XLV, No. 8, p. 179.

present, because in 1963 only two out of forty respondents felt that the instructional program had been handicapped by the placement of Negroes in formerly all-white schools. Administrators and teachers repeatedly stated that they had a better instructional program now than they had before desegregation began. The St. Louis school system reported that test results show phenomenal improvement in the basic skills of students in the culturally disadvantaged neighborhoods of that city. This is attributed largely to a reduced pupil-teacher ratio and added effort on the part of teachers and principals.

One serious problem the Negro youngster faces as he attempts to compete with the white student in desegregated schools is his speech. The Negro student has a difficult time communicating because he lacks confidence in his language, and in turn the teacher finds it difficult to understand him.

The determination of school people to maintain and raise academic standards in the desegregated schools even though they report they are meeting the needs of the individual has accentuated the dropout problem. This problem, although not limited to the Negroes, is greater among them than among the whites. The less capable Negro student, faced with higher academic standards and often with little encouragement from home, wants to drop out of the integrated schools, especially after the novelty wears off. This problem will grow as schools move closer to complete desegregation.

In any desegregation program, publicity should be kept to a minimum. One superintendent stated emphatically, "Publicity, I feel, invites people to choose sides--even people not directly involved." Evidence of the efficacy of this advice is suggested by the experience in Dade County, Florida, where virtually complete desegregation of students and faculty

was achieved without publicity and without incident. Each step of the desegregation plan was taken as a matter of course, and newspaper reports were usually of something already accomplished. White parents of this school system were often surprised when they learned that Negro children were attending the same school as their own children. Some of these parents, although accepting what had already been done, could easily have become excited and been willing to initiate action if they had known in advance about desegregation plans.

One superintendent suggested that school men not allow the press to exaggerate small incidents. A fight between a white boy and a Negro boy should be treated just the same as a fight between two white boys or two Negro boys. An elementary teacher in his system said that the most important piece of advice she could give would be not to begin a desegregation program by assigning a single Negro student to a classroom with all white students. She felt that two or more Negro students in a classroom help ease the adjustment, not only for the Negro students but for the white students.

A St. Louis teacher offered the following advice:

Dont' blow this situation up out of proportion--do not assume that a completely new and different kind of situation is going to confront you. You are not going to face the unknown. You will still be working with living, breathing human beings--child size.⁷⁶

White leaders in the Deep South still say that most Negroes are not interested in desegregation and, if left alone would be quite happy. If it were ever true, it definitely isn't so now. Now that national leaders of both races take the stand for desegregation and since news media have

⁷⁶Wey, p. 93.

been filled with information on the subject, Negroes in the South, both at the highest and lowest cultural level, strongly desire desegregation. Of course it is true that if the Negro is approached by a southern leader, he will readily reply that he is happy with his own school. However, when given a chance to express his opinion without having his name revealed, his answer is quite different.

A summary of this study results in this one valuable conclusion:

The extent of community upheaval when desegregation comes will be determined by the attitude of the leaders of the community and in the state as a whole. Desegregation? It works, say the people who furnished much of the information for this report. But whether it can be made to work in areas of determined resistance is yet to be decided.⁷⁷

In the Brown case, the United States Supreme Court placed the responsibility of integrating the school squarely on the hands of the local school authorities:

School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving the varied local school problems, which may require solution in fully implementing the governing constitutional principles. The courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles.⁷⁸

The remaining part of this chapter will be devoted to a summary of the attempts made by various local school districts in implementing plans of racial integration. Each of these attempts reflects a different approach to the problem. Even as this paper is written, many large- and medium-sized school districts are attacking the problem with vigor. It will be interesting to observe these efforts in the future and assess the communities' responses to such efforts.

⁷⁷Wey, p. 95.

⁷⁸347 U.S. 483, 497.

Evanston, Illinois

The city of Evanston, a middle-class Chicago suburb, will integrate its schools, now 22 per cent Negro, by changing district boundaries and converting one formerly all-Negro institution into a laboratory school.

The integration plan, adopted by the Evanston Board of Education in November, 1966, is a consequence of two years of community study and debate. Its details were developed on the basis of population patterns and other data processed through a computer programed to develop maximum integration with a minimum disruption of neighborhood school patterns. The major ingredient, however, was a continuing series of community meetings and public hearings to enlist the support of citizens and to accommodate their views. The plan was fully implemented in September, 1967; in the meantime, the school system is planning summer seminars for teachers who have never worked in integrated schools and a "buddy system" for students and parents of students who will be transferred to new schools in September.

Boston, Massachusetts

Two independent community organizations, neither of them associated with the Boston School Committee, are now busing children out of the city's ghetto schools. The Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunities (METCO) is operating a program that takes 220 inner-city children to schools in seven suburbs, among them the most prestigious systems in the area. METCO, financed by grants from the Federal Government and the Carnegie Corporation, is directed by representatives of Negro organizations, members of the suburban school systems involved in the program, and a number of independent individuals from the Boston area.

The other busing program, Operation Exodus, also grew out of the bitter desegregation struggles in the Boston system, but unlike METCO, it operates entirely within the city. In the fall of 1965, after the Boston School Committee refused to bus Negro children from overcrowded ghetto schools to schools in white neighborhoods that had extra space, a group of Negro parents, taking advantage of an open enrollment policy, organized its own busing and tutoring project. Financed by individual gifts from suburban residents, ghetto Negroes, and funds raised at charity concerts and dances, Exodus in 1965-1966 transported approximately four hundred children each day. This year, with some support from the Ford Foundation and at least tentative prospect of federal assistance, Exodus is busing close to nine hundred children to twenty-five Boston elementary and junior high schools.

Hartford, Connecticut

Some 265 deprived children in the city of Hartford are being bused to five Hartford suburbs--West Hartford, Simsbury, South Windsor, Manchester, and Farmington--in an experiment designed to determine whether integrated classes and extra services will upgrade the level of education of such students. In West Hartford, the experiment was further refined to learn whether integration alone, without extra services, will raise classroom performance. Some of the children being bused to West Hartford are in classes with extra teachers and teacher aides; some are not. The performance of these two groups will be compared with that of two similar control groups in the core city schools. This experiment, financed by state and federal funds, may determine, according to West Hartford's Superintendent of Schools Charles O. Richter "whether it is money or mixing that will make the difference for deprived youngsters from the central city.

White Plains, New York

A model school's racial balance plan in effect here for three years has produced small but measurable academic gains for Negro pupils while neither harming nor driving away any of the white pupils. The White Plains Board of Education which in 1964 made this the first city in the country to set minimum-maximum racial quotas for all its schools, said in a news report:

1. Negro pupils who entered grade one after integration performed "slightly" better by grade three than did a comparable group of Negroes before integration.

2. Negro pupils who were in grade three when integration started as a group have not surpassed the performance of their pre-integration predecessors. But some of them, though still below grade level, have closed the gap.

3. White pupils who have attended racially mixed schools for grades three through five have performed at least as well as a comparable group of white pupils in mostly-white schools before 1964.

The report was based on scores from the Stanford Achievement Test given to selected groups of white and Negro elementary school pupils before and after the racial balance plan was effected.

The plan requires all schools to have an enrollment that is at least 10 per cent but no more than 30 per cent Negro. Most seriously involved were the city's elementary schools. As a whole, the 8,700-pupil system is 18.6 per cent Negro.

The board report made no secret of the fact that Negro pupils as a group still generally lag behind white pupils. But the achievement gap for at least some Negroes was narrowed through integration, the report said.

Evidence for the report's conclusions included these findings:

1. The median percentile rankings on three parts of the four-part Stanford test for post-integration Negro first-graders were five to fifteen points higher than for pre-integration Negroes. On the fourth part of the test, the median scores were identical for both groups.

2. Of the Negro pupil group that has moved from grade three to five in integrated schools, 45 per cent achieved two or more years of academic progress in those two years; before integration, only 25 per cent of the post-integration group made less than 1.5 years' progress as opposed to 33 per cent before integration.

3. The white pupils who have moved from grade three to grade five since 1964 performed as well as or better than their pre-integration counterparts on three of the four Stanford tests.

Questionnaires received from parents and teachers indicated no massive opposition to the integration effort which introduced busing.

Of teachers who responded on unsigned forms, only 12.4 per cent said the effort is "all negative;" the largest group--45.2 per cent--indicated mixed feelings by saying the program had both advantages and drawbacks.

The board found that integration did not drive white pupils to private and parochial schools.

At the present time the most potent weapon available to force school districts to implement plans of integration apparently is the withholding of Federal funds under NDEA of 1958, ESEA of 1965, or the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Six million dollars was withheld from Springfield, Massachusetts, and a similar amount was withheld from Chicago temporarily until such time that the school boards reshaped plans to integrate the schools.

In Oklahoma City and Minneapolis, open enrollment policies were established for the expressed purpose of integrating the schools. However, the number of non-white students taking advantage of this policy was considerably lower than expected. In Providence, Rhode Island, Negro parents, who for a month kept one hundred pupils in "freedom schools" to protest a racial balance plan that cost them a neighborhood school, ended their boycott in October, 1967. The neighborhood school reopened in January, 1968. James Redmond, superintendent of the Chicago schools, has proposed a massive busing plan to begin in February, 1968, which was not accepted by the Board of Education. Pittsburgh schools are planning educational park complexes. There will be five super high schools replacing the present twenty-three. San Mateo, California, has begun a cross-busing program. Approximately three hundred white and non-white students are involved.

School districts are employing three approaches in reacting to the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, compliance, tokenism, and defiance. Prince Edward County, Virginia, used every means available to avoid compliance, even closing the public schools. The case remained active in the courts through the entire ten years, and at the end of the period was once again before the Supreme Court. Clarendon County, South Carolina, continued to operate segregated schools as before.⁷⁹

The penalty for racial discrimination in federally-aided school districts is loss of federal assistance, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Office of Equal Educational Opportunity in the USOE was established to administer that part of the law in federally-financed educational programs.

⁷⁹Jim Leeson, "The First Ten Years," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964, Vol. XLV, No. 8, p. 126.

By September 10, 1965, Title VI was having a profound impact upon segregation in the South. More desegregation existed than in all the eleven years since the Supreme Court declared segregation unconstitutional.⁸⁰

While preparing Equality of Educational Opportunity,⁸¹ Coleman discovered that a pupil's achievement is indeed strongly related to the educational backgrounds and aspirations of other students in his school. However, there is an everything-to-gain-and-nothing-to-lose factor. The achievement of a white pupil with strong educational motivation will not be reduced even if he is surrounded by schoolmates whose socio-economic background is sharply different from his own. However, a Negro pupil will increase his achievement if placed with schoolmates whose background stimulates them to high performance. In other words, the report was a powerful argument for integration as opposed to the theory of "separate but equal" schools which, ironically, is now being backed by Negro radicals as well as white conservatives.

Inasmuch as one aspect of this study concerns itself with the attitudes of teachers and laymen in the community, a search was made for relevant literature and research in these areas. Weinberg,⁸² in an article entitled "Civil Rights and the Schoolmen," made some statements regarding public opinion about school integration.

Nationally, white Americans are increasingly receptive to the modification of segregation. Recent reports have been prepared by sociologist

⁸⁰Leeson, p. 126.

⁸¹Coleman, p. 21.

⁸²Weinberg, p. 162.

Herbert Hyman of Columbia University and by psychologist and sociologist Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz of the University of Chicago.

A Gallup Poll of June, 1963, reported that a majority of white parents in the North would not object to sending their children to a school in which as many as half the children were colored. In September, 1963, a Harris poll for Newsweek reported that over 70 per cent of the white population did not object to integrated schools; three-fourths of all whites, including 57 per cent Southern whites, regarded integrated schools as inevitable.⁸³

In modification of these findings one should keep in mind a 1961 observation by the Michigan Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

It...seems not improbable that the majority of white parents in Michigan would prefer segregation, but not at the cost of public disturbances or public confession of prejudice.⁸⁴

In certain localities educators have defended their inaction by pointing to anti-integrationist sentiment among the white population. Federal Judge Joseph C. Zavatt, in the Manhasset case, criticized the school board's references to "community preferences" as a reason for inaction. "It is the board," wrote Judge Zavatt, "not the electors, who must determine when, if ever, these policies should be modified."

Although newspaper policies vary with the locality, most newspapers support the anti-integration, tokenist, or gradualist position. In the revolution for equality, probably not a single large-city newspaper is a consistent supporter of the integrationist.

⁸³P. Brink and W. Harris, Negro Revolution in America, New York, Harper, 1965, p. 151.

⁸⁴United States Commission on Civil Rights, The 50 States Report, Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 287.

Things are often more complicated than they seem. But it is just as true, if not as frequent, that things are at times simpler than they seem. At a recent symposium in Chicago on "Integration and Education," integration consultant Doctor Max Wolff was asked how integrationists should counter-organize against parent and taxpayer groups which take an antagonistic position on specific integration proposals put forward by the New York City Board of Education. "Don't bother," was his answer. These groups, he said, always attack specific integration plans while protesting their devotion to the general goal of integration. They were caught in what Gunner Myradal once dubbed the American Dilemma. They believed in the ideal of equality of opportunity but were fearful of its application. Wolff is confident that such groups do not have any workable alternatives. Civil rights groups have the responsibility to organize all the more effectively and to support any school board which is willing to carry out a specific integration plan.⁸⁵

⁸⁵Weinberg, p. 165.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN
OF RESEARCH

This chapter will be an outline of the research design and statistical measures used in attempting to find some answers to the basic questions raised in this study. The chapter will be divided into two basic parts. The first part being an analysis of standardized test data and the second part being a treatment of the two attitude inventory surveys.

In the section dealing with the analysis of standardized test data, the two basic areas being considered are achievement test scores and intelligence test scores. The achievement test data will include these test items:

1. overall achievement
2. reading vocabulary
3. reading comprehension
4. arithmetic reasoning
5. arithmetic fundamentals
6. mechanics of English
7. spelling

Comparisons of growth in achievement test scores in these seven areas reflecting academic progress in segregated and integrated school settings will be made. The rationale behind this all-inclusive approach is rather obvious. It is conceivable that no significant increases will be noted in overall achievement, but significant changes may appear in isolated tests reflecting increases or decreases in verbal or non-verbal aspects of academic achievement.

Inasmuch as this thesis is a descriptive study, no attempt will be made to formulate a formal hypothesis to be tested with a specific level of significance. Rather, some basic questions will be raised with the anticipation that the analysis of the standardized test data will reveal some answers to those questions. A list of these questions is offered below with this writer being fully aware that such a list is certainly not all-inclusive and that the analysis of the data could well reveal additional information.

1. Will there be noticeable differences or trends in the increases in standardized achievement test scores for Negro pupils after one year of racial integration in the Urbana elementary schools when compared with the increases on identical tests the year prior to integration?

2. Will there be noticeable differences or trends in the increases in standardized achievement test scores for white pupils after one year of racial integration in the Urbana elementary schools when compared with the increases on identical tests the year prior to integration?

3. If any noticeable increases in standardized achievement test scores exist are they evident in those areas which are basically verbal or non-verbal in nature?

4. Do younger or older children in the groups studied benefit more from a plan of racial integration in terms of academic achievement as measured by standardized tests?

5. Do boys or girls in the experimental groups benefit more from a plan of racial integration in terms of academic achievement as measured by standardized tests?

The second part of this section dealing with the statistical analysis of standardized test data involves changes in intelligence test scores. The standardized intelligence tests used in this study include both language and non-language scores which in turn yield a total intelligence test score. Comparisons will be made only in the total intelligence test score. The basic questions raised in this area are as follows:

1. Will there be noticeable differences or trends in standardized intelligence test scores for Negro pupils after one year of racial integration in the Urbana elementary schools when compared with the scores on identical tests prior to integration?

2. Will there be noticeable differences or trends in standardized intelligence test scores for white pupils after one year of racial integration in the Urbana elementary schools when compared with the scores on identical tests prior to integration?

3. Do younger or older children in the Urbana schools benefit more from a plan of racial integration in terms of intelligence test scores as measured by standardized tests?

4. Do boys or girls in the Urbana schools benefit more from a plan of racial integration in terms of intelligence test scores as measured by standardized tests?

In order to gain some idea as to the pattern of growth which Urbana elementary students demonstrate on standardized achievement tests, this researcher will analyze the scores of students who were in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades in 1963, 1964, and 1965. This analysis will give some indication as to the pattern of growth which elementary students demonstrate on standardized tests as they advance through the elementary grades and more background in the interpretation of the data for this study.

One word of caution must be stated at this time insofar as intelligence test scores are concerned. This precaution must also be considered a definite limitation of this study. Standardized intelligence tests are given only in grades one, two, four and six. This limiting factor means that the number of subjects will be reduced considerably and also the intelligence test score prior to integration could well be two or three years prior to integration rather than one year. This limitation does not hold true for achievement tests inasmuch as these are given each year throughout the elementary grades from grades two through six.

Instrumentation

The California Achievement Test will be utilized in the first portion of the study. The complete battery of tests was administered to all elementary students in grades two through six in the Urbana schools in October, 1965; October, 1966; and October, 1967. The differences in scores in each area as well as in total achievement between 1965 and 1966 will be compared to the differences in scores between 1966 and 1967. The differences between 1965 and 1966 represent the increase in academic progress for the year prior to racial integration, and the differences between 1966 and 1967 will be the increases in achievement after one year of integration.

The 1963 Short-Form of the California Test of Mental Maturity will be the standardized test utilized in comparing intelligence test scores. This test was administered to all elementary pupils in grades one, two, four and six, October, 1965, 1966, and 1967. The score in 1965 or 1966 will be compared to the score received in 1967. Inasmuch as only two scores are available, the t-test will be utilized to see if there is any significant difference between these two scores. The 1965 or 1966 score is the pre-integration score, and the 1967 score is the post-integration score.

Sampling

All elementary students in the Urbana schools who were administered the standardized tests each of the three years will comprise the N. Approximately 350 students at each grade level, grades three through six, will be the subjects. This includes all Negro children who have been bused to the previously all-white schools, Negro children who remained in the previous all-Negro school, white students who were bused to the previous all-Negro school, and white students who remained in their all-white neighborhood schools. Of the 1336 students involved in this study, approximately twelve per cent are Negro. Comparisons will be made by race, grade level, and sex.

Statistical Design

The t-test for matched pairs will be the statistical test used with each student being his own match. The mean differences in scores of all students between 1965 and 1966 will be compared with the mean differences in scores between 1966 and 1967. This comparison will be made at all grade levels, by race, and by sex. The tabulation of this data will be recorded in tables and reported in the following chapter.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES SURVEY

The second major part of this chapter is concerned with the two attitudinal aspects of this study, community attitudes and professional staff attitudes toward racial integration in the Urbana elementary schools. Each of these will be taken separately and the outline below will be followed in discussing them.

1. Development of the inventory
2. Sampling techniques

3. Design for analysis of results

The questionnaire, which is included in the appendix, is a set of nine basic questions which assess the current attitudes of the respondents toward racial integration in the elementary schools. The respondents were able to respond to each question by merely selecting a response on a five-point Likert-type scale. This particular questionnaire, to this student's knowledge, had never been used previously. It was devised on an arbitrary basis. The questionnaire was administered to a junior high school parent group of approximately fifty persons prior to the actual sending of the questionnaires to the subjects used in the study. This pre-administering of the questionnaire gave this researcher some direction and guidance as to which questions were valid and which ones needed revision.

The junior high parent group was a representative sample of the Urbana community. As a result of this reliability trial, three of the nine questions were revised or replaced altogether.

The questionnaires were administered by sending them in the mail with a stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed for return purposes. The questionnaires were coded in order to determine the classification of the respondent. This coding was explained in a cover letter which accompanied the questionnaire. These classifications are explained in the following paragraph.

The sampling techniques used in administering this questionnaire were strictly random. Parents of elementary school students were selected as well as non-parents. The questionnaire was directed to the head of the household. Those selected were relatively stable residents in the community. This would eliminate many students at the University of Illinois who are here on a rather temporary basis.

The basic source of information concerning the subjects came from the school records of their children and from the Urbana City Directory which is compiled by the Chamber of Commerce.

All possible respondents who were parents of school children were given identification numbers which identified their occupation also. This was done for both Negro and white parents. A random table was then used to select the respondents.

All possible respondents who were non-parents of children in school and who were listed in the Urbana City Directory were also given numbers to identify their occupation.

The random table was then used to select the final list. A limitation of this aspect of the study could well be suggested at this time. All residents of Urbana are not listed in the Urbana City Directory, although the Chamber of Commerce reports approximately 90 per cent participation.

The sample was then drawn with an equal number of respondents from the parent and non-parent groups. Six occupations were selected as being representative of the Urbana community. These six occupations, being represented on both the parent and non-parent groups as well as Negro and white, are as follows:

1. University academic personnel
2. Business owners (large and small)
3. Service occupations (clerical, repairmen, custodians, etc.)
4. Industrial management and/or business management
5. Factory workers, laborers, construction workers
6. Independent professionals (doctors, lawyers, dentists, etc.)

A summary of the findings is in Chapter IV.

TEACHER ATTITUDE SURVEY

When the first year of racial integration was being concluded in the Urbana schools in May, 1967, an attitude inventory questionnaire was administered to all certificated staff members in the Urbana schools. This questionnaire, included in the Appendix, was an adapted version of the questionnaire administered by James S. Coleman in his study, Equality of Educational Opportunity. The questionnaire was administered to classroom teachers throughout the nation. An attempt was made to delete certain questions which this writer thought to be irrelevant to this study. Other questions were modified and adapted to fit the Urbana situation. A summary of the results of this survey is in the next chapter.

In addition to providing basic information concerning the attitudes of staff members toward racial integration in the public schools, the questionnaire also provided much background and basic information for in-service training of teachers. One of the strongest recommendations resulting from this study is in the area of teacher training and in-service education. The entire aspect of teacher attitudes is crucial in this monumental problem of integrating our public schools. If our educational programs are to be effective in educating children in integrated school settings, it is vital that teacher attitudes be conducive to this end.

The future for those cities who are faced with this problem will be determined more by the success of education in human relations by staff members in the schools than by any other factor. The effort to improve racial representation in schools, to reduce de facto segregation, and to begin extensive programs of compensatory education is only supplementary to the basic problem of how people with varied characteristics and backgrounds live and work together in a community. The lessening of racial

imbalance in school or residential areas, compensatory education, equal rights and opportunities, absence of discrimination in education, housing, and employment are important and necessary. However, they are not sufficient to eliminate frictions and misunderstandings nor to insure cooperation in the joint effort of solving social and economic problems. The success of this education in human relations is highly dependent upon the attitudes of our professional educators, both administrators and classroom teachers. Teachers have always been concerned with education in human relationships. They have recognized the need and have endeavored to instill in their pupils some of the concepts of self-discipline, cooperation, acceptance and toleration of differences, and other democratic principles. Such teaching should be an aspect of every modern curriculum. In order for staff members to teach these values, it is absolutely necessary that they themselves possess these traits. Attention to the improvement of human relationships must pervade every aspect of the educational program. The school must not only teach the ideals of democracy but must provide an example of these ideals in practice.

Now that the elementary schools of Urbana are racially integrated, it is of extreme importance that we provide the environment for teachers to take advantage of the situation and be of utmost effectiveness in providing equal educational opportunities for all students. In order to do this, in-service training of teachers is a must in developing favorable attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Tables I and II, as outlined in Chapter III, clearly demonstrate the findings of this study. The discussion which follows is centered on the information in the tables. This chapter will be divided into two basic sections, each section being sub-divided into two parts. This is in keeping with the format of the thesis described in the previous chapter.

STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

A discussion of the findings of the pre-integration control group must necessarily precede the discussion of the analysis of the standardized test data. An analysis was made of the standardized achievement test scores for those students who were enrolled in grades four, five and six in 1963, 1964, and 1965. These students and their scores are not included in the study per se, but an analysis of these data will give us an indication as to what the patterns of change in standardized test scores are for elementary pupils in Urbana over a three-year period. This three-year period, which is in essence a control factor, includes the 1963, 1964, and 1965 years. This period of time is prior to the implementation of racial integration. A basic assumption that must be made is that this group of students is comparable to the groups included in the study.

The pattern of change for this control group will be compared to the patterns found in analyzing the data for those groups actually involved in the study. This analysis should demonstrate whether greater growth in standardized test performance is more evident in younger or older students.

That is to say, do students show more growth between grades two and three than they do between grades three and four? This same question could be raised extending through grade seven.

Table I is a summary of the data for this control group.

The data in Table I demonstrate that there is a decrease in the amount of growth that students exhibit on standardized achievement test scores as they advance in the elementary school. In all of the subject areas except spelling, the increase between the 1964 and 1965 scores is not as great as the increase between the 1963 and 1964 scores. However, the only area which has a significant difference at the 5 per cent level is reading comprehension, which exhibited a tremendous drop from 1.22 to .744. These figures are expressed in grade-level equivalents. This decrease of almost one-half year does not appear in the experimental group in reading comprehension.

This pattern of a decreasing rate of advancement on achievement test scores is quite similar to that shown by the pre- and post-integration experimental groups. When these groups are matched with themselves, the gain achieved in the post-integration year is definitely smaller than the gain achieved in the pre-integration year. This loss is explained by showing the 1963 to 1965 control-group pattern.

However, if the performance of the experimental group is compared with another group's performance the previous year at the same grade level, we find very few differences. In other words, the mean scores on standardized achievement tests of one group of students at a specific grade level will be quite similar to the mean achievement test scores of any other group at that same grade level, whether pre-integration or post-integration. This comparison will be discussed more fully later in this chapter.

TABLE I

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT MEAN TEST SCORES

Pre-Integration Sample
Grade (as of Sept., 1967) 8

| Sub-Group | N | Reading Vocabulary | | | Reading Comprehension | | | Arithmetic Reasoning | | |
|-------------|----|--------------------|--------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|--------|------------|
| | | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 40 | 1.13 | 1.10 | - .03 | 1.16 | .71 | - .45 | .86 | .75 | - .11 |
| Girls | 37 | 1.19 | 1.12 | - .07 | 1.28 | .77 | - .51 | .88 | .77 | - .11 |
| Negro | 12 | 1.08 | 1.06 | - .02 | 1.14 | .72 | - .42 | .84 | .70 | - .14 |
| White | 65 | 1.18 | 1.13 | - .05 | 1.25 | .75 | - .50 | .88 | .78 | - .10 |
| Negro Boys | 7 | 1.09 | 1.07 | - .02 | 1.12 | .71 | - .41 | .84 | .72 | - .12 |
| Negro Girls | 5 | 1.07 | 1.04 | - .03 | 1.16 | .73 | - .43 | .83 | .68 | - .15 |
| White Boys | 33 | 1.17 | 1.11 | - .06 | 1.21 | .80 | - .41 | .84 | .71 | - .13 |
| White Girls | 32 | 1.19 | 1.15 | - .04 | 1.29 | .70 | - .59 | .92 | .85 | - .07 |

*Gain 1 denotes difference between September, 1963 score and September, 1964 score.
Gain 2 denotes difference between September, 1964 score and September, 1965 score.

TABLE I (Continued)

| Sub-Group | Arithmetic Fundamentals | | | Language Mechanics | | | Spelling | | | Total Ach. | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|--------------------|--------|------------|----------|--------|------------|------------|--------|------------|
| | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 1.01 | .87 | - .14 | 1.09 | .90 | - .19 | .79 | 1.25 | + .46 | .94 | .87 | - .07 |
| Girls | 1.07 | .79 | - .28 | 1.27 | .94 | - .33 | .67 | 1.19 | + .52 | 1.08 | .97 | - .11 |
| Negro | .98 | .85 | - .13 | 1.09 | .84 | - .25 | .81 | 1.14 | + .33 | .99 | .86 | - .13 |
| White | 1.06 | .82 | - .24 | 1.21 | .94 | - .27 | .69 | 1.24 | + .55 | 1.02 | .93 | - .09 |
| Negro Boys | .92 | .86 | - .06 | 1.14 | .86 | - .28 | .86 | 1.31 | + .45 | .96 | .83 | - .13 |
| Negro Girls | 1.05 | .84 | - .21 | 1.04 | .81 | - .23 | .75 | 1.14 | + .39 | 1.02 | .89 | - .13 |
| White Boys | 1.04 | .86 | - .18 | 1.14 | .95 | - .19 | .74 | 1.28 | + .54 | .95 | .89 | - .06 |
| White Girls | 1.08 | .78 | - .30 | 1.28 | .93 | - .35 | .64 | 1.16 | + .52 | 1.09 | .97 | - .12 |

Tables II and III, sections A through D, summarize the data for the experimental group which includes those students who were in grades one, two, three, four in 1965; grades two, three, four, five in 1966; and in grades three, four, five, six in 1967. Only those students who were enrolled all three years and were administered the standardized tests are included. Inasmuch as the first graders are not given standardized achievement tests, that group will be excluded in the data that is given.

A second note of vital importance concerns the standardized intelligence test scores. These were administered only in grades one, two, four and five during the 1965-1967 time span. This, of course, means that scores are not available for all three years. In order to compensate for this loss of so many subjects, the following plan was put in effect. The students who were administered the standardized intelligence test in 1967 comprise the N for this aspect of the study. That 1967 score was then paired with a previous score on a test which was administered in either 1965 or 1966. If a score was available for 1966, this was used. If a 1966 score was unavailable, the 1965 score was used as a comparison. With only two scores available, the t-test was utilized to determine if any significant difference existed between the two mean scores.

ACHIEVEMENT TEST FINDINGS

As pointed out previously, the achievement gains for all sub-groups for the 1966-1967 year were not as great as the gains for the 1965-1966 year. That this was rather a normal occurrence for students in the elementary school was also demonstrated. That is to say, the gains made on standardized achievement tests decrease as the students advance in the grade levels. The following discussion will center on specific areas of the tests.

TABLE IIA
STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT MEAN TEST SCORES

| Sub-Group | N | Reading Vocabulary | | | Reading Comprehension | | | Arithmetic Reasoning | | |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|--------|------------|
| | | Gain 1 | Gain* 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 168 | 1.09 | .95 | - .14 | 1.17 | .96 | - .21 | 1.44 | 1.34 | - .10 |
| Girls | 151 | 1.57 | .97 | - .60 | 1.42 | 1.23 | - .19 | 1.57 | 1.25 | - .32 |
| Negro | 12 | 1.29 | .69 | -.60 | 1.07 | .78 | - .29 | 1.60 | 1.18 | - .42 |
| White | 307 | 1.43 | .95 | - .48 | 1.51 | 1.23 | - .28 | 1.47 | 1.30 | - .17 |
| Negro Boys | 7 | 1.07 | .66 | - .41 | .99 | .78 | - .21 | 1.51 | 1.15 | - .36 |
| Negro Girls | 5 | 1.36 | .73 | - .63 | 1.14 | .79 | - .35 | 1.69 | 1.22 | - .47 |
| White Boys | 161 | 1.12 | .93 | - .19 | 1.34 | 1.01 | - .33 | 1.42 | 1.35 | - .07 |
| White Girls | 146 | 1.73 | .98 | - .75 | 1.69 | 1.42 | - .27 | 1.54 | 1.26 | - .28 |
| Totals | 319 | | | | | | | | | |

*Gain 1 denotes difference between 1965 score and 1966 score.
Gain 2 denotes difference between 1966 score and 1967 score.

TABLE IIA (Continued)

| Sub-Group | Arithmetic Fundamentals | | | Language Mechanics | | | Spelling | | | Total Ach. | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|--------------------|--------|------------|----------|--------|------------|------------|--------|------------|
| | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 1.39 | 1.17 | - .22 | 1.30 | .73 | - .57 | 1.30 | 1.15 | - .15 | 1.25 | 1.02 | - .23 |
| Girls | 1.36 | 1.01 | - .35 | 1.50 | .98 | - .52 | 1.15 | 1.20 | + .05 | 1.52 | 1.16 | - .36 |
| Negro | 1.22 | 1.46 | + .24 | 1.36 | .39 | - .97 | .82 | 1.85 | +1.03 | 1.29 | 1.02 | - .27 |
| White | 1.40 | 1.02 | - .38 | 1.42 | .92 | - .50 | 1.29 | 1.15 | - .14 | 1.43 | 1.12 | - .31 |
| Negro Boys | 1.29 | 1.47 | + .18 | 1.04 | .29 | - .75 | .81 | 1.82 | +1.01 | 1.13 | 1.96 | + .83 |
| Negro Girls | 1.13 | 1.43 | + .30 | 1.51 | .50 | -1.01 | .83 | 1.90 | +1.07 | 1.46 | 1.09 | - .37 |
| White Boys | 1.43 | 1.13 | - .30 | 1.34 | .79 | - .55 | 1.35 | 1.14 | - .21 | 1.29 | 1.04 | - .25 |
| White Girls | 1.39 | .97 | - .42 | 1.50 | 1.05 | - .45 | 1.22 | 1.15 | - .07 | 1.57 | 1.19 | - .38 |

TABLE IIB
STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT MEAN TEST SCORES

| Sub-Group | N | Reading Vocabulary | | | Reading Comprehension | | | Arithmetic Reasoning | | |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|-------|------------|-----------------------|------|------------|----------------------|------|------------|
| | | Gain | Gain* | Difference | Gain | Gain | Difference | Gain | Gain | Difference |
| | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | |
| Boys | 155 | .89 | 1.09 | + .20 | 1.27 | 1.04 | - .23 | 1.08 | .68 | - .40 |
| Girls | 179 | .93 | 1.20 | + .27 | 1.09 | 1.12 | + .03 | 1.44 | .76 | - .68 |
| Negro | 19 | .25 | 1.28 | +1.03 | .89 | .98 | + .09 | 1.06 | .80 | - .26 |
| White | 315 | .99 | 1.08 | + .09 | 1.20 | 1.12 | - .08 | 1.33 | .70 | - .63 |
| Negro Boys | 8 | .24 | 1.11 | + .87 | .89 | .95 | + .06 | .78 | .70 | - .08 |
| Negro Girls | 11 | .26 | 1.44 | +1.18 | .89 | .99 | + .10 | 1.33 | .90 | - .43 |
| White Boys | 147 | .93 | 1.06 | + .13 | 1.29 | 1.07 | - .22 | 1.17 | .67 | - .50 |
| White Girls | 168 | 1.05 | 1.10 | + .05 | 1.13 | 1.17 | + .04 | 1.48 | .73 | - .75 |
| Totals | 334 | | | | | | | | | |

*Gain 1 denotes difference between 1965 score and 1966 score.
Gain 2 denotes difference between 1966 score and 1967 score.

TABLE IIB (Continued)

| Sub-Group | Arithmetic Fundamentals | | | Language Mechanics | | | Spelling | | | Total Ach. | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|--------------------|--------|------------|----------|--------|------------|------------|--------|------------|
| | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 1.10 | .69 | - .41 | 1.00 | .99 | - .01 | 1.13 | .97 | - .16 | .99 | .90 | - .09 |
| Girls | .98 | .67 | - .31 | 1.24 | 1.12 | - .12 | 1.24 | 1.06 | - .18 | 1.20 | 1.02 | - .18 |
| Negro | 1.09 | .48 | - .61 | 1.25 | .85 | - .40 | 1.01 | 1.58 | + .57 | .94 | .97 | + .03 |
| White | 1.03 | .72 | - .31 | 1.09 | 1.11 | + .02 | 1.23 | .92 | - .31 | 1.13 | .95 | - .18 |
| Negro Boys | 1.16 | .52 | - .64 | 1.05 | .78 | - .27 | 1.05 | 1.48 | + .43 | .89 | .91 | + .02 |
| Negro Girls | 1.01 | .45 | - .56 | 1.45 | .92 | - .53 | .97 | 1.68 | + .71 | .99 | 1.03 | + .04 |
| White Boys | 1.09 | .74 | - .35 | .98 | 1.02 | + .04 | 1.16 | .87 | - .29 | 1.01 | .90 | - .11 |
| White Girls | .97 | .70 | - .27 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 0 | 1.28 | .96 | - .32 | 1.24 | 1.01 | - .23 |

TABLE IIC
STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT MEAN TEST SCORES

| Sub-Group | N | Reading Vocabulary | | | Reading Comprehension | | | Arithmetic Reasoning | | |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|--------|------------|
| | | Gain 1 | Gain* 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | 169 | .74 | 1.01 | + .27 | .98 | .98 | 0 | .70 | .90 | + .20 |
| Girls | 152 | .93 | 1.26 | + .33 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 0 | .81 | .93 | + .08 |
| Negro | 23 | .70 | .57 | - .13 | .83 | .43 | - .40 | .65 | .45 | - .20 |
| White | 298 | .87 | 1.32 | + .45 | 1.04 | 1.11 | + .07 | .77 | .99 | + .22 |
| Negro Boys | 11 | .64 | .48 | - .16 | .83 | .40 | - .43 | .59 | .43 | - .16 |
| Negro Girls | 12 | .76 | .62 | - .14 | .84 | .48 | - .36 | .70 | .48 | - .22 |
| White Boys | 158 | .77 | 1.28 | + .51 | 1.01 | 1.08 | + .07 | .73 | .97 | + .24 |
| White Girls | 140 | .96 | 1.35 | + .39 | 1.08 | 1.13 | + .05 | .83 | 1.00 | + .17 |
| Totals | 321 | | | | | | | | | |

*Gain 1 denotes difference between 1965 score and 1966 score.
Gain 2 denotes difference between 1966 score and 1967 score.

TABLE IIC (Continued)

| Sub-Group | Arithmetic Fundamentals | | | Language Mechanics | | | Spelling | | | Total Ach. | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|--------------------|--------|------------|----------|--------|------------|------------|--------|------------|
| | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference | Gain 1 | Gain 2 | Difference |
| Boys | .98 | .89 | - .09 | .96 | .72 | - .24 | .92 | .97 | + .05 | .86 | .93 | + .07 |
| Girls | .89 | .79 | - .10 | 1.20 | 1.01 | - .19 | .93 | .87 | - .06 | .90 | 1.02 | + .12 |
| Negro | .54 | .70 | + .16 | 1.06 | .22 | - .84 | 1.00 | .23 | - .77 | .80 | .53 | - .27 |
| White | .99 | .88 | - .11 | 1.09 | .95 | - .14 | .89 | 1.01 | + .12 | .90 | 1.04 | + .14 |
| Negro Boys | .57 | .68 | + .11 | .89 | .21 | - .68 | 1.03 | .23 | - .80 | .77 | .50 | - .27 |
| Negro Girls | .51 | .72 | + .21 | 1.24 | .23 | -1.01 | .98 | .24 | - .74 | .84 | .55 | - .29 |
| White Boys | 1.05 | .95 | - .10 | .98 | .79 | - .19 | .88 | 1.06 | + .18 | .88 | .99 | + .11 |
| White Girls | .94 | .82 | - .12 | 1.20 | 1.13 | - .07 | .91 | .94 | + .03 | .92 | 1.10 | + .18 |

Some general findings show that girls in the elementary schools not only score well above the boys, but they also show greater increases each year than do the boys. The areas of arithmetic computation and spelling to some extent reverse that trend. This is not surprising inasmuch as other studies also show this same pattern.

Another general finding shows that white students score higher on the standardized tests than do Negro students. However, the scores taken after integration show that the Negro students have dropped farther behind. The white students had an increase in total achievement of 1.15 years from 1965 to 1966, and this figure decreased to 1.03 from 1966 to 1967. The Negro students had an increase of .96 years from 1965 to 1966 and this decreased to .78 year. This decrease was almost 19 per cent as compared with a 10 per cent decrease for the whites. The Negroes increased in reading vocabulary from .67 to .84 and in spelling from .96 to 1.08. The white students increased only in reading vocabulary from 1.09 to 1.11 years.

The Negro students showed dramatic decreases in reading comprehension from .90 to .70; arithmetic reasoning dropped from 1.00 to .74; arithmetic fundamentals showed less decrease, from .88 to .79; language mechanics showed a drop from 1.19 to .48. This high percentage decrease accounts for a large portion of the drop in the total achievement.

The white students showed decreases in reading comprehension from 1.25 to 1.14; arithmetic reasoning from 1.19 to .99; arithmetic computation from 1.11 to .87; language mechanics from 1.19 to .99; and spelling from 1.13 to 1.02.

Negro students who were in grades three, four, five during the 1965-1967 years showed a greater increase in total achievement after integration

than they demonstrated the year prior to integration. This increase was from .94 to .97. All other groups followed the pattern of decreasing rates of achievement gains.

The group of white students in grades four, five, six during this same three-year period showed an increase in total achievement from .90 to 1.04 years. All other groups of white students showed a decrease the year after integration.

The Negro students in grades, two, three, four showed an increase in gains in 1967 in arithmetic computation and spelling. In arithmetic computation, the pre-integration gain was 1.21, and the post-integration gain was 1.45. In spelling the gain increased from .82 to 1.85, a tremendous change. Nevertheless, due to decreases in the other areas, the total for this group was .26 less gain after integration than before integration. The white students in this same age span of three years showed a decrease from 1.41 to .91, a net loss of .49. The white group showed no increase in gains in any subject.

Negro students in grades three through five showed an increase in gains in total achievement from .94 to .97. Increases were also shown in reading vocabulary and comprehension as well as spelling. In comparison, the white students in grades three through five showed a difference between gain 1 and gain 2 of .17. This means that the post-integration gains were less than the pre-integration gains. Slight increases were registered in reading vocabulary and language mechanics.

In looking at Table II C, we can compare the Negro and white students who were in grades, four, five, six during the 1965-1967 years. The Negroes showed a decrease in gain in total achievement, dropping from .80 to .52 with a gain made only in arithmetic computation, from .54 to .70. It has

been noted earlier that the group of white students in these three grades had an increase in gain 2 over gain 1. This increase was from .90 to 1.04 with increases in reading vocabulary and comprehension, arithmetic reasoning, and spelling.

The data for the standardized achievement test scores indicate one group of Negro students and one group of white students did not follow the pattern of decreasing rates of growth as the students advanced to higher grade levels. All other groups were quite similar to the control group for the 1963-1965 pre-integration years. The control group showed a decrease of .09 between the 1963-1964 scores and the 1964-1965 scores, whereas the total experimental group, including all sub-groups, showed a difference of .12. This .03 difference is negligible in terms of being significant. The total Negro group showed a difference of .16, and the total white group showed a difference of .11. Boys showed a difference of .15, and girls showed a difference of .09. The control groups showed almost identical figures.

At the 5 per cent level of significance no differences existed between the gains made in standardized achievement test scores the year prior to integration when compared with the scores one year after integration. This is particularly true in light of the findings of the control group for the three pre-integration years, 1963-1965.

STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS

In analyzing the standardized intelligence test scores for elementary students in Urbana during the 1965, 1966, and 1967 school years, it is even more apparent that the scores were less affected by the implementation of racial integration in 1966 than were the standardized achievement test

scores. It has also been pointed out that few students had scores for each of the three years. Thus, it was impossible to compare gain 1 with gain 2 in the manner that achievement test scores were compared. It has also been explained that either a 1965 or a 1966 score was used as a pre-integration measure, and this score was then compared with the 1967 score. The tabular results of this comparison are shown in Tables III, A through D. The discussion which follows is a summary of this data.

The Negro students in grades one through three during 1965-1967 increased their mean intelligence test score from 102.3 to 105.7. The white students increased their mean score from 113.0 to 114.8.

In comparing Negro students with white students in grades two, three, and four, we find the Negroes' mean score increased from 102.5 to 104.3. The mean score of the white students remained at 113.8.

For grades three, four, and five we find the mean score for the Negro students increased from 105.0 to 106.5, and the white students' mean score decreased from 115.3 to 114.8.

In looking at the table for grades four, five, and six, we find that the Negroes' mean score decreased from 104.0 to 102.5, and the whites' mean score dropped from 114.3 to 112.3.

Some general findings which can be gleaned from the data are summarized as follows:

1. Girls at the elementary level achieved higher scores on standardized intelligence tests than do boys. This was true for both Negroes and whites.

2. White students had scores on standardized intelligence tests which are approximately ten points higher than Negroes had. This was true at all grade levels in the elementary schools in Urbana.

TABLE IIIA
 STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE MEAN TEST SCORES
 Pre- and Post-Integration Group
 Grade (as of Sept., 1967) 3

| Sub-Group | N | 1965 or 1966 Score | Total Intelligence Score 1967 Score | Difference |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|--|------------|
| Boys | 101 | 107.68 | 106.96 | - .72 |
| Girls | 96 | 112.74 | 113.25 | + .51 |
| Negro | 10 | 102.30 | 102.78 | + .48 |
| White | 187 | 113.08 | 114.85 | +1.77 |
| Negro Boys | 5 | 98.36 | 99.42 | +1.06 |
| White Boys | 96 | 110.02 | 109.48 | - .54 |
| Negro Girls | 5 | 106.33 | 106.14 | - .19 |
| White Girls | 91 | 116.24 | 116.86 | + .62 |
| Totals | 197 | | | |

TABLE IIIB
 STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE MEAN TEST SCORES
 Pre- and Post-Integration Group
 Grade (as of Sept., 1967) 4

| Sub-Group | N | 1965 or 1966 Score | Total Intelligence Score 1967 Score | Difference |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|--|------------|
| Boys | 51 | 105.06 | 106.31 | +1.25 |
| Girls | 52 | 116.88 | 115.96 | - .92 |
| Negro | 8 | 102.50 | 104.43 | +1.93 |
| White | 95 | 113.86 | 113.82 | + .04 |
| Negro Boys | 5 | 98.62 | 99.50 | + .88 |
| White Boys | 46 | 107.98 | 107.62 | - .36 |
| Negro Girls | 3 | 105.87 | 108.38 | +2.49 |
| White Girls | 49 | 120.48 | 121.04 | + .56 |
| Totals | 103 | | | |

TABLE IIIIC
 STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE MEAN TEST SCORES
 Pre- and Post-Integration Group
 Grade (as of Sept., 1967) 5

| Sub-Group | N | 1965 or 1966 Score | Total Intelligence Score 1967 Score | Difference |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|--|------------|
| Boys | 97 | 107.36 | 107.10 | - .26 |
| Girls | 111 | 117.75 | 117.62 | - .13 |
| Negro | 114 | 105.00 | 106.50 | +1.50 |
| White | 194 | 115.35 | 114.88 | - .47 |
| Negro Boys | 6 | 101.67 | 102.36 | + .69 |
| White Boys | 91 | 109.87 | 109.42 | - .45 |
| Negro Girls | 8 | 109.46 | 110.81 | +1.35 |
| White Girls | 103 | 121.41 | 120.96 | - .45 |
| Totals | 208 | | | |

TABLE II
 STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE MEAN TEST SCORES
 Pre- and Post-Integration Group
 Grade (as of Sept., 1967) 6

| Sub-Group | N | 1965 or 1966 Score | Total Intelligence Score 1967 Score | Difference |
|-------------|----|--------------------|--|------------|
| Boys | 36 | 106.78 | 106.28 | - .50 |
| Girls | 33 | 114.28 | 113.71 | - .57 |
| Negro | 11 | 104.00 | 102.54 | -1.46 |
| White | 58 | 114.36 | 112.36 | -2.00 |
| Negro Boys | 6 | 101.90 | 99.94 | -1.96 |
| White Boys | 30 | 109.60 | 108.53 | -1.07 |
| Negro Girls | 5 | 107.41 | 105.00 | -2.41 |
| White Girls | 28 | 119.43 | 116.49 | -2.94 |
| Totals | 69 | | | |

3. Negroes showed an increase in their mean intelligence test scores in every group except the oldest group, which was in grade six after integration.

4. The oldest group showed a decrease in mean scores for every subgroup within that group.

Even though the decreases for the oldest group are not significant, the fact that all sub-groups showed a decrease cannot be overlooked. The control group for grades four, five, and six during the 1963-1965 pre-integration years did not show this pattern. Only two sub-groups of the control group showed a decrease. The increases were negligible, but, nevertheless, they were evident.

A discussion in Chapter I centered on the concept that intelligence tests were, in reality, achievement tests. This concept can be substantiated if these intelligence test scores follow a pattern similar to that of achievement tests and decrease as the student advances grade levels.

This, in part, could possibly explain the differences in Negro and white students' scores, and the differences in boys' and girls' scores. Also, most standardized intelligence tests are undoubtedly culturally oriented, i.e., they are heavily verbal and language based. This factor, in part, also accounts for the differences in scores between Negroes and whites.

The data indicate that the implementation of a plan of racial integration in the elementary schools, such as the plan in Urbana, does not affect the performance of elementary students on standardized intelligence tests insofar as mean scores are concerned.

In fact, if any conclusions were to be drawn, the trend seems to indicate that younger children tend to improve their scores on standardized

intelligence tests after one year of racial integration. Test scores do not indicate that older children benefit from racial integration.

ATTITUDE INVENTORIES

The second basic part of this chapter is a summary and an analysis of the two attitude inventories administered as a part of this thesis. These two attitude inventory surveys include the attitudes of the professional staff as well as community attitudes toward racial integration as implemented in Urbana. The first discussion will center on the community attitudes.

Community Attitudes

Since no survey was taken in Urbana prior to July, 1966, it was impossible to have a before and after integration questionnaire administered. The possibility of administering an identical inventory in a city comparable in size to Urbana but in which the schools have not been integrated was dismissed because of the large number of assumptions which would have to be made in comparing the cities. Such comparison would have led to no valid conclusions.

Because no pre- and post-integration attitude survey could be administered, a survey was conducted in Urbana to assess current attitudes toward racial integration in the Urbana schools. The plan for devising and administering such a questionnaire was described in the previous chapter.

Perhaps, it would be most advantageous and revealing if a summary of the results could be placed in tables to better assist the readers in understanding the results. Tables IV, A through G, demonstrate the frequencies and levels of responses for each group included. Questions one

and two were used to assess whether there were any children in that family and if so, if they were enrolled in the public schools of Urbana during the 1967-1968 school year. It will not be necessary nor crucial to summarize the responses to these first two questions.

Table IV A indicates that very few adults feel that racial integration in the public schools is undesirable. Only three individuals, two Negroes and one white, responded "strongly disagree." Thirteen Negroes and thirteen whites responded "disagree." The table also demonstrates to the reader that the higher the level of education and occupation, the more likely the individual will respond positively to this statement. This was not a surprising result.

The table also points out that parents tend to consider racial integration more desirable than non-parents, although the differences are not as evident.

Table IV B is a summary of the fourth statement which deals with the basic concept of neighborhood schools for elementary students. The results point out two things:

1. Parents are more favorable to the concept of maintaining neighborhood schools regardless of the racial composition than are the non-parents. This is true of Negroes and whites.

2. The results of these responses seem to be contradictory to those responses to the previous statement. In the previous statement it was shown that a high percentage of the respondents favored integrated schools, and yet a comparable per cent of the respondents wish to maintain neighborhood schools. It would seem that the community desires racially integrated schools, but yet parents want their children to attend the school nearest their home.

TABLE IVA

THIRD STATEMENT

"It is desirable to have Negro children and white children attend school together in the elementary school."

Response Key

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO PARENT | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | 2 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 27 |
| | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NEGRO NON- PARENT | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 16 |
| | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| WHITE PARENT | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 27 |
| | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE NON- PARENT | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

TABLE IVB
FOURTH STATEMENT

Response Key
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

"All elementary school children should attend the school in their neighborhood regardless of the makeup of the student population."

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals | |
|-------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|----|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Exec. | Independent Professionals | | |
| NEGRO | PARENT | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| | | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| | | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| | | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| WHITE | PARENT | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| | | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 31 |
| | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| | | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

TABLE IVC

FIFTH STATEMENT

Response Key

- 1. 1-5%
- 2. 5-10%
- 3. 10-15%
- 4. 15-20%
- 5. more than 20%

"If the elementary schools are integrated, the per cent of students representing the minority race should be."

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| | 2 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 33 |
| | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 29 |
| | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Statement five is concerned with the degree of integration which the respondents feel is most desirable in the elementary schools. The possible choices are given in percentages for the respondents to select. Table IV C shows the tally of the responses. There is little doubt that the responses are dependent upon the fact that approximately 15 per cent of the Urbana population is Negro. One hundred twenty-nine persons indicated between 5 and 15 per cent is most desirable. Thirty-four selected less than 5 per cent and only eight selected more than 15 per cent. It would appear that few differences exist between races, parents and non-parents, and the six different occupations.

Table IV D is concerned with the topic of busing to achieve integration. The statement merely asks to what extent is busing desirable. Of the total responses, only five persons marked strongly agree with little differentiation between categories. However, in the strong disagree category, sixteen Negro parents responded; only two Negro non-parents marked that response. For the white adults, there was little difference between parents and non-parents. Approximately the same number in the four categories responded no opinion. A trend seemed to indicate the higher level occupations tended to favor busing as a desirable method of achieving integration.

The next statement on the questionnaire inquires about compensatory educational programs. Compensatory education involves the expenditure of additional funds in those schools which have a high per cent of culturally disadvantaged children. These additional funds are utilized to improve pupil-teacher ratios, provide for additional instructional materials and library supplies, provide for more individualized tutorial programs, and provide additional physical plant facilities.

TABLE IVD
SIXTH STATEMENT

"Busing students is a desirable way to desegregate the elementary schools in a community."

Response Key
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO PARENT | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 12 |
| | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| NEGRO NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 15 |
| | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| WHITE PARENT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 15 |
| | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| WHITE NON- PARENT | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 15 |
| | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

TABLE IVE
SEVENTH STATEMENT

Response Key
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

"Another plan of providing a better education for Negro children is to provide additional funds within the segregated school in order to have fewer pupils per teacher and special classes and materials."

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO PARENT | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| | 2 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 22 |
| | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| NEGRO NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 13 |
| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| WHITE PARENT | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 25 |
| | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE NON- PARENT | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Both Negro and white parents favored this more than the non-parents did. Seventy-six responded strongly agree or agree. Only forty-two non-parents responded similarly. Only twenty-six individuals responded disagree or strongly disagree. It would seem that compensatory education is quite a popular concept in Urbana.

Table IV F reports the summary of responses to the eighth question, concerning the assignment of teachers. An assessment was made to determine attitudes toward the plan of rotating all teachers in some manner throughout the nine elementary schools. Very few of the townspeople expressed strong feelings, pro or con, for this concept. Seven Negroes, two parents and five non-parents, responded strongly agree. Eight white non-parents marked strongly agree, and no parents marked that response.

Similarly, few respondents marked strongly disagree. Only one Negro and one white would strongly oppose such a plan. There seems to be little differentiation in any of the responses to this question.

Table IV G summarizes the data received for the last question, the assessment of attitudes toward the racial integration plan as implemented in Urbana. The results in the table demonstrate beyond any doubt that the community favors the plan. One hundred twenty-four persons out of a total of one hundred twenty, approximately 73 per cent, marked strongly agree or agree. In contrast to that ratio, only thirty-one marked disagree and only one responded strongly disagree.

It is vital to note that the highest percentages favoring the plan do appear in those categories of highest education and level of occupation. It would seem that the highest resistance to racial integration would be in the white parent group with the lower levels of occupation. The tallies in those categories are significantly higher than those in comparable groups in the Negro sector.

TABLE IVF
EIGHTH STATEMENT

Response Key
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

"Another plan to provide equal educational opportunities is to assign all the teachers to different schools on a rotation basis. This would mean the best experienced teachers would be teaching in all schools."

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Workers & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO PARENT | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| NEGRO NON- PARENT | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 |
| | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE PARENT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
| | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
| | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| WHITE NON- PARENT | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 |
| | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE IVG

NINTH STATEMENT

Response Key
 1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree

"The Urbana Community School District #116 integrated the nine Urbana elementary schools in July, 1966. What is your personal opinion of the plan which was implemented?"

| Race | Re- sponse | Level of Occupation | | | | | | Totals |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|
| | | University Acad. Staff | Business Owners | Service Occupations | Indust. & Business Exec. | Factory Worekrs & Laborers | Independent Professionals | |
| NEGRO PARENT | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 27 |
| | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NEGRO NON- PARENT | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 |
| | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE PARENT | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 17 |
| | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHITE NON- PARENT | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 20 |
| | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

It is safe to conclude that the Urbana plan has been accepted by the community, but it is also necessary to add that there are some smaller groups which must be convinced that this has been a sound educational undertaking. More recommendations will be offered in the following chapter.

Professional Staff Attitudes

The questionnaire which was administered to all certificated staff members in the Urbana schools in May, 1967, was an adaptation of the questionnaire which Coleman used in his nation-wide study mentioned earlier in this study. Some of the questions included in his study were omitted or adapted to some degree to make them more relevant to the Urbana situation and this study.

The items included in the questionnaire assessed the overall general attitude of the teachers toward racial integration rather than the specific Urbana plan. Table V includes a portion of the questionnaire containing only those items which are considered relevant to this study. The discussion which follows will center only on those items which deal directly with racial attitudes. The entire questionnaire is included in the appendix.

Item twenty-eight deals with the type of school in which the teacher would like to teach. A high percentage of the teachers (67 per cent) prefer to teach in a school which has children from a general cross-section of the community. Only fourteen stated a preference for a school which has all children from professional and white collar workers' families. No Urbana teacher stated a preference to teach only those students from factory workers and blue-collar workers' families.

Item thirty is concerned directly with the racial composition of the school in which they prefer to teach. Twenty-four prefer to teach in an all-white school. This was approximately 10 per cent of the total teaching staff. Ninety-six stated a preference for a mostly-white school with some non-whites. This was approximately 40 per cent of the total. Sixty prefer to teach in a school composed of approximately half white and half non-white. This was approximately 25 per cent of the total. Only nine expressed wishes to teach in a school with no white students. Thirty-two per cent, or seventy-seven teachers, expressed no preference at all.

Item thirty-one inquires about the level of ability of the students the teacher would like to instruct or counsel. Approximately 33 per cent prefer high ability students. Thirty-eight per cent or ninety-seven teachers prefer average ability groups. Very few, only eighteen (6.5 per cent) prefer a low ability group. Approximately 18 per cent stated a preference for mixed ability groups.

Item thirty-four asks which of three policies appears most desirable in operating elementary schools. The concept of maintaining neighborhood schools regardless of the racial composition was preferred by fifty-eight teachers, approximately 21 per cent. Fifty-five per cent or one hundred fifty-eight teachers prefer to maintain neighborhood schools, if possible, but to introduce some device to promote racial balance. Such devices include reducing the grade span of the schools or "pairing" schools. Approximately 15 per cent, comprising forty-six teachers, thought that neighborhood schools could be abandoned without any significant losses.

Item thirty-four assesses the attitude of teachers toward busing to achieve racial balance in the schools. Thirty-three teachers (11 per cent) believe that no elementary pupils should be bused out of their neighborhood. Twenty-two per cent of the teachers expressed preference for busing only to relieve overcrowding. This 22 per cent included sixty-three teachers. Forty-eight teachers (18 per cent) stated that non-white students should be bused to achieve racial balance. The highest number of teachers, one hundred seven (40 per cent) expressed preference for busing of both white and non-white students to achieve racial balance.

The third part of item thirty-four deals with compensatory educational programs for culturally disadvantaged students. A large majority of teachers, one hundred ninety-eight (69 per cent) preferred yes. Only 3 per cent or ten teachers voted no, and sixty-seven (25 per cent) stated no opinion.

In items 34d, 34e, and 34f questions are raised concerning the racial composition of the teaching staff. In all three items, the Urbana teachers expressed a definite preference for racially mixed faculties, regardless of the composition of the student body.

According to the data secured from the questionnaires, it would appear that the Urbana teachers are definitely in favor of racially balanced schools, both in the student population and the teaching staff. This doesn't mean, however, that the teachers know how to teach all students coming from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds. If the Urbana plan of racial integration is to be successful, in-service training is of utmost importance, not only with the younger, inexperienced teachers but with the older, more experienced staff members. More specific recommendations will be made in the following chapter.

TABLE V
PROFESSIONAL STAFF ATTITUDES

| Item | Responses | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Jr. Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High | Special Staff |
| 22. Overall, how would you rate students in your school on how hard they try in school? | | | | |
| (A) Excellent | 20 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| (B) Good | 52 | 14 | 19 | 4 |
| (C) Average | 51 | 28 | 13 | 13 |
| (D) Fair | 20 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| (E) Poor | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| (O) No Response | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 23. Overall, how would you rate the academic ability level of the students in this school? | | | | |
| (A) Excellent | 25 | 12 | 6 | 5 |
| (B) Good | 38 | 25 | 22 | 14 |
| (C) Average | 57 | 14 | 8 | 3 |
| (D) Fair | 25 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| (E) Poor | 5 | 1 | | 1 |
| (O) No Response | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 25. Suppose you could go back in time and start college again; in view of your present knowledge, would you enter the teaching profession? | | | | |
| (A) Definitely yes | 79 | 24 | 10 | 13 |
| (B) Probably yes | 57 | 17 | 23 | 6 |
| (C) Undecided | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| (D) Probably no | 6 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
| (E) Definitely no | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (O) No Response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 26. If you could choose, would you be a faculty member in some other school rather than this one? | | | | |
| (A) Yes | 19 | 13 | 4 | 3 |
| (B) Maybe | 35 | 18 | 13 | 5 |
| (C) No | 96 | 24 | 21 | 17 |
| (O) No Response | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

TABLE V (Continued)

| Item | Responses | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----|
| | Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High | 0 |
| 28. If you could take your choice of school settings, which would you select from the following? | | | | |
| (A) All children of professional and white-collar workers | 9 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| (B) Mostly children of professional and white-collar workers | 23 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| (C) Children from a general cross section of the community | 94 | 34 | 30 | 16 |
| (D) Mostly children of factory and other blue-collar workers | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (E) All children of factory and other blue-collar workers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (F) Children of rural families | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| (G) I have no preference | 18 | 10 | 1 | 2 |
| (O) No Response | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 30. What kind of school do you prefer to work in, as far as racial composition is concerned? | | | | |
| (A) An all white school | 17 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| (B) A mostly white school but with some non-white students | 53 | 19 | 15 | 9 |
| (C) A school that has about half white and half non-white students | 33 | 13 | 8 | 6 |
| (D) A mostly non-white school but with some white students | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (E) A school with all non-whites | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| (F) I have no preference | 45 | 18 | 13 | 1 |
| (O) No Response | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 31. What type of class do you most like to teach or counsel? | | | | |
| (A) A high ability group | 40 | 21 | 9 | 11 |
| (B) An average ability group | 55 | 18 | 20 | 4 |
| (C) A low ability group | 8 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| (D) A mixed ability group | 37 | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| (E) I have no preference | 10 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| (O) No Response | 2 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| 32. In Your judgment, what is the general reputation of this school among teachers outside the school? | | | | |
| (A) Among the best | 34 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| (B) Better than average | 35 | 22 | 21 | 4 |
| (C) About average | 34 | 13 | 6 | 11 |
| (D) Below average | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| (E) A poor school | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (F) Don't know | 26 | 12 | 8 | 1 |
| (O) No Response | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

TABLE V (Continued)

| Item | Responses | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----|
| | Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High | 0 |
| 34. Below is a list of current school issues on which we want the judgments of teachers throughout the country. Please answer each in terms of your judgment of the best educational practice. | | | | |
| a. Which of the following policies on neighborhood elementary schools represents the best educational practice, in your estimation? | | | | |
| (A) Neighborhood elementary schools should be maintained regardless of any racial imbalance produced. | 29 | 15 | 10 | 4 |
| (B) Neighborhood elementary schools should be maintained, but where possible a device, such as reducing the grade span of schools, "pairing" schools, or another practice, should be used to promote racial balance. | 88 | 30 | 26 | 14 |
| (C) The idea of neighborhood elementary schools can be abandoned without significant loss. | 29 | 7 | 3 | 7 |
| (O) No Response | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| b. Which of the following policies on busing of elementary school children represents the best educational practice in your estimation? | | | | |
| (A) Children should be bussed to a school other than their neighborhood school. | 15 | 10 | 7 | 1 |
| (B) Children should be bussed to another school but only to relieve overcrowding. | 36 | 11 | 12 | 4 |
| (C) Non-white children should be bussed to another school in order to achieve racial balance. | 30 | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| (D) Both white and non-white children should be bussed into schools with a predominantly different racial composition, to achieve racial balance. | 59 | 21 | 13 | 14 |
| (O) No Response | 12 | 0 | 2 | 5 |

TABLE V (Continued)

| Item | Responses | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----|
| | Elem. | Jr. High | Sr. High | 0 |
| c. Do you believe there is a sound basis in educational policy for giving compensatory programs to culturally disadvantaged students at extra cost per pupil cost? | | | | |
| (A) Yes | 111 | 41 | 26 | 20 |
| (B) No | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| (C) Undecided | 31 | 8 | 9 | 5 |
| (O) No Response | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| d. What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with an all non-white or predominantly non-white student body? | | | | |
| (A) An all white faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (B) Predominantly white faculty | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| (C) About equal number of white and non-white faculty | 34 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| (D) Predominantly non-white faculty | 13 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
| (E) All non-white faculty | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (F) Doesn't matter | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (G) Selected without regard to race | 39 | 18 | 17 | 6 |
| (H) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter | 51 | 12 | 9 | 6 |
| (O) No Response | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| e. What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with a racially heterogeneous student body? | | | | |
| (A) An all white faculty | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| (B) Predominantly white faculty | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| (C) About equal number of white and non-white faculty | 40 | 5 | 7 | 8 |
| (D) Predominantly non-white faculty | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| (E) All non-white faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| (F) Doesn't matter | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| (G) Selected without regard to race | 44 | 24 | 18 | 9 |
| (H) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter | 43 | 18 | 10 | 5 |
| (O) No Response | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| f. What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with an all white or predominantly white student body? | | | | |
| (A) An all white faculty | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| (B) Predominantly white faculty | 23 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| (C) About equal number of white and non-white faculty | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| (D) Predominantly non-white faculty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (E) All non-white faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (F) Doesn't matter | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| (G) Selected without regard to race | 50 | 21 | 14 | 11 |
| (H) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter | 38 | 15 | 12 | 5 |
| (O) No Response | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |

TABLE V (Continued)

| Item | Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|-------------|----|---|---|--|
| | E | Jr | H | O | E | Jr | H | O | E | Jr | H | O | |
| | Yes | | | | No | | | | No Response | | | | |
| 35. Surveys of school problems show a number of things reported by teachers as reducing the effectiveness of the school. Below is a partial list of these problems. Mark Y (yes) for those situations that constitute a problem in your school. Mark N (no) for those that do not constitute a problem in your school. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. The home environment of the student is not good. | 103 | 40 | 28 | 20 | 45 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | |
| b. Pupils are not well fed and well clothed. | 68 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 81 | 37 | 23 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| c. The different races or ethnic groups don't get along together. | 27 | 36 | 23 | 9 | 120 | 15 | 17 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | |
| d. Parents attempt to interfere with the school. | 38 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 108 | 37 | 29 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | |
| e. There is too much competition for grades. | 22 | 28 | 18 | 9 | 122 | 24 | 20 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |
| f. There is too much emphasis on athletics. | 0 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 149 | 45 | 25 | 20 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | |
| g. There are too many absences among students. | 38 | 21 | 28 | 10 | 107 | 31 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | |
| h. The classes are too large for effective teaching. | 42 | 43 | 23 | 13 | 106 | 9 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | |
| i. There should be a better mixture, the students are all too much of one type. | 29 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 120 | 45 | 34 | 18 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | |
| j. Too much time has to be spent on discipline. | 63 | 28 | 14 | 11 | 86 | 24 | 25 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | |
| k. The students aren't really interested in learning. | 45 | 20 | 12 | 7 | 102 | 31 | 24 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | |

TABLE V (Continued)

| Item | Responses | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|-------------|----|---|---|
| | Yes | | | | No | | | | No Response | | | |
| | E | Jr | H | O | E | Jr | H | O | E | Jr | H | O |
| l. There is a lack of effective leadership from the school administration. | 40 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 107 | 40 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| m. The parents put too much pressure on the students for good grades. | 37 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 108 | 31 | 23 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| n. The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together. | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 142 | 49 | 31 | 21 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| o. Teachers have too little freedom in such matters as textbook selection, curriculum, and discipline. | 12 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 135 | 49 | 36 | 18 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| p. There is too much student turnover. | 50 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 99 | 44 | 34 | 16 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| q. The parents don't take enough interest in their children's school work. | 69 | 17 | 14 | 9 | 80 | 32 | 24 | 15 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| r. We have poor instructional equipment: supplies, books, laboratory equipment, etc. | 19 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 128 | 45 | 35 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| s. There are too many interruptions during class periods. | 21 | 18 | 17 | 6 | 125 | 33 | 22 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| t. There is too much teacher turnover. | 78 | 43 | 26 | 20 | 69 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| u. There is too much turnover of administrators. | 1 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 145 | 48 | 35 | 27 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

TABLE V (Continued)

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Responses</u> | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| | <u>Elem.</u> | <u>Jr. High</u> | <u>Sr. High</u> | <u>Assisting Personnel</u> |
| 38. Express your attitude toward the Urbana plan of racially integrating the elementary schools of Urbana by marking one statement below. | | | | |
| (A) It is an excellent plan with which I strongly agree. | 23 | 16 | 11 | 6 |
| (B) It seems to be a sound plan with which I agree. | 110 | 27 | 20 | 13 |
| (C) I have no opinion concerning the plan. | 18 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| (D) It doesn't appear to be a sound plan and I disagree with it. | 11 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| (E) It is an undesirable plan and I strongly disagree. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore the first year effects of racial integration in the nine elementary schools of the Urbana, Illinois, School District. This exploration includes an examination of standardized test data, both achievement test scores and intelligence test scores. The study also includes a survey of community attitudes toward racial integration of the schools and an analysis of the attitudes of the professional certificated staff.

Disparities in the educational opportunities available to elementary school children throughout our nation have been pointed out by Coleman in his monumental study, Equality of Educational Opportunity, and by other writers mentioned in Chapter II. These disparities are evident in those school districts which clearly have racially segregated schools. The great demands made upon our educational system today only serve to magnify these shortcomings. In addition to these demands, pressure is also being exerted by the Negro population to have the schools educate all children in order that Negro children can compete with the white students for college entrance and professional positions.

Perhaps, the one element which supercedes all of these demands is the legal mandate being placed on the local school districts by the Federal Government to integrate the schools. Since the 1954 ruling of the United States Supreme Court in the Brown case, many states have followed suit

and enacted legislation to force local school boards to implement a plan of racial integration. Many cases have been brought to trial since that famous landmark case. Even as this thesis is being written, other cases are being considered. Many school districts are voluntarily adopting plans to integrate their schools. Urbana, Illinois, is the first unit district in Illinois to initiate a plan of action directed toward this end. Since there is only one junior high school housing grades seven, eight, nine, and one senior high school, housing grades ten, eleven, twelve, in Urbana, there has been no problem of racial isolation at those levels. At the elementary level, one school was comprised of 95 per cent Negroes, and the other eight elementary schools had almost total white pupil populations. As the students entered grade seven at the Urbana Junior High School, the disparities in intellectual development were rather obvious with the Negroes from the segregated school considerably inferior to the white students. These disparities continued to exist year after year even though the school board provided a superior physical plant, lower pupil-teacher ratios, additional funds for materials and equipment, and a compensatory educational program for the all-Negro school.

The Urbana plan of racial integration provided for each of the nine elementary schools to receive an equal percentage of Negro students at each grade level. The Negro students were bused to the various elementary schools beginning in September, 1966, and a large group of white students living in a concentrated university housing complex were bused to the previously all-Negro school.

This study was undertaken to determine if the Urbana plan of racial integration was effective in providing equal educational opportunities for

all of the elementary children in the Urbana schools, insofar as the standardized test scores measured effectiveness. The study was also undertaken to assess the attitudes of the community and the professional staff concerning the total plan as implemented. By assessing these attitudes, some indication could be forthcoming as to what must be done in the future to educate the townspeople and to provide meaningful in-service training sessions for staff members. This writer also anticipated that the design of this study would be useful in evaluating the Urbana plan over an extended period of time to ascertain the effectiveness of the plan.

In carrying out the purposes of this study, it was decided that these procedures should be followed: (1) review the literature and the research pertaining to the racial integration of public schools; (2) review the court cases involving racial integration in the public schools; (3) analyze standardized data before and after integration; (4) develop and administer a community attitude inventory; and (5) administer Coleman's teacher-attitude inventory to the professional staff.

The analysis of literature and research pertaining to the racial integration of the public schools was undertaken in order to: (1) determine the effectiveness of existing plans of racial integration which have been implemented throughout the country; (2) examine the evidence presented by experts in the field of racial integration relating to the public schools; and (3) examine the psychological aspects of integrating disadvantaged Negro children with middle- and upper-class white children. This analysis also includes legislative actions at the federal level and state level.

The analysis of standardized test data includes achievement test scores in the areas of reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, arithmetic reasoning, arithmetic fundamentals, mechanics of English, spelling, and overall achievement. Comparisons of growth in these seven areas of academic achievement reflecting progress in segregated and integrated school settings was made. The same type of comparison was made with intelligence test scores. Test scores obtained in September, 1965, 1966, and 1967 were used in this study. The differences between 1965 and 1966 reflected the growth in a segregated school setting. The differences between 1966 and 1967 represented the growth in the integrated school setting. In making these comparisons, it was necessary to utilize a control group in the years 1964, 1965, and 1966 to determine a growth pattern on standardized tests as elementary children in Urbana advance through the grades. The three years involved were pre-integration years.

In developing the attitude inventory for the community, it seemed advisable to make the questionnaire brief, easy to mark, and in general comprised of straight-forward questions. A stamped, addressed envelope was provided for convenience. Six levels of occupations were selected using Negroes and whites, parents and non-parents. The participants were randomly selected from lengthy lists. A list of nine basic questions were used, and the respondents marked a response on a five-point scale. The respondent was assured anonymity.

The questionnaire administered to the professional staff in late May at the close of the first year of integration was an adaptation of Coleman's questionnaire. Some questions were deleted, and one question was added to make the questionnaire relevant to the Urbana situation.

CONCLUSIONS

In summarizing the findings of this thesis and arriving at a concluding statement, the format of the thesis which includes three major areas, viz., standardized tests including both achievement and intelligence tests, community attitudes, and professional staff attitudes is followed.

Standardized Tests

1. The data in this thesis lend little support to those individuals who declare that racial integration in the public schools is harmful to both Negro and white students insofar as academic achievement is concerned as measured by standardized tests. This is true of both achievement and intelligence test scores. It is equally true that the data in this one-year study gives no support to those people who believe that integrating the schools racially will increase the performance of Negro students on standardized tests and keep the scores of the white students at a constant level. The data would seem to indicate that the Urbana plan of racial integration after one year of implementation had little effect if any on the standardized test scores of all students, both Negro and white. The gains made on achievement tests during the year preceding integration were somewhat larger than those gains made the year following integration, but this same pattern of rate of increase had been evident in the Urbana elementary schools several years prior to the implementation of integration.* On the other hand, the gains made by any group of students at any specific grade level were quite comparable to the gains made by all other groups at that same grade

*See Appendix D for possible explanation of this.

level. This fact tends to support the thesis that the Urbana plan of racial integration did not affect the academic achievement levels of the students.

Community Attitudes

2. It is obvious from the table presented in Chapter IV that a majority of the sample in the survey favored the Urbana plan of integration and thought that racial integration in the schools was vital to the concept of equal educational opportunities for all children. Although there was some contradiction concerning the advisability of maintaining neighborhood schools, the general attitude which prevails indicates that the schools in Urbana have taken a bold step forward in integrating the total community.

3. It was not surprising to discover that the lower socio-economic and less educated Negroes and whites were opposed to any plan of racial integration. There was a high correlation between the level of occupation and concurrence with integration. The higher level occupations and professions strongly favored the plan of integration. The lower level occupations were more opposed.

Professional Staff Attitudes

4. It was quite obvious that the teachers in the Urbana schools prefer to teach in schools which have children from varied backgrounds. These backgrounds not only include various races but also economic and social differences. Few teachers expressed a desire to teach in a school where all children come from similar environments.

5. The Urbana teachers also expressed the attitude that the elementary pupils would benefit from racially integrated schools.

6. The professional staff of the Urbana schools feels that the Urbana plan of racial integration is an educationally sound plan and strongly support it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A serious limitation of this study is the brief period of time which it covers. The first year of racial integration is a period of transition, and the effects of such a dramatic change have not had time to crystallize. In order to fully evaluate the Urbana plan of racial integration, it is vital that a longitudinal study, lasting a minimum of five years, be conducted in assessing the standardized test scores of all the students involved in this study in addition to other students beginning in the primary grades during the next few years. Comparisons, similar to those in this thesis, could be continued each year. Such comparisons could give us an indication as to the trend the scores were following. This writer has developed plans to conduct such a study. A plan has already been implemented to study the Urbana students as they enter the seventh grade at the Urbana Junior High School from the integrated elementary schools. Data have been secured three years prior to 1966 which includes standardized test scores, report card grades, grade point averages, discipline referrals, and attitude check lists completed by classroom teachers. Pre- and post-integration comparisons will be compiled.

2. One of the strongest recommendations which must be made involves the area of community attitudes. The school officials in Urbana must make a concerted effort to involve lay persons in the community in school policy development. Some elementary schools, using the local PTA unit as the

vehicle, have reached out to those families whose children are being bused to that school. This reaching out has done much to involve Negro parents in the school life of their new school. This has been accomplished by personal invitations to school functions, the provision of transportation for Negro students for after school activities such as scouts, sports, and musical events, and by invitation to private homes.

All of the schools need to make a concerted effort to involve the Negro families in the school's social life. All of the schools in Urbana have dedicated PTA members, and this organization can function as the liaison between the school and the community. Communication between the school and the community is of utmost importance.

3. The next recommendation is closely related to the previous one. Each of the schools in Urbana needs to develop an advisory group, composed of both Negroes and whites, to act as the liaison between the school and community. This group would not only serve as a public relations group for information purposes, but it would also serve as an intermediary in contacting those families who do not feel comfortable in talking to school officials concerning the problems their children may be having in school. This small group of twelve to fifteen people would not necessarily be a group of educated persons, but rather it would be comprised of people who are sincere, conscientious, and dedicated to the goal of a better community through better schools for all children.

4. Another strong recommendation resulting from this study arises in the area of staff attitudes. Even though the Urbana teachers as a whole feel that racially integrated schools are vital in providing equal educational opportunities for all children, apparently many of them feel inadequate in teaching students from different racial backgrounds.

Possessing an attitude of wanting to assist Negro students from severely culturally disadvantaged homes and actually knowing how to help them is a real dilemma. The teachers in the Urbana schools must be trained to teach in integrated schools. This can be accomplished by these methods.

- a. Provide meaningful in-service training workshops. These should be conducted during a time when all teachers could attend. These workshops would include demonstrations by successful teachers in ghetto schools, seminars and panels utilizing people who know and understand the problems of the Negro community, and examples of effective personal relationships in teaching boys and girls. These workshops could be conducted a week before school began in September with a concentrated effort being made at that time. Throughout the year, periodic sessions would be conducted to evaluate efforts from time to time.
- b. Classroom teachers and school administrators must be willing to reach out to the total community by making more home visits and by becoming involved in the life of the community. Only with first hand knowledge of the environment can we really understand the problems which exist and learn how to deal effectively with those problems.

5. A strong effort must be continued and expanded in Urbana to recruit staff members who have positive attitudes toward racial integration in the schools and who possess some skill and ability in teaching students who come from culturally disadvantaged areas. With the rapid turnover of staff and the large number of applicants applying for positions in the

Urbana schools, it is apparent that recruiting and staffing practices will play a major role in the success of the schools in meeting the challenge of racial integration.

A final statement needs to be made concerning the racial integration of the Urbana elementary schools. It is unfortunate that attitudes of students were not assessed prior to integration and then assessed annually after integration. This writer feels strongly that a definite pattern of positive attitudes would have developed. A prevailing attitude and feeling in the community seems to be, "The schools are desegregated, but not yet integrated." If this statement is correct, it would mean that the Negroes are not yet made to feel welcome in their new schools by the white communities. There is also a prevalent feeling that this situation will improve each year. It is doubtful if the schools alone can produce social change in a community. There should be a total community effort toward the integration of the community. Busing elementary school children to another neighborhood school and then back home to the same environmental conditions at night will fall short in providing equal opportunities unless the entire community is willing to accept the responsibility. All public institutions and community agencies must coordinate their efforts and work toward the goal of community improvement by providing equal opportunities in all aspects of living.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angelino, H., Dollins, J., and Mech, E. V. "Trends in the Fears and Worries of School Children as Related to Socio-economic Status and Age," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 89:1956, 263-276.
- Atkinson, J. W. "Motivational Determinants of Risk Taking Behavior," in J. W. Atkinson (ed.) Motives in Fantasy Action and Society, New York, 1958, pp. 322-340.
- Ausubel, David. "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in School Children in Urban Slums, readings in Social Science Research, ed. by Joan I. Roberts, New York, 1967.
- Bass, B. M. "Conformity Deviation and a General Theory of Interpersonal Behavior," in I. A. Berg and B. M. Bass (eds.) Conformity and Deviation, New York, Harper, 1961, pp. 38-100.
- Brink, P. and Harris, W. Negro Revolution in America, New York, Harper, 1965.
- Bullock, H. A. "A Comparison of the Academic Achievements of White and Negro High School Graduates," Journal of Educational Research, 44: 1950, pp. 179-192.
- Carson, A. S., and Rubin, A. I. "Verbal Comprehension and Communication in Negro and White Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 1960, pp. 47-51.
- Coleman, James S. et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Harold Howe II, Commissioner, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1966.
- Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Cothran, T. C. "Negro Conceptions of White People," American Journal of Sociology, 56: 1951, pp. 458-467.
- Criswell, Joan H. "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom," Archives of Psychology, New York, 1939, p. 235.
- "Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City," published by the New York State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, May 12, 1964.

- Deutsch, Martin P., et al. "Some Considerations as to the Contributions of Social Personality and Racial Factors to School Retardation in Minority Group Children," paper read at the American Psychology Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1956.
- Deutsch, Martin P. "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement," Society for Applied Anthropology Monograph, 1960, No. 2.
- Dodson, D. Statement read at a conference before the United States Commission on Civil Rights: Fourth Annual Education Conference on Problems of Segregation and Desegregation of Public Schools, Washington, D. C. United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1962, pp. 137-141.
- Findley, W. G. "Learning and Teaching in Atlanta Public Schools," Princeton, New Jersey, Educational Testing Service, 1956.
- Greenberg, H., Chase, A. L., and Cannon, T. M. "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Torn Between School Integration," Journal of Applied Psychology, 41: 1957, pp. 27-31.
- Hanson, C. F. "The Scholastic Performances of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, 30: 1960, pp. 216-236.
- Howe, Harold II. Remarks made at the National Conference of the Education of the Disadvantaged, Washington, D. C., July 18-20, 1966.
- Illinois, State of, School Code, Sec. 10:21.3, Springfield, Illinois, 1965.
- Kaplan, John. "Segregation Litigation and the Schools, Part II: The General Northern Problem," Northwestern University Law Review, May-June, 1963, pp. 211, 214.
- Katz, Irwin. "The Effects of Desegregation on the Performance of Negroes," in School Children in the Urban Slums, ed. by Joan I. Roberts, New York, 1967, pp. 261-292.
- Knowles, L. W. "Part I, Kentucky," in United States Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962, pp. 19-56.
- Kozol, Jonathan, and Coles, Robert. Death at an Early Age, New York, 1967.
- Leeson, Jim. "The First Ten Years," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964, Volume XLV, No. 8, p. 126.
- Mearns, E. A. Jr. "Part IV, Virginia," in United States Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962, pp. 19-56.
- Neprash, J. A. "Minority Group Contacts and Social Distance," Phylon, 14: 1953, pp. 207-212.

- Plant, R. L. "Blueprints for Talent Searching," New York National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1957.
- Roach, Stephen F. "The Federal Courts and Racial Imbalance in Public Schools," in Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1966.
- Roberts, S. O. "Test Performance in Relation to Ethnic Group and Social Class," Mimeographed report made in 1963 at Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Smuts, R. W. "The Negro Community and the Development of Negro Potential," Journal of Negro Education, 26:1957, pp. 456-465.
- Southern School News (untitled article) August, 1960, Volume 7, p. 6 and April, 1963, Volume 9, p. 11.
- Stallings, F. H. "A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, 28:1959, pp. 439-444.
- Tanner, J. C. "Integration in Action," Wall Street Journal, January 26, 1964:64, p. 1.
- Tumon, M. "The Process of Integration," in G. J. Klopff and I. A. Lester (eds.) Integrating the Urban School, New York Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1936, pp. 13-28.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights, The 50 States Report, Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 287.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, a two volume report, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., February, 1967.
- Urban School District #116, Board of Education Minutes, July 19, 1966, Urbana, Illinois.
- Webster, S. W. "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, 52: 1961, pp. 292-296.
- Weinberg, Meyer. "Civil Rights and the Schoolmen," in Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964, Volume XLV, No. 8, p. 162.
- Wey, Herbert. "Desegregation--It Works," in Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964, Volume XLV, No. 8, p. 179.
- Wyatt, E. "Part I, Tennessee," in United States Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights, U.S.A.--Public Schools, Southern States, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962, pp. 19-56.

Legal Cases Cited

Brown, et al. V. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Bell V. Board of Education, Gary, Indiana, 324 F.2d 209 (October, 1963)
7th Circuit.

Downs, et al. V. Board of Education, Kansas City, Kansas, 336 F.2d 988
(September, 1964) 10th Circuit.

Schultz V. Board of Education, New York City, New York, 379 U.S. 881
(October, 1965).

Springfield School Committee et al. V. Abraham Barsdale, Jr. et al. 348 F.2d
261 (July, 1965).

Tometz et al. V. Board of Education, Waukegan School District No. 61, 1
Ill. 2d (1965).

APPENDIX A

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Mark the space on the answer sheet that is correct for you for each question. Mark only one answer for each question. You may omit any question which you would prefer not to answer, but please answer them all if you possibly can.

1. What is your sex?
 - (A) Male
 - (B) Female

2. How old were you on your last birthday?
 - (A) Under 26
 - (B) 26 to 35
 - (C) 36 to 45
 - (D) 46 to 55
 - (E) 56 to 65
 - (F) 66 or older

3. Where have you spent most of your life?
 - (A) In this city, town, or county
 - (B) In this state outside this city, town, or county
 - (C) In another state in the U.S.
 - (D) In Puerto Rico or another U.S. possession
 - (E) In Mexico
 - (F) In Canada
 - (G) In a country other than the U.S., Canada, or Mexico

4. In What type of community have you spent most of your life? (Give your best estimate if your are not sure.)
 - (A) In the open country or in a farming community
 - (B) In a small town (less than 10,000 people) that was not a suburb
 - (C) Inside a medium size city (10,000 to 100,000 people)
 - (D) In a suburb of a medium size city
 - (E) Inside a large city (100,000 to 500,000 people)
 - (F) In a suburb of a large city
 - (G) In a very large city (over 500,000 people)
 - (H) In a suburb of a very large city

5. Are you
 - (A) Negro
 - (B) White
 - (C) American Indian
 - (D) Oriental
 - (E) Other

6. What is the highest earned college degree you hold? Do not report honorary degrees.
- (A) No degree
 - (B) A degree or diploma based on less than 4 years work
 - (C) A Bachelor's degree
 - (D) A Master's degree
 - (E) Professional or Specialist diploma (Sixth year)
 - (F) A Doctor's degree
7. How many credits of college work have you had beyond your highest degree?
- (A) None
 - (B) 1 to 10 semester hours
 - (C) 11 to 20 semester hours
 - (D) 21 to 30 semester hours
 - (E) 31 or more semester hours
8. As of June, 1965. What was the total number of years of full-time teaching experience you have had? (Consider counseling as teaching experience.)
- (A) None
 - (B) 1 or 2
 - (C) 3 or 4
 - (D) 5 to 9
 - (E) 10 to 14
 - (F) 15 to 19
 - (G) 20 to 29
 - (H) 30 or more
9. As of June, 1967. What was the number of years of full-time teaching experience you have had in this school? (Consider counseling as teaching experience.)
- (A) None
 - (B) 1 or 2
 - (C) 3 or 4
 - (D) 5 to 9
 - (E) 10 to 14
 - (F) 15 to 19
 - (G) 20 to 29
 - (H) 30 or more
10. In the last school year (1966-67), how many school days were you absent from work?
- (A) I was not a regular teacher or counselor last year
 - (B) None
 - (C) 1 or 2
 - (D) 3 to 6
 - (E) 7 to 15
 - (F) 16 or more

11. How did you happen to be assigned to this particular school rather than some other school in this district?
 - (A) I asked to work in this school
 - (B) I was placed in this school

12. Have you ever attended any summer institutes sponsored by the National Sciences Foundation or financed by the National Defense Education Act or by the 1965 Elementary-Secondary Education Act?
 - (A) None
 - (B) 1
 - (C) 2 or 3
 - (D) 4 or more

13. Have you ever attended any summer institutes or comparable training programs that offer special training in teaching or counseling the culturally disadvantaged?
 - (A) No
 - (B) Yes, 1
 - (C), 2 or more

14. What will be your total annual salary from this school system this year? (Estimate supplements for extra services by using supplements from last year.)
 - (A) Below \$3,000
 - (B) \$3,000 to \$3,999
 - (C) \$4,000 to \$4,999
 - (D) \$5,000 to \$5,999
 - (E) \$6,000 to \$6,999
 - (F) \$7,000 to \$7,999
 - (G) \$8,000 to \$8,999
 - (H) \$9,000 to \$9,999
 - (I) \$10,000 or more

15. Overall, how would you rate students in your school on how hard they try in school?
 - (A) Excellent
 - (B) Good
 - (C) Average
 - (D) Fair
 - (E) Poor

16. Overall, how would you rate the academic ability level of the students in this school?
 - (A) Excellent
 - (B) Good
 - (C) Average
 - (D) Fair
 - (E) Poor

17. What is your employment status in this school system?
 - (A) I am on a tenured appointment
 - (B) I have a regular full-time appointment but not on tenure
 - (C) I am a substitute teacher on temporary assignment

18. Suppose you could go back in time and start college again; in view of your present knowledge, would you enter the teaching profession?
- (A) Definitely yes
 - (B) Probably yes
 - (C) Undecided
 - (D) Probably no
 - (E) Definitely no
19. If you could choose, would you be a faculty member in some other school rather than this one?
- (A) Yes
 - (B) Maybe
 - (C) No
20. What kind of a high school would you most like to work in? (Answer even if you are not a high school teacher.)
- (A) An academic school with strong emphasis on college preparation
 - (B) A comprehensive school
 - (C) A special curriculum school that is designed to serve the culturally disadvantaged
 - (D) Vocational, technical or trade school
 - (E) Commercial or business school
21. If you could take your choice of school settings, which would you select from among the following?
- (A) All children of professional and white-collar workers
 - (B) Mostly children of professional and white-collar workers
 - (C) Children from a general cross section of the community
 - (D) Mostly children of factory and other blue-collar workers
 - (E) All children of factory and other blue-collar workers
 - (F) Children of rural families
 - (G) I have no preference
22. What kind of school do you prefer to work in, as far as ethnic composition is concerned?
- (A) A school with predominantly Anglo Saxon students
 - (B) A school with a mixture of Anglo Saxon and minority ethnic groups
 - (C) A school with predominantly minority ethnic groups
 - (D) I have no preference
23. What kind of school do you prefer to work in, as far as racial composition is concerned?
- (A) An all white school
 - (B) A mostly white school but with some non-white students
 - (C) A school that has about half white and half non-white students
 - (D) A mostly non-white school but with some white students
 - (E) A school with all non-whites
 - (F) I have no preference

24. What type of class do you most like to teach or counsel?
(A) A high ability group
(B) An average ability group
(C) A low ability group
(D) A mixed ability group
(E) I have no preference
25. In your judgment, what is the general reputation of this school among teachers outside the school?
(A) Among the best
(B) Better than average
(C) About average
(D) Below average
(E) A poor school
(F) Don't know
26. About what percentage of the students you teach or counsel this year are white?
(A) None
(B) 1 to 9%
(C) 10 to 24%
(D) 25 to 49%
(E) 50 to 74%
(F) 75 to 89%
(G) 90 to 99%
(H) All
27. Below is a list of current school issues on which we want the judgments of teachers. Please answer each in terms of your judgment of the best educational practice.
- (A) Which of the following policies on neighborhood elementary schools represents the best educational practice, in your estimation?
- (a) Neighborhood elementary schools should be maintained regardless of any racial imbalance produced.
 - (b) Neighborhood elementary schools should be maintained, but where possible a device, such as reducing the grade span of schools, "pairing" schools, or another practice, should be used to promote racial balance.
 - (c) The idea of neighborhood elementary schools can be abandoned without significant loss.
- (B) Which of the following policies on bussing of elementary school children represents the best educational practice in your estimation?
- (a) Children should not be bussed to a school other than their neighborhood school.
 - (b) Children should be bussed to another school but only to relieve overcrowding.
 - (c) Non-white children should be bussed to another school in order to achieve racial balance.
 - (d) Both white and non-white children should be bussed into schools with a predominantly different racial composition, to achieve racial balance.

- (C) Do you believe there is a sound basis in educational policy for giving compensatory programs to culturally disadvantaged students at extra per pupil cost?
- (a) Yes
 - (b) No
 - (c) Undecided
- (D) What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with an all non-white or predominantly non-white student body?
- (a) An all white faculty
 - (b) Predominantly white faculty
 - (c) About equal number of white and non-white faculty
 - (d) Predominantly non-white faculty
 - (e) All non-white faculty
 - (f) Doesn't matter
 - (g) Selected without regard to race
 - (h) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter
- (E) What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with a racially heterogeneous student body?
- (a) An all white faculty
 - (b) Predominantly white faculty
 - (c) About equal number of white and non-white faculty
 - (d) Predominantly non-white faculty
 - (e) All non-white faculty
 - (f) Doesn't matter
 - (g) Selected without regard to race
 - (h) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter
- (F) What type of faculty do you believe is best for a school with an all white or predominantly white student body?
- (a) An all white faculty
 - (b) Predominantly white faculty
 - (c) About equal number of white and non-white faculty
 - (d) Predominantly non-white faculty
 - (e) All non-white faculty
 - (f) Doesn't matter
 - (g) Selected without regard to race
 - (h) Some degree of integration, but ratio doesn't matter

28. Surveys of school problems show a number of things reported by teachers as reducing the effectiveness of the school. Below is a partial list of these problems. Mark Y (yes) for those situations that constitute a problem in your school. Mark N (no) for those that do not constitute a problem in your school.

- (A) The home environment of the students is not good
- (B) Pupils are not well fed and well clothed
- (C) The different races or ethnic groups don't get along together
- (D) Parents attempt to interfere with the school
- (E) There is too much competition for grades
- (F) There is too much emphasis on athletics
- (G) There are too many absences among students
- (H) The classes are too large for effective teaching
- (I) There should be a better mixture, the students are all too much of one type

- (J) Too much time has to be spent on discipline
 - (K) The students aren't really interested in learning
 - (L) There is a lack of effective leadership from the school administration
 - (M) The parents put too much pressure on the students for good grades
 - (N) The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together
 - (O) Teachers have too little freedom in such matters as textbook selection, curriculum, and discipline
 - (P) There is too much student turnover
 - (Q) The parents don't take enough interest in their children's school work
 - (R) We have poor instructional equipment: supplies, books, laboratory equipment, etc.
 - (S) There are too many interruptions during class periods
 - (T) There is too much teacher turnover
 - (U) There is too much turnover of administrators
29. Are you a member of any teachers' association?
- (A) No
 - (B) Yes, an officer
 - (C) Yes, an active worker
 - (D) Yes, a member but not an active worker
30. Do you read regularly any national educational or subject matter journals such as the NRA Journal, The Nation's Schools, The English Journal, etc.?
- (A) No, not regularly
 - (B) Yes, 1 regularly
 - (C) Yes, 2 regularly
 - (D) Yes, 3 or more regularly
31. Do you expect to remain full-time in public education until you reach retirement age?
- (A) Definitely yes
 - (B) Probably yes
 - (C) Probably no
 - (D) Definitely no
32. About how many hours a day do you spend outside of your scheduled work day in preparation for teaching or counseling?
- (A) None
 - (B) 1
 - (C) 2
 - (D) 3
 - (E) 4 or more
33. How many hours a day do you spend in classroom teaching this year?
- (A) None
 - (B) 1
 - (C) 2
 - (D) 3
 - (E) 4
 - (F) 5
 - (G) 6 or more

34. Because of ability grouping of students in some schools, some teachers teach students at predominantly one ability level. Which of the categories below best fits your classes?
- (A) All high ability groups
 - (B) All low ability groups
 - (C) Combination of various ability groups
 - (D) Ability grouping is not used in this school
35. What is the lowest grade in which you teach this year?
- (A) Nursery or kindergarten
 - (B) 1
 - (C) 2
 - (D) 3
 - (E) 4
 - (F) 5
 - (G) 6
36. What is the highest grade in which you teach this year?
- (A) Nursery or kindergarten
 - (B) 1
 - (C) 2
 - (D) 3
 - (E) 4
 - (F) 5
 - (G) 6
37. From a realistic viewpoint, there may be some jobs from which Negroes have been excluded. Do you personally feel that a teacher or guidance counselor should encourage Negro students to aspire to such jobs?
- (A) Yes
 - (B) Yes, with a full discussion of the difficulties
 - (C) No
 - (D) No opinion

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SCHOOL BOARD FROM NEGRO COMMUNITY

Dear Board Member:

Realizing that it is the responsibility of a school district to provide an adequate and equal education for all children within a said district, We, the parents of children attending Hays School, located in School District No. 116 Urbana, Illinois are and are not at the present time receiving an education that will prepare them to be useful citizens of our society.

Our opinions are based on a master thesis written by Charles Springer Scheck entitled Planning The Community Schools--The Cases of Champaign and Urbana, Illinois, 1965. In this thesis, Mr. Scheck uses Hays School as a specific example. Materials in his thesis are obtained from many sources. Among these sources are School Board Meetings, reports of the Citizens Advisory Council, personal interviews with board members and school administrators and other sources which are not directly related to our particular situation. Enclosed is a reprint of pages 55-58 in which Mr. Scheck discusses the Hays School Problem.

We are also influenced by the number of children from our area who become "dropouts." It has been pointed out in various reports and by a school administrator that the percentage rate of "dropouts" from our area is higher than any other area in the district.

We are also familiar with a report from the Citizens Advisory Council 1963-64 which states that children from our area and two other areas, when they reach Junior High level, are not prepared to meet the educational standards as set by the Junior High School.

In the second half of the school year 1965-66, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was implemented in the Urbana School System. As a result of this, many programs were initiated at Hays School. We realize that these programs are a necessary part of the education of our children, however, we also feel that a great percentage of the value of these programs is lost due to the segregated pattern of our school. Because of this segregated pattern in our area we are depriving both the Negro child and the White child of becoming well adjusted citizens within our society. The Negro child becomes more culturally deprived because he doesn't have the opportunity to mingle with the other races at an age in which his life is molded. In contrast to this the White child becomes culturally dependent because he knows only of the white culture and as a result when these factions are thrown together at a later age (grade) the problems of integrating are too large for them to overcome.

Finally, as we look at our area from the standpoint of housing, we know that the segregated pattern of housing has been set and is not likely to change. The realtors are certainly not going to make any efforts to help this problem, the city refuses to take an active part in trying to alleviate this problem. Consequently, the school district is the only agency left that can rightfully solve the segregated pattern of our school.

We are enclosing a speech made by the Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, to educators and school administrators from 76 major cities in the United States concerning the problem of segregated schools. Another enclosure is a solution to a problem similar to ours in Evanston, Illinois.

In Justice Warren's decision of Brown V. The Board of Education of Topeka, 1954, a part of his text reads, To separate (children) from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds is a way unlikely ever to be undone... Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER AND COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

November 1, 1967

Dear Citizen of Urbana,

I am presently working on an advanced degree at the University of Illinois, and I am soliciting your help. I would like for you to complete the enclosed questionnaire by making the one response which best fits your opinion to each statement. Please enclose the questionnaire in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope and drop it in a mail box. It is vital that you not sign your name.

Even though I am Principal of the Urbana Junior High School and therefore an employee of the Urbana School District #116, I wish to make it absolutely clear that this study is my own project, and it is not sponsored by the Urbana School Board nor the administrative staff.

The Roman numeral followed by a capital letter in the upper right hand is used to define categories of those people who have been asked to participate. This Roman numeral labels your occupation and the capital letter is used to define whether the respondent is a parent of school-age children or a non-parent.

I would appreciate your help in this project. I anticipate that this study will be beneficial to us as we continue to plan for the improvement of the schools in Urbana.

Sincerely,

Roger B. Marcum

COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Respond to each statement by circling the desired response.

1. How many children do you have in the public schools (grades Kindergarten through grades 12)?
A. 0 B. 1 C. 2 D. 3 E. 4 or more
2. How many children do you have in the elementary school (grades Kindergarten through grade 6)?
A. 0 B. 1 C. 2 D. 3 E. 4 or more
3. It is desirable to have Negro children and white children attend school together in the elementary school.
A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. No opinion
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree
4. All elementary school children should attend the school in their neighborhood regardless of the make-up of the student population.
A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. No opinion
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree
5. If the elementary schools are integrated, the per cent of students representing the minority race should be
A. 1 - 5 %
B. 5 - 10 %
C. 10 - 15 %
D. 15 - 20 %
E. more than 20 %
6. Bussing students is a desirable way to desegregate the elementary schools in a community.
A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. No opinion
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

7. Another plan of providing a better education for Negro children is to provide additional funds within the segregated school in order to have fewer pupils per teacher and special classes and materials.
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
8. Another plan to provide equal educational opportunities is to assign all the teachers to different schools on a rotation basis. This would mean that the best experienced teachers would be teaching in all schools.
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree
9. The Urbana Community School District #116 integrated the nine Urbana elementary schools in July, 1966. What is your personal opinion of the plan which was implemented?
- A. Strongly agree
 - B. Agree
 - C. No opinion
 - D. Disagree
 - E. Strongly disagree

APPENDIX D

EXPLANATION FOR ACHIEVEMENT DECREASE

Throughout this study, the data indicated that the gains in standardized achievement test scores for Urbana elementary students decreased as the students advanced through the elementary grades. This situation is a cause for some alarm and deep concern. Even though this thesis was not concerned directly with this problem, this writer felt that some mention should be made of this situation.

Studying the Urbana schools and its operational philosophy could divulge some possible explanations for this decrease in gains. The following list is merely suggested as a departure point in studying the problem, and it is not intended as a list of valid reasons.

1. With the advent of the upgraded primary school in Urbana, perhaps more emphasis is placed at the primary level on academic advancement.
2. Generally speaking, class sizes in Urbana are larger in grades 4, 5, 6 than in grades 1, 2, 3.
3. Team teaching is utilized in the intermediate grades with students being taught by several teachers rather than one teacher.
4. The primary grades in Urbana stress those skills and concepts which are measured by the achievement tests. The intermediate grades spend more time on art, music, physical education and other subjects not included in the standardized tests.
5. With Urbana's test norms being above the national norms, perhaps the standardized tests have "ceilings" or limitations which reduce the mean scores of the Urbana students.

Whatever the cause may be, the Urbana schools' administration should pursue this question, and offer some suggestions to remedy the situation.

VITA

Roger Brasel Marcum was born in Centralia, Illinois on January 19, 1931. He was the fourth child in a family of nine children born to Stacy and Agnes Marcum. He lived in Centralia until he entered military service in 1952 at the age of twenty-one. After being discharged from the service, he attended Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Illinois and completed the requirements for the Bachelor Degree in Elementary Education in August, 1954.

His first teaching position was in the Danville, Illinois Public Schools which began in September, 1954. This first teaching position was in grades six, seven, and eight including the subjects of mathematics and physical education. After school hours were spent in coaching football and basketball and taking graduate work in education administration at the University of Illinois in Urbana, Illinois. Mr. Marcum was awarded the Master's Degree in Education Administration from the University of Illinois in August, 1956. He was appointed as an elementary principal in Danville, Illinois in September, 1957. He retained this position for seven years, and then he became a junior high school principal in September, 1963. During those years additional graduate work was done at the University of Illinois.

Mr. Marcum accepted the position of Coordinator of the Gifted Project in the Urbana Schools in September, 1964. He became the Principal of the Urbana Junior High School in September, 1966. This is the position he has at the present time. He has completed the course work and the residence requirement for the doctorate degree in education administration.