

A STUDY OF THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS SPECIALIST
AND SOURCES OF INTERGROUP CONFLICT
IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JAMES M. COLEMAN
1971



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

A STUDY OF THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS
SPECIALIST AND SOURCES OF INTERGROUP
CONFLICT IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

presented by

James M. Coleman

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Higher Ed. & Adm.

Joseph H. McMillan
Major professor

Date August 30, 1971



FEB 1 1975
~~18~~

~~F~~ 192

~~189~~

~~186~~

~~186~~



ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS SPECIALIST AND SOURCES OF INTERGROUP CONFLICT IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

James M. Coleman

The major purpose of this study was to identify the qualities pertaining to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, analyze sources of intergroup conflict, and explore the need for intergroup relations education programs.

The population of the study was the secondary schools of the Pontiac, Michigan Public School District. Data were gathered through the use of an instrument designed by the writer and a member of the Department of Research and Evaluation, Michigan State University. The instrument was administered to a highly selective sample, consisting of the eight secondary school principals, one from each school, two parents, two students, two counselors, and two teachers from each of the Human Relations Committees of their respective schools. The data were then analyzed, examined, and presented.

Major Findings

Based upon the analysis of the data, major findings are:

1. The schools are racially and ethnically imbalanced.
2. Administrators and other school personnel may not be aware of the crosscultural clashes that beset schools.

3. "Racism" is a major societal source of intergroup conflict.
4. "Student Grievances" are a major in-school source of intergroup conflict.
5. Most intergroup conflict may have a racial and ethnic basis.
6. "Outsiders" are identified as the major source of intergroup conflict in the Pontiac School District.
7. No formal courses in intergroup relations education are offered students.
8. Most respondents indicated that the Intergroup Relations Specialist is most helpful in the area of "Student Grievances".
9. Most respondents indicated that the Intergroup Relations Specialist is least helpful with problems pertaining to "Insensitive Teachers".
10. Most respondents indicated that "Skill in Promoting Intergroup and Interpersonal Relations" is the most important quality for the success of the Intergroup Relations Specialist.

Conclusions

If intergroup conflict is inevitable, our schools may have to plan programs and develop strategies to respond to the societal and in-school sources of intergroup conflict. If racism is a major societal source of intergroup conflict, there may be a need for teacher-preparation institutions to develop activities that will enable educators to understand, appreciate and work with pupils, colleagues and constituents who are different from the dominant Anglo-Caucasian, middle-class norm; otherwise, the school will not be able to supersede the "big community" and find solutions to its own problems.

The rise of ethnic and racial pride among minorities and the "War on Poverty" have resulted in an increased effort on the part of low-income groups to be involved in making policies and decisions that effect them. These concerns are transmitted into our schools through the parents of students in urban areas and through mass media. Our students, encouraged by civil rights protests and college students protests, want an enlargement of their role in making policy in the schools.

Intergroup Relations Education Programs can help negate the diverse influences in our schools. Educators have a chance to make a unique contribution by openly addressing themselves to the issues of the ethnic and cultural differences. We will thus be able to respond to problems of providing awareness programs for staff, integration of staff increased community contacts, intergroup relations education programs, and ethnic and racial contributions in our textbooks.

The Intergroup Relations Specialist can be the catalytic agent who provides the kind of leadership and guidance to deal with some of the social problems that interfere with the learning process.

Recommendations

As has been indicated, majority and minority group educators need to be taught constructively and creatively about racial, cultural, ethnic, and socio-economic differences between people. These educators should make use of the services of an Intergroup Relations Specialist and understand that the implementation of a meaningful intergroup relations education program may be an effective means of overcoming educational handicaps of all pupils.

With this in mind, the writer recommends that:

1. Educators provide for intergroup relations education programs, so necessary for the dignity and self-respect of all pupils.
2. Experiences be provided whereby minority and majority group students are involved in the decision making processes of their schools.
3. Intergroup education be a regular part of the school curricula.
4. All school personnel be encouraged to accept the objective of intergroup education, i.e., recognizing the fact that a pupil must be helped to develop the type of self-concept that enables him to think and act positively toward individuals unlike himself.
5. Classroom teachers become involved in awareness programs and thus cease to impose patterns of conformity and learn to cherish what each pupil brings from his culture into the school setting.
6. School systems plan in-service training which deals with conflict management.
7. Central administration should include as staff the position of assistant superintendent for intergroup relations. A partial list of his services could be the following:
 - a. selection of textbooks which provide fair and balanced treatment of minorities.
 - b. provide analytical services in the area of school-community relations.
 - c. provide workshops in human relations and organize human relations committees which consist of parents and students.

8. In-depth studies be made by universities pertaining to the reduction of intergroup conflict and hostility.
9. School-communities work cooperatively toward a realistic evaluation of change in intergroup practices.
10. More teacher-preparation institutions offer graduate and post-graduate degrees in human relations, and include in the curriculum, undergraduate program experiences that will cause the teacher to be more cognizant of the human element of the pupil.
11. The combined issues of trust and power represent themes for responding to intergroup crises since many constituents may have lost faith in school people to serve their interests.
12. The position of Intergroup Relations Specialist be created in all urban school systems.

A STUDY OF THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS SPECIALIST
AND SOURCES OF INTERGROUP CONFLICT
IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

James M. Coleman

A THESIS

Submitted to
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

College of Education

1971

673832



Copyright by

JAMES McDOWELL COLEMAN

1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to express his appreciation to all of the people who provided him with assistance in the development of this thesis; however, space does not allow including all of them by name.

Particular appreciation goes to Dr. Joseph H. McMillan, my life-long friend and chairman, for his continual personal and professional support. Gratitude is also extended to Dr. Clyde Campbell, a human engineer and constant source of inspiration and kindness, Dr. Howard Hickey, warm and encouraging; and Dr. Ruth Hamilton for analytical input to the development of this study. The writer was fortunate to have these four as members of his guidance committee.

Warmest thanks is also due Dr. Larry Lezotte, although not a member of the guidance committee, who rendered invaluable service with problems of research and techniques of design.

Further appreciation is extended to the central administration staff of the Pontiac, Michigan Public School System. Especially Dr. Dana Whitmer, the superintendent; Mr. Wesley Maas, Director of Secondary Education, for his assistance in collecting the data; and Mr. John F. Perdue, Director of Intergroup Relations, for the many pamphlet materials, books, and for permitting the writer to intern with him for approximately six months.

The writer is pleased to have had the association of his eight colleagues: Larry Decker, Homer Kearns, Douglas Lund, Gene McFadden, Jeffery Moss, Arnold Munoz, Philip Sheridan, and George Woons, great friends, "severe critics", and deserving Mott Fellows.

Thanks is due to my children, Alexis, Kathy, Paul and Natalie.

Finally and most of all, eternal gratitude is extended to my wife, Gertrude, for her patience, love and assistance. Without her, completion of the doctoral program would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Assumptions	3
Research Questions and Statements	4
Limitations of the Study	5
Design of the Study	5
Population	5
Sample	5
Some Functions of the Intergroup	
Relations Specialist	6
The Problem	8
The Social Setting	8
Summary and Overview	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
The Intergroup Relations Specialist	12
Sources of Intergroup Conflict	15
Selected Literature on Intergroup	
Education	24
Definition of Terms	39
Summary	41
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	42
Introduction	42
Basis for Population Selection	42
Basis for Sample Selection	44
Administration of the Questionnaires	44
Recording of Data	52
Summary	53
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	54
Introduction	54
Research Question #1	59
Research Question #2	68
Research Question #3	78
Summary	88

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
Introduction	90
General Summary	91
Conclusions	93
Recommendations	94 45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	99
APPENDICES	
A. SAMPLE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE	103
B. QUESTIONNAIRE PREPARED BY PARENT MEMBERS OF THE PONTIAC SCHOOL DISTRICT CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON INTERGROUP RELATIONS TO PONTIAC CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	111
C. TABULATION OF RESULTS OF RESPONSE TO APPENDIX B. .	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
	Chapter II	
2.1	Graph Pertaining to Schools According to Degrees of Racial Influence in the Eight Geographical Regions of the United States	17 & 18
	Chapter III	
3.1	Number and Percentage of Respondents Returning Completed Questionnaires	45
3.2	Number and Percentage of Principals Returning Completed Questionnaires	46
3.3	Number and Percentage of Parents Returning Completed Questionnaires	47
3.4	Number and Percentage of Students Returning Completed Questionnaires	48
3.5	Number and Percentage of Counselors Returning Completed Questionnaires	49
3.6	Number and Percentage of Teachers Returning Completed Questionnaires	50
	Chapter IV	
4.1	Distribution of Administrative, Instructional Staff, and Student Body Possessing Certain Ethnic Characteristics	• 58
4.2	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to the Question: Have You Had Any Forms of Intergroup Conflict in the Past Two Years? . . .	60
4.3	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to the Request to Rank the Societal Sources of Intergroup Conflict	65

Table		Page
4.4	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to the Request to Rank the In-School Causes of Intergroup Conflict	66
4.5	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to the Request to Rank the Forms of Intergroup Conflict in the Pontiac School System	67
4.6	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Extent of Racial Basis of Major Forms of Intergroup Conflict	68
4.7	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Formal or Informal Intergroup Relations Programs in School	69
4.8	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Programs With Schools With Different Ethnic Populations	70
4.9	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Parent Membership on Intergroup Relations Committees	71
4.10	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Student Membership on Intergroup Relations Committees	71
4.11	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Intergroup Relations Committees	72
4.12	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Inter-Staff Meetings to Discuss Intergroup Relations Experiences	73
4.13	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Outside Professionals in Intergroup Relations In-Service Programs	74
4.14	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Parent Representation in In-Service Programs	74
4.15	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Social Attitude Testing	75
4.16	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to Intergroup Relations Education Courses for Students	76

Table		Page
4.17	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Degree of Familiarity With the Function of the Department of Intergroup Relations	80
4.18	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Degree of Familiarity With the Role of the Director of Intergroup Relations . .	80
4.19	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Area in Which the Director of Intergroup Relations is Most Helpful	82
4.20	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Area in Which the Director of Intergroup Relations is Least Helpful	83
4.21	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Area in Which the Director of Intergroup Relations is Able to be More Effective Than a Teacher or Administrator	85
4.22	Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Pertaining to the Skills and Qualities That Contribute Most to the Success of the Director of Intergroup Relations	86

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent months headlines of local and national newspapers indicate a particular kind of response being made by students to certain situations and conditions that exist within the school and society.

This unrest and disruption in the secondary schools has deep roots within the fabric of society and in our educational system. Teenagers are living with the pain of poverty, the guilt of affluence, racism's corrosion of black and white people, the pressure of an unpopular war, and the constraining effects of adult-run bureaucracies.¹

Is the school a significant vehicle by which the culture of a given society is perpetuated or can the school because of its uniqueness supersede the "big community" and find its own solutions to some of these pressing problems?

According to Eugene S. Mornell of the California State Department of Education, 44 percent of all recorded civil disorders reported between January and April of 1968 involved public schools. This information was taken from the Riot Data Review, published by the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.

¹Mark A. Chesler, Student and Administration Crises, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, October 1969, p.1.

Mornell further states that the report revealed that this represented a three-fold increase over the proportion in 1967, and during the 1968-69 school year, there were more than 300 reported disorders in high schools alone with an increase in this number by 1970.

Whatever the situation, educators are being called upon to devote more and more time to the resolution of intergroup relations problems. Student grievances, whether justified ^{or} are not, typically have been quite similar in most school conflicts: insensitive administrators and teachers, lack of minority group staff, irrelevant curricula, unrealistic dress codes, absence of minority groups from texts and course content, poor counseling, discrimination in handling discipline and segregation in ability grouping. Even the most sincere, well-meaning and highly trained educators do not seem to truly understand that social conflict, group dynamics, interpersonal and inter-racial relationships are proper and essential subjects of concern to teacher and student alike.¹

In the Saturday Review, Nat Hentoff writes:

There exists among us a subject population as diverse in ethnic and socio-economic composition as the nation itself. In increasing numbers, its members are conducting a stubborn, sometimes explosive, struggle for liberation. Their goal, considering the previous history of this group within the United States, is quite revolutionary. They want their Constitutional rights.

¹Eugene S. Mornell, Sources of Intergroup Conflict in the Schools, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California, May 1966, pp. 1-3.

Nearly thirty years ago, it appeared that this colony, coterminous with the mother country, was about to achieve those rights. The United States Supreme Court proclaimed in *West Virginia, Board of Education vs. Barnette*, that educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of Constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes.

Despite the Court's 1943 pronouncement, there has been little significant change, until recently, in the attitudes of most public school administrators toward their students. The latter, compelled by law to attend these institutions, find their Constitutional freedoms routinely violated rather than scrupulously protected by those in charge of the schools. Such basic rights of an American citizen as freedom of speech and assembly, protection from invasion of privacy, and the guarantee of due process of law do not exist for the overwhelming majority of American high school students.¹

If our educational program is to improve, we must address ourselves to causes of intergroup conflict in our schools.

Assumptions

The development of this study is based on these specific assumptions. They are:

1. The Intergroup Relations Specialist may be the focal point of change within the educational system as we attempt to relate to the needs of different ethnic groups, social classes, school desegregation, school-community relations and the elimination of cultural blindness.

¹Nat Hentoff, "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights", Saturday Review, May 22, 1971, p.60.

2. School systems, in order to deal with some of the social problems that tend to interfere with the learning process, may include intergroup relations as part of the educational program.
3. Needs of the majority and minority group students may be met by the kinds of experiences and opportunities the intergroup relations specialist can implement through study, work, and play of other racial and ethnic groups.
4. An adequate educational program should include efforts to insure minority representation on all committees, in all clubs, and all organizations.
5. A meaningful in-service program in intergroup relations should include outside professionals, parents, and students.
6. All educators need to become familiar with the societal and in-school sources of intergroup conflict.
7. There is a need for formal intergroup relations education courses in all schools.
8. Trained Intergroup Relations Specialists are necessary if urban schools are to offer strategies for solving intergroup relations problems.

Research Questions and Statements

Some research indicates that many educators may not be thoroughly familiar with the social dynamics associated with intergroup relations problems.

This study will attempt to respond to the following questions which were selected as being most pertinent to the study:

1. What is the school's intergroup relations education program?

2. What are the specific sources of intergroup conflict in schools?
3. What qualities contribute to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist?

Limitations of the Study

1. This study involves the secondary school principals, some parents, students, counselors, and teachers of the Pontiac, Michigan Public School District in a descriptive study. A study of this nature has certain variable factors; therefore, an applicability of the conclusions and recommendations to other school districts or schools systems should be assessed carefully by those wishing to use the findings.
2. The sample is highly selective. Each respondent to the questionnaire was a member of his school's Human Relations Committee.
3. This study is applicable only to Pontiac, Michigan at the time the instrument was administered.

Design of the Study

Population

The population is the eight secondary schools of the city of Pontiac, Michigan.

Sample

The writer has been involved in an administrative internship with the Department of Intergroup Relations of the Pontiac, Michigan Public School District from January 1971 to June 1971. With the coopera-

tion of the secondary school principals, 72 persons, representing the secondary schools, will be asked to respond to a questionnaire (Appendix A), which will serve as the basis of the study. The sample is as follows:

1. Eight secondary school principals, one from each school.
2. Sixteen counselors, two from each school.
3. Sixteen parents, two from each school.
4. Sixteen students, two from each school.
5. Sixteen teachers, two from each school.

Some Functions of an Intergroup Relations Specialist

In the review and examination of the literature the writer observed that the functions of some individuals who are referred to as intergroup relations specialists are not clearly defined. Eleanor Blumenberg writes:

Each operates at home or in the field, within the framework of an organization. Yet each is singularly free to select his own special clients and arrange his own calendar contingent only upon possible calendar conflicts within his organization, such as staff meetings, etc., and the occasional crisis situation. What seems to be expected of the employee are certain kinds of skills in intergroup and interpersonal relations as they affect education, but skills conceived so broadly that they include the practitioner's personality, creativity, and often his social and community contacts.¹

After having made personal contact with the Department of Intergroup Relations, Detroit, Michigan Public Schools, and having received a written response from the Association of California Inter-

¹Eleanor Blumenberg, The School Intergroup Relations Specialist: A Profession in Process, Sociology of Education, Spring 1968, Volume 41:2, p. 225.

group Relations Educators, the researcher concludes that the following are general concerns of the Intergroup Relations Specialist:

1. Recruitment
2. Personnel Practices
3. In-service training
4. Ethnic studies
5. Counseling and discipline of minority students
6. Organized courses in intergroup relations education
7. Selection of audio-visual materials
8. Selection of textbooks
9. Encounter group meetings
10. School to school visitation programs

Blumenberg also relates:

Quantifiable indicators of achievement and success are difficult to find. The crucial sources of judgment are those applied by the professional himself; the key controls are those which he applies to his own performance.¹

Routh and Bragdon assert:

The intergroup relations worker plays many roles; among those recognized are: enabler, catalyst, organizer, researcher, administrator, and activist. Most intergroup relations workers play all these roles at one time or another during their professional career.²

Routh and Bragdon, in conclusion, contend:

The intergroup relations worker should have sufficient sophistication and modesty to recognize that one profession alone cannot change society. It takes many professions and his is but one. Recognizing this, he can devote his full energy to contributing to that change.³

¹Blumenberg, op. cit., p. 225.

²Frederick B. Routh and Marshall Bragdon, "The Role of the Intergroup Relations Worker," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, Fall, 1970, p. 48.

³Ibid, p. 48.

THE PROBLEM

Intergroup relations problems in our schools are not novel or rare. These problems could be the result of gross ethnic or racial imbalance and the educational, social and psychological liabilities that such imbalance may produce. The problem may have resulted from physical desegregation in the schools without accompanying social intergregation, or the problem may be the result of a clash of cultures within the school setting. Such problems should concern program, staff-leadership, community, and student responsiveness to these conditions.

There has been little or no systematic examination of the factors pertaining to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, nor has there been an attempt to understand his function in trying to respond to the needs of the school social environment.

Research alone will not solve the problems, but an understanding of the sources of intergroup conflict may minimize the strained relationships between different ethnic, racial, and national groups. The problem, then, is to determine the salient qualities that contribute to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, analyze sources of intergroup conflict, and explore the need for intergroup relations education programs.

The Social Setting

Pontiac, Michigan was selected as the social setting for this study for the following reasons:

1. It has a Department of Intergroup Relations

2. The cooperation of the superintendent and staff in permitting studies to be made pertaining to concerns of their school system

3. Problems of disruption in the high schools

Pontiac is a predominantly industrial city with a population of approximately 95,000 citizens. It is located in southeastern Michigan, 35 miles north of Detroit. Three divisions of the General Motors Corporation contribute 60 percent of the tax base, which accounts for a school equalized valuation of \$19,269.00 per pupil. Twenty-five percent of the city population is black.

According to the Michigan Chronicle, Pontiac is a study in black and white hate.¹ It is, however, a city with high hopes that has a dream of a \$22 million dollar redevelopment project for its inner-city area. It has visions of a brand new physical plant for Central High, one of its public high schools. The Board of Education will complete a \$5 million dollar Human Resources Center in August 1971, located in the downtown area. Its public school system is considered one of the finest in the State of Michigan, with a superintendent who has a national reputation for his leadership ability.

Unfortunately, Pontiac has problems which may cause many of its dreams to fade. Despite services of an Intergroup Relations Specialist, recent incidents at Central and Northern High Schools and

¹Gerald A. Tilles, The Michigan Chronicle, Detroit, Michigan, Volume 35:25, October 17, 1970, p. 1.

Eastern Junior High School have captured national headlines and have caused many to feel that racism is the major cause of Pontiac's ills.¹

Summary and Overview

It has been the focus in Chapter I to introduce the study. Concepts have been explained and defended on the basis of the observations of the writer, who further intends to examine any previous studies concerned with the Intergroup Relations Specialist and Sources of Intergroup Conflict.

This in-depth examination of the attitudes and opinions of administrators, parents, students, counselors, and teachers, may demonstrate the need for professional educators to develop a broad plan that will incorporate the services of an Intergroup Relations Specialist in urban public schools and organize intergroup relations education programs as part of the school curricula.

Research questions and statements have been suggested dealing with the Intergroup Relations Specialist, Intergroup Education, and Sources of Intergroup Conflict. The assumptions have been stated, the design of the study outlined, and the problem explained.

Certain general functions of the Intergroup Relations Specialist have been conveyed, limitations discussed, and the social setting described.

In Chapter II the literature related to the study will be explored, and the terms defined. In Chapter III the procedures will be defined dealing with the basis for the selection of the population

¹Ibid., p. 1.

and the sample. Instrumentation and techniques of analysis will be reviewed and a response to a survey from students, administered by the Department of Intergroup Relations, Pontiac Public School System, will be reported. Chapter IV will contain an analysis of the results and relate them to research questions and statements. In Chapter V the study will be summarized; conclusions and recommendations will be treated.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

The review of the literature is primarily directed at the following areas:

1. The Intergroup Relations Specialist
2. Sources of intergroup conflict
3. A review of selected literature supporting the need for intergroup relations education

The Intergroup Relations Specialist

Blumenberg found that:

At present, the Intergroup Relations Specialist seems to be the focal point of change within the educational system, either as a fore-runner or as the result of some already achieved systemic change as it relates to needs of different ethnic groups and social classes, school desegregation, intergroup cooperation, and school community relations. The specialist has indeed carved out and proclaimed a special mission, and attempted to give it special importance and new dignity. It is still primarily educationalist in emphasis. Although he deals most often with adults (administrators or teachers) he sees the students as his actual clients, and the achievement of their potential through programs of educational opportunity as his objective. He has developed a methodology and techniques that differ from those with either schoolman or community relations professional. He blends the two sets of jargon, and has synthesized the school's role as a "mediator of the culture and transmitter of knowledge" with another point of view which talks in terms of both

"institutional and psychological change", of "shifts in content as well as hardware."¹

Blumenberg further stated:

As the profession develops, one sees a reaching out for increased formal and theoretical knowledge by its members. In its newsletter for January-February, 1968, NAIRO (National Association for Intergroup Relations Organizations) listed among the services performed for its members during the past year a compilation of the Centers for Human Relations Studies offering masters and doctoral programs, and a review of those foundations with special emphasis on intergroup education and training. Currently, despite vaguely expressed educational and experimental prerequisites, there is no standard training or qualifications.²

Schools, especially those in urban areas, throughout the nation have been faced with continuing problems arising out of culture conflict and out of perceived and expressed differences among students, administrators, and teachers based upon color. The historical background of these problems and the social dynamics associated with them are not well understood in the school community. But in order for schools to do the best possible job they can do in the interest of democratic teaching and learning, and to help every student achieve at his highest potential, programs must be provided by Intergroup Relations Specialists in a continuing effort to develop understanding and mutual respect among all members of the school community.

"All our children must live in a multi-racial world and the school is a natural place in which to introduce them to that world".³

¹Blumenberg, op. cit., p. 223.

²Ibid, p. 224.

³James E. Allen, Jr. Obligation of the Educator With Respect to School Desegregation, Statement by U.S. Commissioner of Education, March 1970.

"The Intergroup Relations Specialist represents one of the few clear-cut attempts by school systems to create mechanisms to direct the changes implicit in the press for equal educational opportunity".¹

The school Intergroup Relations Specialist belongs to a group that reflects the ferment in public education today and is rapidly developing a characteristic entity of its own. If one defines a profession as an occupation marked by (1) a specialized competence, (2) heavily based on a body of theory and knowledge, (3) with service attributes, (4) public recognition of authority and expertise, and (5) a sense of collegueship, these happy few, if not already professionalized, are surely part of a "profession in process".² Professionalization does not occur in a vacuum.³

Grambs in conclusion wrote:

If a person can learn to hate and distrust others, he can learn to like and trust others. Intergroup understanding and acceptance do not occur just because we want them to. Children do not "just naturally" like other children. The deliberate education of the child about himself and others is one of the obligations of the educator.⁴

This is a basic assumption of the Intergroup Relations Specialist.

¹Blumenberg, op. cit., p. 221.

²Ibid., p. 221.

³Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, Professionalization, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, p. 46.

⁴Jean Dresden Grambs, Intergroup Education, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968, p. 1.

Sources of Intergroup Conflict

Chesler wrote:

In a number of secondary schools throughout this nation we are experiencing riots, insurrections and rebellions that protest existing conditions in urban education. Sometimes the focus of student concern is racial relations, or the perpetration of racial injustice in the school. At least as often students' dissatisfaction is with the character of teacher-student relations, faculty brutality or incompetence, student exclusion from school decision making processes, and the general low quality, irrelevance or failure of the educational enterprise.¹

Tumin contended:

Since racial tensions have erupted in the United States in the past few years, questions such as Why? Could it happen here? When will it happen here? and How can it be avoided? are being heard in communities throughout the world in which there are strained relationships between members of different ethnic, racial, religious, and national groups.²

Research alone will not solve the problems generating conflict, but a knowledge of the nature of group differences and sources of intergroup tensions may be a means of warding off the tragic predicaments faced by so many. We must continue to be concerned with the causes of stress and the processes of interpersonal and intergroup attitude and behavioral change.³

In November, 1970 the National Association of Secondary School Principals published an abridged report of a study conducted

¹Mark A. Chesler, "Alternative Responses In School Disruption". The Newsletter of Western Association of Counselors, Educators and Supervisors, Spring 1969, p. 1.

²Melvin M. Tumin, Research Annual on Intergroup Relations, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970, p. 5.

³Ibid., p. 5

by the Syracuse University Research Corporation entitled, Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Twenty-nine thousand schools were sent questionnaires; 50 percent responded. Basic findings as interpreted by the National School Public Relations Association in its newsletter dated March 2, 1970 were as follows:

1. Eighteen percent of the schools responding had experienced "serious protests".
2. Major issues of protest were disciplinary rules, dress codes, school services, facilities, and curriculum policy.
3. Most importantly, the survey considered racial issues in a separate category and found that this was a factor in more than 50 percent of the protests in schools with more than 1,000 students and in 30 percent of the smaller schools. Racial issues were involved in city school protests about four times as often as in suburban or rural schools.¹

¹Stephen K. Bailey, Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools, National Association of Secondary School Principals, N. W. Washington, D.C., November 1970, p. 8.

Table 2.1. Percentage of School's In Each of Eight Geographic Regions Reporting Disruption According to Extent of Racial Basis.

	Substantial Racial Basis								Somewhat Racial Basis								No Racial Basis							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Form of Disruption	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Teacher Boycott	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	7	0	1	1	0	0	1	30	21	15	23	36	9	8	10
Walkout or Strike																								
Student Boycott, 10	16	8	8	17	5	11	9	7	16	9	7	11	2	9	7	33	21	17	13	11	5	4	9	17
Walkout or Strike																								
Arson	7	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	2	2	0	4	0	2	6	20	21	14	10	24	7	6	17	
Property Damage (other than arson)	10	0	2	1	6	2	0	3	0	9	5	6	7	2	8	5	60	56	42	45	49	38	42	52
Rioting	7	9	7	4	7	0	9	6	3	9	2	1	6	0	0	2	3	0	5	1	2	2	0	1
Student-Teacher Physical Confrontation	0	2	2	2	6	3	4	3	7	14	12	9	13	5	11	6	20	16	18	11	23	9	15	
Picketing or Parading	7	7	2	8	10	2	4	3	3	12	2	2	6	3	6	2	37	26	18	10	12	9	8	17

¹Ibid., p. 11.

Table 2.1. Continued.

	Substantial Racial Basis								Somewhat Racial Basis								No Racial Basis							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Form of Disruption	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Presence on Campus of Unruly Unauthorized Non-school Persons	7	9	9	9	11	3	8	5	17	16	12	16	16	7	17	10	57	35	29	26	29	36	32	33
Abnormal Unruliness	7	7	7	6	10	0	4	6	3	19	13	16	19	12	13	10	27	12	16	11	9	16	8	15

*The numbers identify geographic regions in the following manner:

1. New England
2. New York-New Jersey
3. Mid-Atlantic
4. South
5. Midwest
6. Southwest
7. Mountain
8. West

The Syracuse University study also revealed:

1. Disruption is positively related to integration.

Schools which are almost all white or all black are less likely to be disrupted.

2. Integrated schools with higher percentages of black students are less likely to be disrupted if such schools also have high percentages of black staffs; but, schools with predominantly black student bodies and predominantly white staffs are more likely to be disrupted.¹

Frederic R. Gunsby, Consultant in Intergroup Relations for the State of California conceded:

As the realities and processes change, as urban population becomes larger and their groupings more rigid, public schools come face to face with a new set of problems and demands.²

Just as important as reading and other skills, and inextricably related to learning them, are the needs of every child to develop a sense of identity, character and values, and to acquire the wider knowledges and disciplines required to lead a life of self-fulfillment and social participation. If schools are to carry out these purposes, they must recognize and deal constructively with racial, ethnic and cultural differences among students, parents

¹Ibid., p. 12.

²Frederic R. Gunsby, "Problems and Opportunities in Intergroup Relations", Journal for Instructional Improvement, California State Department of Education, October, 1966, p. 181.

and others in the community.¹

Robin M. Williams, Jr., of Cornell University, voiced:

All individuals brought up in human society manifest some hostility toward other individuals or social groups.²

He further offered several alternatives for the reduction of intergroup hostility:

1. Complete isolation
2. Complete assimilation
3. Information and education
4. Direct reorientation of values
5. Intergroup contact and collaboration
6. Legislation and law enforcement ³

According to H. Harry Giles:

It is an astounding fact that for all the waste, death, and destruction caused by human conflict, particularly social conflict there has not developed in man's long history any professional education approach to its treatment, nor any truly scientific analysis of the kinds, causes and methods of dealing with conflict.⁴

Giles added:

It is self-evident that such knowledge would be useful in the training of those who deal with the education of human beings. It is still more evident, painfully so, that

¹Ibid., p. 181.

²Robin M. Williams, Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions, Social Science Research Council, New York, 1947, p. 51. (Reprinted 1965).

³Ibid., pp. 61-77.

⁴H. Harry Giles, Conflict Episode Analysis--A Tool For Education In Social Technology," The Journal of Educational Sociology, May 1953, p. 418.

such knowledge is desperately needed in the governmental field for most intelligent dealing with war and international tensions, and for the treatment and prevention of the destructive antagonisms which show themselves in hostilities between cultural groups of varying religious, economic, nationality and racial background all over the world and within many of our own communities.¹

William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole said that there are three major types of intergroup conflict that play a discordant role among Americans. They are: racial conflict, ethnic differences and interfaith conflicts.²

Cole and Vickery felt that there is a need for intercultural education for the public schools.³ The younger generation needs to know the facts about race, prejudice, and conflict of cultures, and to rethink the place of majority and minority racial groups in a society committed to making democracy a working reality. They need also to share daily educational opportunities when as members of different racial groups, they can unite in significant activities on behalf of common purposes. Even so, an adequate program of intercultural education must compass other social issues besides those pertaining to race.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 419.

²William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, Intercultural Education in American Schools, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, p. 3.

³Ibid., p. 3

⁴Ibid., p. 13.

Vickery and Cole further suggested that as members of racial groups differ in skin-color and other biologically transmitted characteristics, members of ethnic groups differ in folkways, mores, arts and crafts, languages and family customs. They state, for example, that the typical educational program imposed on the pupils of Mexican background is unsuited to their needs, and that a meaningful intercultural program in our public school can develop an appreciation of the diverse gifts of peoples in the making of America.¹

Vickery and Cole elaborated on the role educators should play in seeking to develop democratic understanding among culture groups of the contemporary phases of religious conflict. They said that religious discrimination tends to make one unfit for participation in a democratic society and that the school can teach pupils to treat objectively the interfaith conflicts which disturb certain peoples in the community.²

The May 1953 issue of The Journal of Educational Sociology pointed to the fact that the Bureau of Intercultural Education was organized for the purpose of establishing programs to test whether through educational means, tensions and conflict between cultural groups could be ameliorated or cured through educational measures.³

The article held that during this period there was a great deal of national interest in the treatment of intergroup tension

¹Ibid., p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 21.

³H. Harry Giles, op. cit., p. 420.

and conflict. There were according to the Julius Rosenwald Fund, over 1,000 agencies concerned in some degree with race relations. An estimated 14 to 18 million dollars a year was spent in an effort to bring about better intergroup relations.¹

Williams wrote: "It is obvious that we are confronted by a world seething with tensions and open conflicts among all kinds of racial, cultural, economic and political groups. The control of intergroup tension and hostility is one of the crucial needs of our times. This is time for intranational and international communities."²

"It is the assumption that conflict can be solved or accommodated by non-violent means and that intergroup hostilities can be kept below the point where the basic consensus of the society is threatened. The survival of a democratic nation depends on the invention of techniques for resolving its internal group conflicts."³

Williams in conclusion stated that:

The more specific techniques which have been used by agencies concerned with promoting intergroup cooperation or with improving the status of a particular group include almost every conceivable mode of influencing human behavior. Goodwin Watson has classified these activities into seven patterns: exhortation, education, participation, revelation, negotiation, contention, and prevention. Three of these are primarily in the area of direct attempts to change attitudes or values--exhorting to ideal patterns, education and revealing new facts. Social contact across group lines (participation represents a situational alteration which is assumed to affect subsequent behavior). Watson's ordering of approaches helps to clarify the main type of current intergroup programs.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 421.

²Williams, op. cit., p. viii.

³Ibid., p. viii.

⁴Ibid., p. viii.

Selected Literature On Intergroup Education

If man is to understand life around him and actively participate in the process of change, problems of interracial, interreligious, and ethnic tensions must be intensively studied and efforts at amelioration of intergroup relations problems must be systematically analyzed.

The development of new approaches and techniques is essential if one is to adjust to the recent dramatic changes in relations between racial and ethnic groups of this country.

The educational process seeks to perpetuate the culture of a given society. Allison Davis defined "culture" as:

The basic social habits, emotions, and values of any group of people. From the point of view of the individual, culture may be objectively defined as all that behavior which he has learned in conformity with the standards of some group. This group may be his family, his play associates, his colleagues in work, his same-sex companions, his religious sect, his potential party, or all of these groups together.¹

Sheriff referred to culture as:

The accumulated products of interaction within the group, such as the status hierarchy, the social organization, the division of labor and work routines or techniques, the standards of living, beliefs in magic and myth and religion, the language and all art forms, standards of conduct, and any other social values or norms.²

The nature of our multi-race society and its concomitant problems have caused educators to recognize the fact that schools cannot remain neutral in a changing social order. Many school systems

¹Allison Davis, Light From Anthropology on Intercultural Relations, Cultural Groups, and Human Relations. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957, p. 77.

²Muzafer Sherif, Light From Psychology on Intercultural Relations, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951, p. 11.

in their attempt to deal with some of the social problems that tend to interfere with the learning process, are including intergroup relations as an integral part of the educational program.

One of the most serious challenges to professional educators today is to improve their skills and techniques in interpersonal and intergroup relations and to arrange the curriculum and the educational environment in order to compete with the negative, divisive influences of residential segregation, family income differences, social separation, isolation and discrimination.

Contrary to the belief of many school people, the conception of intergroup relations as significant to equality of educational opportunity did not spring full blown under press of the so-called Negro revolt. There had long been a small but determined and well-organized movement behind the claim that social conflict, group dynamics, interpersonal and interracial relationships were proper and essential subjects of concern to teacher and student alike. Beginning on college campuses as an outgrowth of the concept of cultural pluralism in 1930's, the movement known as "intercultural education" made rapid headway. Such men as Otto Klineberg, William Kilpatrick, William Vickery and William Van Til gathered devoted followings.¹

Grambs said that human relations education or intergroup education is not a special need of any special group. There is evidence that prejudice against others is widespread throughout the

¹Blumenberg, op. cit., p. 222.

United States and does not depend on whether or not a child has any actual contact with a given group.¹

Grambs acknowledged:

It is important that those who are interested in a wider discussion of the real human relations problems facing us in America, and with implications for our international role as well, must be prepared to face those who attack the idea of discussing contemporary race problems in our schools, sources of prejudice, and "human relations" problems of young people.²

Grambs commented further and stated that:

Every school has a problem of education for human understanding. One does not have to have Negroes in the school to realize that all children need to gain insight into what the sources of the contemporary situation of the Negro are, and why the role of the Negro is a critical problem in American life.

The educator who says with pride and security, 'But we don't have any problems here; see, our children all come from the same type of middle-class homes,' is denying in fact a very major problem. The children who come to such a school are not being educated in life as it occurs in the larger world. They are as Henry Jules stated in Culture Against Man, 'learning to be stupid'.

No group of children, even those with identical IQ's will come from identical homes; they will vary in their religious beliefs, in the emotional climate of their families, in their experiences with birth, death, illness, and other emotional traumas, and they will have had each in his own way a special education regarding "our groups" and "those others". Surface homogeneity masks undercover heterogeneity. All are important and must become part of our curriculum.³

¹Grambs, op. cit., p. 11.

²Ibid., p. 25.

³Ibid., p. 4.

William H. Kilpatrick wrote that there are four outstanding psychological sources from which human relations problems arise, and there is one pertinent law of learning. He contends that the snobbishness inherited socially from the days of feudalism is the strongest of these sources, and some people feel as if they are born superior to others and should be granted special privileges. These people look down on others and wish not to associate with them either in their dwelling areas or in their resort hotels. They also think they can and should transmit their superior status to their children and descendants. Such people clearly reject the doctrines of equal rights and equal opportunities.

Kilpatrick related that the second source of bias and prejudice is the narrow-minded rejection of the unfamiliar--antagonism to all other than one's own ways of acting and thinking. In general, the more limited one's experiences, the stronger is this attitude.

The third source is the age-old assumption of religious authority; specifically, the tendency to use this assumed religious authority against Jews.

The fourth source of bias is the bad logic of imputing to all members of an out-group the weaknesses found in the individual members of that out-group. If one of our in-group does wrong, people say, "He is a bad man;" not we, he! If one of the out-group does wrong, they say, "Yes, they are like that".¹

¹William H. Kilpatrick, The Genesis of the Problem, New York: Anti-Defamation League, B'Nai, Brith, 1955, pp.1-2.

Kilpatrick felt that when any two or more of these sources operate in the same person, these sources strengthen each other. The more that a person who holds to any one of these sources associates with other people who hold the same views, the stronger the sources operate. This, according to Kilpatrick, is where the major problem lies. Anyone who holds to one of these wrong attitudes tends to pass them on to his children. This is the crux of the situation. If we are going to change attitudes, we must base our plan on this important law of learning. We learn what we live, not on that upon which we can stand examination. We learn what we live, live in our own actual lives, live in our hearts. We learn each response as we accept it to live by. We learn each such response in the degree we live it. What we thus learn, we therein build into character. This kind of learning explains how people learn their wrong attitudes and how we must so manage our children and other people in order that they learn to renounce and reject undemocratic attitudes and learn respect for the rights and feelings of others.¹

Melby iterated:

...I like to think that we in America have the power to build really great education; an education that matches the measures of power over the growth and development of human beings; an education that is creative, that recognizes the power of faith, an education that is based on the sacredness of human beings, on respect and humility in the search for truth and the universality of human brotherhood. We've got to build these values into our education

¹Ibid., p. 1.

so that when we look at the tapestry of American freedom, there we will see these four golden threads that illuminate and give it meaning.¹

Lloyd and Elaine Cooke noted:

Attention should be called to the slow but sure emergence of a new field in social education, that of intergroup relations. Publications, including textbooks, are appearing with enough frequency and variation to show that the area is alive, that it is being organized for teacher-training uses. Research in the field has far outrun its diffusion into college courses of study, seminars, and workshops, which suggests the need to close the gap.

What has just been said applies strongly to teachers in big-city schools, such as San Francisco, Chicago and Detroit. Many of these teachers were raised in places, mostly in rural areas and small towns, where their contacts were almost wholly with members of their own race, creed, and social class. Unless their college training takes this fact into account, school personnel are ill-prepared to deal with the heterogeneity and mobility of metropolitan life, the meeting and mingling of all the many people who make up the nation. A definite basic course devoted exclusively to intergroup relations is no substitute for lifelong experiences, yet it has on students a measurable, appreciable effect.

Most textbooks in intergroup education center on concepts of race, religious creed, immigrant peoples, and perhaps social class. All such works would seem to have a pro-minority-group bias, an essential empathy with the underdog. Some state frankly that, in the author's opinion ethnic, creedal, and national groups have had to bear the brunt of the nations search for decency and justice in human relations, the attempt to equalize civil rights. All challenge the polite fiction that any thoughtful person can be neutral in the struggle for equality and opportunity and self-respect. All ask that schools and colleges take a more active part in this ever-changing, never-ending movement.²

¹Ernest O. Melby, Human Relations in Education, New York: Anti-Defamation League, B'Nai B'Rith, 1955, pp.3-6.

²Lloyd and Elaine Cooke, School Problems in Human Relations, New York: McGraw-Hill Series in Education, 1957, p. 135.

Gunsky wrote:

In the schools attended by middle-class Anglo-Caucasian pupils, neither the conventional curriculum nor conventional approaches by teachers satisfy the need to prepare these children for the give-and-take of life in a mixed, pluralistic society. Something is lacking in the school experience as well as the home-and-community experience of children, however privileged, when they do not meet children and adults of other racial and ethnic groups on some common ground. Innovations are called for in curriculum, integration of staff, special pre-service and in-service training of all teachers in this area of concern, and planned activities which promote sound intergroup relations and intergroup education.¹

William H. Kilpatrick charged that intergroup problems are essentially educational problems, and since our prejudices are learned, it is an educational problem as to whether any more such shall be learned and whether present prejudices may not be unlearned.² The writer believes that this means that educators must develop meaningful in-service programs and plan programs which promote sound intergroup relations and intergroup education.

Hilda Taba, et. al., wrote:

Intergroup education is concerned with children's present relationships. All children have some problems of relationship with other people here and now. Other problems are not so apparent; they are the unvoiced worries and fears of children. Still other problems arise from faulty assumptions and misinterpretations. All these immediate conflicts, anxieties and misinterpretations gradually began to be considered concerns of intergroup education.³

¹Gunsky, op. cit., p. 182.

²William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, op. cit., p. viii.

³Hilda Taba and Intergroup Education Staff, Elementary Curriculum in Intergroup Relations, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950, pp. 1-2.

Taba also stated:

The problems of human relations are always personal, emotional and complex. To be able to deal with these problems, it is necessary to know how to identify them, and how to isolate the factors that play upon them.¹

An outgrowth of interest in intergroup relations problems resulted in three famous publications during the 1940's. Goodwin Watson's, Action for Unity, Robin Williams' classic, The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions, and the Science Research Council Study of Intercultural Education. All these were efforts to develop scientific approaches to intergroup relations problems.²

President Roosevelt, in his last public address, made the now famous statement that we need a science of human relations-- a discipline for all men by which to live and work together in the same world, at peace.

There are two good reasons why we must expect people to cling to their prejudices. First, the economy of their lives is based on the assumption that certain out-groups are inferior, threatening and contemptible. Their own sense of worth is maintained by debasing others, particularly Jews, Mexicans and Negroes. Secondly, prejudiced attitudes receive continual support from the social environment.³

Philip D. Ortega in the article, "Between Two Cultures", Saturday Review, April, 1971, wrote that the rise in cultural militancy among young Chicanos is directly related to the school's

¹Hilda Taba, Leadership Training in Intergroup Relations, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1953, p. 5.

²Giles, op. cit., p. 421.

³Gordon W. Allport, The Resolution of Intergroup Tensions, New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952, p. 6.

abysmal ignorance about Mexican-Americans.¹

Allport reported that Professor Lloyd Cooke pointed out six educational methods in intergroup relations: (1) the informational approach, imparting knowledge by lectures and textbooks, (2) the vicarious experience approach, employing movies, dramas, fiction which invite the student to identify with the out-group, (3) the community study-action approach, using field trips, surveys, community programs, and work in social agencies, (4) exhibits, festivals and pageants encouraging respect for the culture of minority groups, (5) the small group process, applying the principles of group dynamics including the socio-drama and group retraining, finally, (6) the individual conference, making use of therapeutic or advisory interviewing.²

Dean and Rosen held that thousands of administrators, executives, and professional workers were handling problems that directly involve intergroup relations.³ Yet, there were few established principles of "good" intergroup practice. They pointed out that there were wide variations for evaluating criteria for "good intergroup relations practices". They recommended that the following criteria be considered:

1. Is genuine two-way communication taking place between the majority and minority groups, especially between the leaders?

¹Philip D. Ortega, "Schools for Mexican-Americans: Between Two Cultures", Saturday Review, April 17, 1971, p. 80.

²Allport, op. cit., p. 14.

³John P. Dean and Alex Rosen, A Manual of Intergroup Relations, The University of Chicago Press, 1955, p. 1.

2. Is the minority group participating effectively in the formulation of policy and program in organizations that have different ethnic groups as members or staff?
3. Are staffs of mixed organizations trained and experienced in intergroup relations?
4. Have those activities been desegregated that can reasonably be expected to be carried on jointly by different groups?
5. Are integrated activities being used to broaden the individual's understanding of other groups and to reinforce a personal creed devoted to democratic intergroup practices?
6. Is intergroup action work effectively organized and has it involved key influential leaders in community life?¹

Gordon W. Allport supported the fact that combined efforts of education and social science, operating according to modern principles of inquiry and action, can provide technical assistance in releasing the potential of love in human relations. He has attempted, in his paper, "Basic Principles in Improving Human Relations",² to establish the following:

1. It is the nature of human life to crave affiliation and love of the sort that maintains personal security and self-esteem.
2. When the bid for affiliation is rebuffed or self-esteem wounded, a secondary hostility develops. This hostility is if often displaced upon irrelevant "enemies".

¹Ibid., p. 3.

²Gordon W. Allport, "Basic Principles in Improving Human Relations", Conference on Educational Problems of Special Cultural Groups, 1949, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951, pp. 8-27.

3. Each person through circumstance and training, develops an exclusionist, an inclusionist, or a mixed style of life that guides his own human relations.

There is a seductive, short-run economy in the exclusionist style of life. But a person who experiences his own integrity only in opposition to other people, who feels secure only by undermining the security of others, can scarcely be said to have a purpose or integrity of his own.

There is no limitation in the nature of man nor in the nature of learning that requires self-esteem to be based on an exclusionist style of life. Personal integrity is entirely compatible with a wide circle of affiliation.¹

Allport continued:

Modern research in education, in psychology, in human relations is teaching us to implement the above principles. The formula is not complex though its application requires ingenuity. It says, "Maximize situations in which the individual-child or adult-can participate fully and in terms of equal status in projects of joint concern to him and to his associates." Wherever this formula is applied, it goes far toward improving human relations-in the home, in school, in factories, in the nation, and between those rivals who live on two banks of the stream of life.²

Important as it is to acquaint students with the tasks of intergroup problems and the principles underlying social relationships, neither of these educational functions is sufficient in itself to achieve the larger goal of improving intergroup relations. Intergroup education has to be considered from the premise that

¹Ibid., pp. 8-27.

²Ibid., p. 27.

democracy is not merely ideas and institutions, but ways of acting. It has to develop social skills both at the personal and at group level if it is to be comprehensive and realistic. Only as education concerns itself with developing appropriate behavior can its concern with education in Judaeo-Christian ideals have meaning.¹

A study by the North Central Association entitled, Human Relations in the Classroom, revealed that the respondents, all of whom were professional educators, had negative attitudes toward non-academic pupils, Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans, Indians, in some cases Catholics, and very often lower class people.²

The study further revealed a lack of pre-service training in human relations, a lack of understanding on the part of college professors in providing curricula that would prepare graduates for teaching the diversity of people found in public schools, and a lack of knowledge of the open class nature of American Society.³

In conclusion, the study related:

The public schools themselves, must fill the gap left in background experiences and training of teachers, at and after the point of employment by orientation workshops, in-service courses, and post-term seminars and workshops in human relations.⁴

¹Marjorie B. Smiley, op. cit., pp. 145-147.

²Human Relations in the Classroom - A Study of Problems and Situations Reported by 1,075 Second Year Secondary School Teachers, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1962, p. 20.

³Ibid., p. 20.

⁴Ibid., p. 21.

Charles S. Johnson proposed:

There is only one way to understand the nature of social processes, and that is by intensive and dispassionate investigation. In this sphere of activity, education needs the coverage of its own function. We have accepted the idea of dispassionate investigation in the physical sciences, and we are astounded by the results achieved and overwhelmed by the control we have won over physical processes. But we have not yet developed the courage or the determination, either as individuals or as a nation, to investigate the social processes with the same thoroughness and objectivity-even less to abide by the results of such studies as we have made, and to act upon them. The reasons for our hesitancy are clear. Dispassionate investigation in the field of human relations and social process leads, wherever it is undertaken, directly into cherished prejudices and socio-economic beliefs that are so deeply rooted as to seem part of ourselves. Yet we should not forget that the same was once true, and not so long ago, of the physical sciences.

According to our best thinking today, the means used in educating for human relations are more important than the specific goals selected; that is to say, that the way in which learning takes place is more important in promoting good human relations than the particular facts which are learned. There is a tendency to confuse scientific knowledge about cultural groups with understanding of those cultures. Scientific knowledge may or may not lead to understanding, but it is not in itself understanding. Understanding means exactly what it says: the act of standing oneself in the other person's spot. And when we refer to building bridges, we must remember that bridges are just means to an end; the bridges will not avail unless there is a will to cross them.¹

Smith, et. al., wrote:

American society is a mixture of national origins and social classes. In some schools as many as fifty nationalities are represented in the pupil body. Because of local pressures to integrate the schools, children

¹Charles S. Johnson, "Cultural Groups and International Problems", Conference on Educational Problems of Special Cultural Groups, 1949, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951, pp. 29-42.

of the poor and the wealthy, the illiterate and the educated are sometimes found in the same school. But in the inner city the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans are forced by circumstances to live off by themselves and thus their children attend schools in which there is less variation of cultural background and wealth. The same observation can be made about the children who live in rural poverty or in Mexican communities, or on Indian reservations. Such variety among communities and pupils demands that all educational personnel be prepared to cope with problems arising from all kinds of social circumstances.¹

Brewton Berry of Ohio State University wrote:

The expression "intergroup relations" has supplanted the older and more familiar "race relations". Group denotes inter-activity, interstimulation, interaction. It consists of any number of people who are bound together by the fact they hold in common at least one interest.²

However, Gordon indicated:

The major problem, then, is to keep ethnic separation in communal life from being so pronounced in itself that it threatens ethnic harmony, good group relations, and the spirit of basic good will which a democratic pluralistic society requires . . .³

Louis Wirth contended:

No ethnic group is ever unanimous in all of its attitudes and actions, and minority groups are no exception. They too have their internal differentiations, their factions and ideological currents and movements.⁴

¹B. Othaniel Smith, Saul B. Cohen, Arthur Pearl, Teachers For the Real World, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, N.W. Washington, D.C.: December, 1968, p. 11.

²Brewton Berry, Race and Ethnic Relations, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, Third Edition, 1965, p. 43.

³Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, New York University Press, 1964, p. 264.

⁴Minako Kurokawa, Minority Responses, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 44.

Statements by Gordon and Illich best reflect the literature:

. . . the bonds that bind human beings together across the lines of ethnicity and the pathways on which people of diverse ethnic origin meet and mingle should be cherished and strengthened. In the last analysis, what is gravely required in a society in which one must say with equal pride and without internal disquietude, at juxtaposition: "I am a Jew, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Negro, or an Indian, or an Oriental or a Puerto Rican"; "I am an American"; and "I am a man".¹

We need an environment in which growing up can be classless. . .²

¹Gordon, op. cit., p. 265.

²Ivan Illich, "The Alternative to Schooling", Saturday Review June 19, 1971, p. 60.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were selected from Robin M. Williams'

The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions.¹

Conflict--a struggle over values.

Culture--the basic social habits, emotions, and values of any group of people.

Discrimination--the differential treatment of an individual based on his membership in a given group which conflicts with institutional rules within a society.

Ethnic--possessing continuity through biological descent whereby one shares in a distinctive social and cultural tradition.

Hostility--an attitude which consists of tendencies to insult, threaten, ostracize, or inflict physical or social injury upon a member of a social group by virtue of membership therein.

Intercultural--the relationship among racial, ethnic, religious, socio-economic groups.

Intergroup Education--teaching information and value judgments that will result in an understanding and appreciation of racial, cultural, and ethnic differences.

Minorities--a group of people who are singled out because of their physical or cultural differences in the society.

Prejudice--an attitude of hostility toward a group whose values may conflict with the basic framework of the society in which they occur.

Race--possessing through biological descent distinctive, common physical characteristics.

Racism--any action, attitude, or institutional structure that subordinates a group or individual because of skin color.

Religion--possessing beliefs and values toward real or imaginary things and events considered to be outside the area of human control.

Segregation--forced separation of minority and majority groups in a community.

Note: The term "intergroup education" is a recent designation for what had earlier been termed "intercultural education" and what appears likely to be called "education in human relations" in the future.² Therefore, these terms are used interchangeably throughout this study.

¹Robin Williams, op. cit., pp. 42-43

²Marjorie B. Smiley, Intergroup Education and the American College, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952, p. 39.

Summary

A review of the literature and research directly related to the Intergroup Relations Specialist revealed a paucity of information about this vital urban school position. There were some articles, however, that offered very important considerations on various aspects of the role. The materials available were not only sparse, but the educational objectives of intergroup relations programs were frequently stated in vague, general terms.

This chapter's intent was to review the general writings and attitudes which are pertinent to this particular investigation, and the literature did support the writer's contention that the Intergroup Relations Specialist and intergroup relations educational activities may offer strategies in solving interracial, interethnic, and interreligious conflict and reducing hostility in urban schools.

The review produced no studies concerned with the Intergroup Relations Specialist; nevertheless, if institutions of higher education are to translate intergroup conflict into tangible institutional assets, attitudes toward intergroup problems and the factors that contribute to these attitudes should be understood. Thus, the contributions of a number of writers did establish a framework on which this study is based.

Chapter III contains the methods of conducting the study, instrumentation and other factors related to the general design.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In this section, the writer will discuss the objective measurements used in the study, define the selection of the population and the sample, describe the procedures in gathering data, and explain the instrument employed and its administration.

The interview instrument was designed by the writer with the assistance of a member of the Department of Research and Evaluation, Michigan State University. Since the use of the instrument was unique to the particular case under study, no pilot or validation procedures could be conducted.

Basis for Population Selection

The population for this study was the eight public secondary schools of the City of Pontiac, Michigan, two senior high schools and six junior high schools.

Enrollment data of those schools in October 1970 was as follows:

		WHITE		BLACK		SPANISH AMERICAN	
*School	1970-71 Enrollment	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
<u>Senior High</u>							
01	2,187	1,182	54.05	923	42.20	82	3.75
02	2,026	1,478	72.95	474	23.40	74	3.65
<u>Homebound</u>							
	4	1	25.00	3	75.00	-	-
<u>Junior High</u>							
03	936	145	15.49	737	78.74	54	5.77
04	506	-	-	499	98.62	7	1.38
05	855	831	97.19	13	1.52	11	1.29
06	878	773	88.04	13	1.48	92	10.48
07	1,145	884	77.21	214	18.69	47	4.10
08	975	697	71.49	262	26.87	16	1.64
<u>Total Senior High</u>							
	4,217	2,661	63.10	1,400	33.20	156	3.70
<u>Total Junior High</u>							
	5,295	3,330	62.89	1,738	32.82	227	4.29
<u>Total Senior & Junior High</u>							
	9,512	5,991	62.66	3,138	33.01	383	3.99

Remarks: American Indians, orientals, and others are counted as White.

*All of the above data was secured from the Department of Pupil Personnel
Pontiac School District.

Most of the secondary schools were identified as experiencing unrest. The determinant factor for unrest in schools was negative correspondence received at the central administration office and negative reactions on the part of the community. There were a few schools experiencing little or no unrest. The unanimous response of secondary principals suggested a desire to participate in the study.

Basis For Sample Selection

The samples for this study were the eight secondary school principals, two counselors, two parents, two students and two classroom teachers from each school. There is in each school a Human Relations Committee, and it was suggested that the respondents be members of this organization since it is sponsored by the Department of Intergroup Relations and consists of parents and students. It was also felt that these individuals might be familiar with the role of the Intergroup Relations Specialist; therefore, this sample is highly selective.

Administration of the Questionnaires

The questionnaires were administered during the period of May 13, 1971 through June 17, 1971. The writer was given invaluable assistance from the Director of Secondary Education, who held a meeting on May 12, 1971 with the secondary principals and solicited their assistance. Respondents were given instructions and questionnaires individually. Upon completion they were requested to mail them to the Director of Secondary Education. Complete anonymity was maintained to insure frank and honest responses.

Extensive follow-up was done by the writer who made telephone calls and personal visits to encourage participation in the study. Seventy-two questionnaires were distributed, sixty-two were returned. A response of 87 percent.

Table 3.1 Number and Percentage of Respondents Returning Completed Questionnaires.

School Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent Returned
01	9	9	100%
02	9	8	88.8%
03	9	7	77.7%
*04	9	6	66.6%
05	9	8	88.8%
06	9	8	88.8%
07	9	8	88.8%
08	9	8	88.8%
Total:			
8	72	62	87%

*School 04 has an all black student body (See Table 4.1), and also has the lowest percent of returns. There is not significant data to conclude that a lack of response indicated a lack of intergroup conflict; however, the writer stated earlier that schools that are largely white or largely black in composition of student body are less likely to experience disruption. (See Syracuse University study page 19).

Table 3.2 Number and Percentage of Principals Returning
Completed Questionnaires.

School Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Questionnaires Returned
01	1	1	100%
02	1	1	100%
03	1	1	100%
04	1	1	100%
05	1	1	100%
06	1	1	100%
07	1	1	100%
08	1	1	100%
<u>Total:</u>			
8	8	8	100%

Table 3.3 Number and Percentage of Parents Returning
Completed Questionnaires.

School Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Questionnaires Returned
01	2	2	100%
02	2	2	100%
03	2	2	100%
04	2	1	50%
05	2	1	50%
06	2	2	100%
07	2	2	100%
08	2	2	100%
<u>Total:</u> 8	16	14	87.50%

Table 3.4 Number and Percentage of Students Returning
Completed Questionnaires.

School Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Questionnaires Returned
01	2	2	100%
02	2	2	100%
03	2	2	100%
04	2	2	100%
05	2	2	100%
06	2	2	100%
07	2	2	100%
08	2	1	50%
<u>Total:</u>			
8	16	15	93.75%

Table 3.5 Number and Percentage of *Counselors Returning Completed Questionnaires.

School Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Questionnaires Returned
01	2	2	100%
02	2	1	50%
03	2	0	0%
04	2	1	50%
05	2	2	100%
06	2	2	100%
07	2	1	50%
08	2	2	100%
<u>Total:</u>			
8	16	11	68.75%

*Note the poor response of Counselors. This may explain why "Poor Counseling" is a source of intergroup conflict. (See Table 4.4).

Table 3.6 Number and Percentage of Teachers Returning Completed Questionnaires.

Number	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percent of Questionnaires Returned
01	2	2	100%
02	2	2	100%
03	2	2	100%
04	2	1	50%
05	2	2	100%
06	2	1	50%
07	2	2	100%
08	2	2	100%
Total:			
8	16	14	87.50%

The data gathering questionnaire was designed to be as brief and concise as possible, yet yield the desired information concerning the respondents' perception of the Intergroup Relations Specialist's role. It was also desired that the questionnaire would be devised in such a way that it would elicit information with the least amount of effort, energy and time on the part of the interviewees.

The first 39 questions warranted a check of the response considered most applicable. However, questions number 8, 10, 11 and 12 called for more than one response depending upon the current work assignment of the respondent. (See Question #4, Appendix A).

Questions 40 and 41 were open-ended, seeking opinions and recommendations and allowing the respondents to state freely and in detail their views pertaining to the Department of Intergroup Relations, and to make suggestions for improving the intergroup relations educational program.

Names and identities of the respondents were irrelevant to this study; however, the researcher was concerned with the total responses of each school. This information was secured through an official envelope used by the respondents.

To further refine the developed questionnaire prior to its distribution, the writer made use of a survey given to approximately 2,000 senior high school students on April 28, 1971.

This survey was administered in the Pontiac Central High School by the Pontiac School District Citizens Committee on Intergroup Relations. (See Appendix B).

The student response to this survey was as follows:

Tabulations-Questionnaire-Pontiac Central

Five (5) most pressing problems at Pontiac Central High

1. Drugs	906
2. Cafeteria conditions	888
3. Administration	822
4. Handling of discipline problems	732
5. Racism	708

Methods to bring about change

1. Set up student jury system to hear complaints	444
2. Protest (non-violent)	369
3. Through administration- change of policies	318
4. Keep police away from school	252
5. Conference with adminis- trators and teachers	246

6. Protest (violent)	192
7. More police protection in school	141
8. Effective drug program	132

Would you be willing to work with other students to
solve the problem?

Yes - 1,128 No - 182

Would you be willing to work with the administration?

Yes - 643 No - 792

Would you be in favor of going before a student jury
in cases of discipline?

Yes - 454 No - 656

Would you be willing to work with Intergroup Relations
Committee to solve problems?

Yes - 368 No - 273

The above survey, although not significant to the study, is pertinent in that it reflects interest and involvement of the lay community since parent members of the Human Relations Committee were responsible for its administration. The student responses to the survey, in the opinion of the writer, accentuated the need for an in-depth exploration of the causal factors pertaining to problems confronting the Pontiac, Michigan School District.

Recording of Data

When the questionnaires were returned, they were immediately posted according to the code number assigned each school. This process was simplified by the symbol placed on the envelope as soon as it was received in the Department of Secondary Education. Each questionnaire was then hand coded, using a pattern that would facilitate recording the information for processing. The information was

then key punched, one card for each questionnaire. Data were analyzed utilizing percent and frequency tables.

Summary

Every Pontiac public secondary school was contacted for the purpose of this study. Nine questionnaires were given each secondary principal, who distributed two of each to parents, students, counselors and teachers, and kept one for himself.

The questionnaires had been prepared with the assistance of information from the review of related literature, and with the consultant assistance of a member of the Department of Evaluation and Research, Michigan State University, and a member of the Computer Center, Michigan State University. An 87 percent (62 of 72) return of questionnaires was obtained. The data are analyzed, organized and presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study was designed for the purpose of identifying the qualities that contribute to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, analyzing sources of intergroup conflict, and exploring the need for intergroup relations education programs. As previously indicated, the information derived has been arranged in tables which utilized frequencies and percentages. A total of seventy-two questionnaires were distributed of which sixty-two or eighty-seven percent were returned.

Despite excellent returns, some of the respondents did not answer every item. Even some of the demographic questions concerning the respondent himself, such as experience, age, sex, and ethnic origin were not answered. Consequently, the numbers in the percentage columns do not always result in one hundred percent.

Research questions were presented in Chapter I. The response to these questions, and the data obtained along with appropriate explanations, will be reported in the present chapter.

To further identify the respondents several items were included in the questionnaire (Appendix A) to help delineate the sample. Questions related to age, sex, marital status, ethnic origin, current work

assignment, and years of experience were asked. Examination of the data revealed the following demographic information:

Age

(Students excepted)

Six respondents were less than 30 years of age.

Five respondents were between the ages 30-35.

Sixteen respondents were between the ages 36-40.

Thirteen respondents were between the ages 41-50.

Five respondents were over 50; and

Two did not respond.

Sex

There were twenty-two female and forty male respondents.

Ethnic Origin

There were twenty-one black respondents, forty white respondents and one Spanish-speaking respondent.

Marital Status

There were thirty-eight married respondents, twenty-two single respondents, one widowed and one did not respond to this item.

Current Work Assignment

There were eight principals, fourteen parents, fifteen students, eleven counselors and fourteen teachers.

Years of Experience

(Students and parents excepted)

Fourteen respondents had 1-5 years of experience.

Seven respondents had 6-10 years of experience.

Ten respondents had 11-19 years of experience; and

Two respondents had more than 20 years of experience.

It is interesting to note that:

1. Most of the respondents were under the age of forty and had less than ten years of experience. However, there is no evidence that lack of experience denotes interest and involvement in intergroup problems.
2. There are more women in public education; yet, most of the respondents were male. Again, one cannot conclude that males were more interested and responded to the questionnaire.
3. One-third of the respondents were black; yet, white personnel outnumber black personnel three to one (See Table 4.1). There was no evidence to indicate a correlation between ethnicity and interest.

Table 4.1 showed the ethnic origin and size of staff and student body of each school. Examination of the data revealed that:

1. Black administrators and black teachers are largely assigned to schools with predominantly black student bodies.
2. The school system has a Spanish-speaking student body of 383 with only four Spanish-speaking instructors and no Spanish-speaking administrators.
3. All student bodies are either predominantly black or predominantly white except School 01.
4. The predominantly black student bodies have few (School 03) or no (School 04) white students. School 05 has 831 white students and 13 black. School 06 has 773 white students and 13 black.

The data revealed that there is a racial and ethnic imbalance of staff and student body, and that there may be a need to attach

high priority to recruiting and promoting minority personnel and to assign them on the basis of the widest possible distribution throughout the district.

Table 4.1. Distribution of Administrative, Instructional Staff and Student Body Possessing Certain Ethnic Characteristics.

School Number	Black			White			Spanish speaking			Oriental*			Other*		
	A	C	S	A	C	S	A	C	S	A	C	S	A	C	S
01	-	21	923	1	79	1,182	-	-	82	-	-	-	-	1	-
02	-	11	474	1	75	1,478	-	1	74	-	-	-	-	-	-
03	1	33	737	-	16	145	-	-	54	-	-	-	-	-	-
04	1	26	499	-	6	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
05	-	8	13	1	40	831	-	2	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
06	-	7	13	1	33	773	-	1	92	-	1	-	-	-	-
07	-	12	214	1	44	884	-	-	47	-	-	-	-	-	-
08	-	11	262	1	78	697	-	-	16	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total</u>	2	129	3,135**	6	371	5,990**	-	4	383	-	1	-	-	1	-

**3 black students are homebound **1 white student is homebound

- *1. As indicated previously, for Student Accounting Only, American Indians, Orientals and Others are counted as White.
 2. A=Administrator or principal, C=All certificated personnel other than principal, S=Student body.

For the purposes of a clearer presentation, the research questions that appear in Chapter I are restated. They are:

1. What are the specific sources of intergroup conflict in schools?
2. What is the school's intergroup relations education program?
3. What qualities contribute to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist?

Research Question 1. What are the specific sources of intergroup conflict in schools? Examination of the data revealed some interesting and inconsistent responses. Table 4.2 reflects the data from the question: Have you had any intergroup conflict in the past two years? Sixty-two and five tenths (62.5%) percent of the administrators indicated that they have had some form of intergroup conflict in the past two years. However, 37.5 percent indicated they had not. Eighty-five and seven tenths (85.7%) percent of the teachers responded "yes" to this question with only 14.3 percent indicating "no". Seventy-three and three tenths (73.3%) percent of the students responded "yes", 26.7 percent responded "no". Counselors responded thusly: 63.6 percent replied "yes" and 36.4 percent "no". The parents reacted: 57.1 percent "yes"; however, 28.5 percent replied "no".

Teachers and students represented the highest "yes" percentages. Administrators and counselors represented the highest "no" percentages. This information may suggest that some school personnel do not want to admit that intergroup conflict has in-school causes. Further, it may suggest that some of those who deal directly with students are not aware of the crosscultural clashes that beset their classrooms and of the consequences of mixing large numbers of young

people who come from different backgrounds, different racial and ethnic strands, and different neighborhoods. The data also suggest that the parents who indicated "no" to this question may be closely associated with the school and may share the same views as some of the certificated personnel. The students, in contrast, seem, by their responses, to be fully cognizant of the intergroup problems in their schools.

Table 4.2. Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Question: Have You Had Any Intergroup Conflict In the Past Two Years? (Item #9).

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Administrator	5	62.5	3	37.5
Parent	8	57.1	4	28.5
Student	11	73.3	4	26.7
Counselor	7	63.6	4	36.4
Teacher	12	85.7	2	14.3
Two parents did not respond.				

Table 4.3 summarizes responses when interviewees were asked to rank the following societal sources of intergroup conflict:

1. Incidence of violence in this country.
2. Civil rights protests of the 1960's.
3. College student protests.
4. Expressions of racial and ethnic pride.
5. Poverty.
6. Racism: black and white.

7. Mass media.
8. "Other" (please indicate).

Examination of the data revealed that the societal sources of intergroup conflict were ranked in the following order:

1. Racism: Black and White.
2. Incidence of violence in this country.
3. Expressions of racial and ethnic pride.
4. Civil rights protests of the 1960's.
5. Poverty.
6. Mass media.
7. College protests.
8. "Other" - No additional societal sources of intergroup conflict were indicated.

Note: The writer was aware of the fact that the term "Racism: Black and White" could negate responses pertaining to Indians, Mexicans and other minority groups. However, blacks do constitute this country's largest and most viable minority group.

No administrator or teacher responded to "Expressions of racial and ethnic pride" as a source of intergroup conflict. There is no means of concluding whether this suggests that they view this as a positive force whereby cultural differences are honored or whether it is viewed as a negative, divisive element.

There was no appreciable difference in the responses of administrators (50 percent) and the students (53.3 percent) in regard to Racism being the number one societal source of intergroup conflict.

No respondent indicated "College protests" as a source of intergroup conflict, whereas a few years ago public schools were

warned of problems they would experience as a result of this movement.

Table 4.4 summarizes responses when interviewees were asked to rank the following In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict:

1. Student grievances.
2. Insensitive administrators.
3. Insensitive teachers.
4. Lack of minority group staff.
5. Irrelevant curricula.
6. Absence of minority groups from texts.
7. Poor counseling.
8. Discrimination in handling discipline.
9. Segregation in ability groupings.
10. "Other"

Examination of the data revealed that the In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict were ranked in the following order:

1. Student grievances.
2. Discrimination in handling discipline.
3. Insensitive teachers.
4. Insensitive administrators.
5. Absence of minority groups from texts.
6. Irrelevant curricula.
7. Poor counseling.
8. Segregation in ability groupings.
9. Lack of minority group staff.
10. "Other"--There were no additions to the above in-school causes of intergroup conflict.

Examination of the data revealed a decrease in the total number of respondents when we compare Table 4.4 with Table 4.5. Eleven did not respond in Table 4.4. Eight did not respond in Table 4.5. This data is especially significant in that every teacher responded to the In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict, six did not respond to the Societal Sources of Intergroup Conflict. This may or may not suggest that intergroup problems are educational rather than social in nature and that schools can address themselves to some of the divisive influences of urban education. Despite this viewpoint, note that only 25 percent of the principals indicated "Student Grievances" as the number one In-School Source of Intergroup Conflict as opposed to 33.3 percent of the students.

The data further suggests the need to reduce academic rigidities, strengthen those practices and programs which deal with counseling of minority students, eliminate practices and problems that contribute to intergroup tensions of students, and encourage students to actually and meaningfully involve themselves in policy-making decisions.

Note: "Lack of Minority Group Staff" received no responses. In fact, of the 50 respondents, 43 were concerned with the first four ranked In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict. Perhaps this suggests that race and ethnicity are subordinate to the human skills needed to solve the problems between individuals and groups.

Table 4.5 is concerned with the rank order of the most frequent forms of intergroup conflict as they pertain to the Pontiac School System. Examination of the data indicated that the closer a respondent became directly responsible for a particular form of conflict, the more he was inclined not to respond. For example, no teacher responded to

the item pertaining to "Teacher Boycott or Strike". Only four students responded to "Student Boycott or Strike" and only one responded to "Student-Teacher Physical Confrontation". Fifty percent of the administrators and 46.2 percent of the parents blamed "outsiders" for their major form of intergroup conflict.

Since the "Presence on School Grounds of Unruly, Unauthorized, Non-school Person" is suggested as a major cause of intergroup conflict one could infer that the schools must find meaningful ways to reclaim their total constituency.

Table 4.6 reflects responses pertaining to the extent of the racial basis of the major form of intergroup conflict. Examination of the data revealed that there were 52 respondents to this item, and that 44 felt that their major form of disruption had a racial basis. This suggested that they view racial problems as a reality in their schools; however, 25 percent of the administrators and 20 percent of the students indicated "no racial basis" as the major form of school disruption. There was no response from parents to the "no racial basis" entry. No conclusions can be drawn from these inconsistencies.

Table 4.3. Rank Order of the Societal Sources of Intergroup Conflict. (Item #10).

RANK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2 parents, 1 student, 1 counselor and 9 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.4. Rank Order of the In-School Causes of Intergroup Conflict. (Item #11).

In-School Sources Of Inter-Group Conflict	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Grievances	2	25	2	25	2	25	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discrimination In Handling Discipline	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0
Insensitive Teachers	5	33.3	3	20	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7	0	0	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0
Insensitive Administrators	4	36.4	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0	0	0	2	18.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Absence of Minority Groups In Texts	5	35.7	2	14.3	3	21.4	4	28.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrelevant Curricula																		
Poor Counseling																		
Segregation In Ability Groupings																		
Lack of Minority Group Staff																		

1 administrator, 5 parents, 1 student, and 3 counselors did not respond.

Table 4.5. Rank Order Of The Most Frequent Forms of Intergroup Conflict As They Pertain To The Pontiac Public School System. (Item #12).

RANK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Presence On School Grounds Of Unruly, Unauthorized Non-School Persons	Property Damage	Abnormal Unruliness	Student Boycott Or Strike	Student-Teacher Physical Confrontation	Rioting	Teacher Boycott Or Strike	Arson	Picketing Or Parading
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Administrator	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Parent	6	3	0	1	2	0	0	1	0
Student	0	3	2	4	1	0	1	1	0
Counselor	1	3	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
Teacher	3	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0

1 parent, 3 students, 2 counselors, and 1 teacher did not respond.

Table 4.6. Extent of Racial Basis of Your School's
Major Form of Intergroup Conflict. (Item #13).

	Substantial Racial Basis		Somewhat Racial Basis		No Racial Basis	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrator	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25
Parent	2	15.4	8	61.5	0	0
Student	3	20	6	40.0	3	20
Counselor	4	36.4	4	36.4	1	9.1
Teacher	3	21.4	8	57.1	2	14.3

4 parents, 3 students, 2 counselors and 1 teacher
did not respond.

Research Question 2

What is the school's intergroup relations education program?

Tables 4.7 and 4.8 reflect responses to these questions respectively:

1. Have you had any formal or informal intergroup relations education programs this year? 2. Have you had any programs in the past two years with schools whose ethnic population is different from yours?

Examination of the data revealed no appreciable differences in the responses to the two questions, with most respondents indicating "yes"; however, approximately 20 percent of the parents, students and teachers indicated "no". One administrator is also included in Table 4.7. This suggests that there is not total participation in the district's intergroup education program.

Table 4.7. Frequencies and Percentages Of Responses To The
 Question: Have You Had Any Formal Or Informal
 Intergroup Relations Education Programs This Year?
 (Item #20).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	7	87.5	1	12.5
Parent	8	61.5	3	23.1
Student	10	66.7	3	20.0
Counselor	11	100	0	0
Teacher	<u>10</u>	71.4	<u>3</u>	21.4

3 parents, 2 students, and 1 teacher did not respond.

Table 4.8. Frequencies and Percentages Of Responses To The Question: Have You Had Any Programs In the Past Two Years With Schools Whose Ethnic Population Is Different From Yours? (Item #24).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	8	100	0	0
Parent	8	61.5	3	23.1
Student	11	73.3	4	26.7
Counselor	11	100	0	0
Teacher	10	71.4	2	14.3

3 parents, and 2 teachers did not respond.

Tables 4.9 and 4.10 are concerned with parent and student membership on the Human Relations Committee. Twenty-five percent of the administrators responded "no" for both the parents and the students. Examination of the data suggests that there is no system wide participation of parents and students on the Human Relations Committees despite no "no" responses on the part of parents in Table 4.9.

Table 4.11 suggests that in addition to not having a system-wide participation of parents and students on Human Relations Committees 28.6 percent of the teacher respondents do not know there is a Human Relations Committee in their school.

Table 4.9. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: Are Parents Members of Your Human Relations or Intergroup Relations Committee? (Item #22).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	6	75	2	25
Parent	12	92.3	0	0
Student	8	53.3	5	33.3
Counselor	8	72.7	3	27.3
Teacher	7	50	4	28.6

2 parents, 2 students and 3 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.10. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: Are Students Members Of Your Human Relations or Intergroup Relations Committee? (Item #23)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	6	75	2	25
Parent	11	84.6	0	0
Student	11	73.3	2	13.3
Counselor	9	81.8	2	18.2
Teacher	6	42.9	5	45.5

3 parents, 2 students and 3 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.11. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The
Question: Do You Have An Intergroup or Human
Relations Committee In Your School?
(Item #21).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	8	100	0	0
Parent	10	76	1	7.7
Student	13	86.7	1	6.7
Counselor	10	90.9	1	9.1
Teacher	9	64.3	4	28.6

3 parents, 1 student, and 1 teacher did not respond.

Table 4.12 indicated that administrative staff and teachers do not meet with other schools to compare intergroup relations experiences. This suggests that there is a need for meaningful dialogue within the school system on intergroup matters especially since there is system-wide ethnic and racial imbalance.

Table 4.12. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The
Question: Does Your Administrative Staff and
Teachers Meet With Staff Of Other Schools To
Compare Intergroup Relations Experiences?
(Item #29)

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	2	25	6	75
Parent	5	38.5	1	7.7
Student	5	33.3	6	40
Counselor	7	63.6	4	36.4
Teacher	3	21.4	9	64.3

8 parents, 4 students and 2 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.13 is concerned with outside professionals who have training in intergroup relations as part of the in-service program. Examination of data indicates overwhelmingly through the responses of administrators, teachers, and parents that such a program does not exist; however, Table 4.14 does reveal that parents are part of the intergroup relations in-service program. It was interesting to note that five parents did not respond to this question and 42.9 percent of the teachers indicated "no".

Table 4.13. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: Are Outside Professionals With Training In Intergroup Relations Part Of Your In-Service Program? (Item #31).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	3	37.5	3	37.5
Parent	6	46.2	2	15.4
Student	0	0	9	60
Counselor	5	45.5	3	27.3
Teacher	3	21.4	9	64.3

2 administrators, 6 parents, 6 students, 3 counselors and 2 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.14. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: Are Parents Part of Your Intergroup Relations In-Service Program? (Item #30).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	7	87.5	1	12.5
Parent	9	69.2	0	0
Student	3	20	7	46.7
Counselor	10	90.9	1	9.1
Teacher	5	35.7	6	42.9

5 parents, 5 students and 3 teachers did not respond.

Tables 4.15 and 4.16 deal with social attitude testing and formal courses in intergroup relations education for students. Examination of the data, according to the administrators, indicates no courses being offered in intergroup relations education. The "yes" responses to this question suggest to the writer that many of the respondents are not truly aware of course offerings in intergroup relations education.

The responses to the question pertaining to social attitude testing were also quite inconsistent. Three administrators did not respond, and of those who did, only one indicated "yes". The writer is convinced that the "yes" responses may mean that the respondent is not really familiar with social attitude testing programs.

Table 4.15. Frequencies and Percentages Of Responses To The Question: Do You Have Formal or Informal Programs of Social Attitude Testing? (Item #26).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	1	12.5	4	50
Parent	3	23.1	4	30.8
Student	9	60.0	5	33.3
Counselor	5	45.5	4	36.4
Teacher	4	28.6	7	50

3 administrators, 7 parents, 1 student, 2 counselors and 3 teachers did not respond.

Table 4.16. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: Does Your School Offer A Course For Students In Intergroup Relations? (Item #32).

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Administrator	0	0	8	100
Parent	6	46.2	4	30.8
Student	4	26.7	9	60.0
Counselor	4	36.4	7	63.6
Teacher	3	21.4	10	71.4

4 parents, 2 students and 1 teacher did not respond.

Item #41, Appendix A, as indicated previously, was open-ended and permitted free response. Twenty-three out of sixty-two chose not to respond. Comments on the question ranged from very brief statements to several pages. Some of the comments were significant to the study, while others dealt irrelevantly with the respondent's personal problems in their schools and the inadequacies of their colleagues. A sample of those comments follow.

Item #41 is: What recommendations would you make for improving the intergroup relations education program?

Administrators

The biggest obstacle is the lack of personnel.

A meaningful in-service program.

Assign specific people from central office to work with each individual school.

Parents

Training of parents for better communication with their children.

More school-community involvement.

No comment at this time.

Keep people informed.

The exercise of more justice and equality on the part of those in power--and a program that will separate the students that do not want an education from those who do.

Reduce the number of blacks per school so that smaller groups of militant blacks could vent their problems and actions in a more passive manner that would create intergroup understanding.

Students

More people should get involved in it.

I would have lots of sports.

Let it be known to the people about intergroup relations.

People who know something about psychiatry.

To have all schools equally divided by race.

Mix all elementary schools so that we can grow up together.

Counselors

Provide intergroup relations specialists for each school.

De-emphasis differences in ethnic groups.

I would recommend that both militant blacks and whites realize that you can't force individuals, either students or

teachers, to change the way they think.

I would like to know more about the program before I could recommend.

None. It takes much more than a "program" to improve intergroup relations.

Teachers

The school board by appealing the recent court order to integrate by busing is not setting an example to be followed by the intergroup relations staff.

Until the whole city works to solve intergroup relations the Intergroup Relations Specialist will not achieve workable intergroup relations.

The department needs to expand into divisions with at least three persons trained in intergroup relations education.

School is not real life to kids. School is bad for humans.

Research Question 3

What Qualities Contribute To The Success Or Failure Of The Intergroup Relations Specialist?

Tables 4.17 and 4.18 indicate that most respondents are at least "somewhat familiar" with the functions of the Department of Intergroup Relations and the role of the Director of Intergroup Relations. However, you will note in Table 4.17 that 26.7 percent of the students indicated they were "not familiar" with the function of the Department of Intergroup Relations and in Table 4.18, 33.3

percent indicated they were "not familiar" with the role of the Director of Intergroup Relations. Responses tabulated in Table 4.17 indicated that 14.3 percent teachers were "not familiar" with the function of the Department of Intergroup Relations and in Table 4.18, 21.4 percent of the teachers indicated "not familiar". The "not familiar" responses are interesting in that the respondents were selected to participate in the study because of their association with Human Relations Committees.

Table 4.17. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Degree of Familiarity With The Function Of The Department of Intergroup Relations. (Item #14).

	Substantially Familiar		Somewhat Familiar		Not Familiar	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrator	4	50	4	50	0	0
Parent	4	30.8	8	61.5	1	7.7
Student	4	26.7	5	33.3	4	26.7
Counselor	5	45.5	6	54.5	0	0
Teacher	5	35.7	7	50.0	2	14.3

1 parent and 2 students did not respond.

Table 4.18. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Degree of Familiarity With The Role Of Director of Intergroup Relations. (Item #15).

	Substantially Familiar		Somewhat Familiar		Not Familiar	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrator	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0
Parent	2	15.4	9	69.2	2	15.4
Student	2	13.3	6	40	5	33.3
Counselor	5	45.5	6	54.5	0	0
Teacher	4	28.6	7	50	3	21.4

1 parent and 2 students did not respond.

Table 4.19 is concerned with which area of in-school source of intergroup conflict is the Intergroup Relations Specialist most helpful. Most respondents felt that he is most helpful in the area of "Student Grievances". However, 17 individuals did not respond to this question, including one administrator. No conclusion can be drawn from the examination of the data as to why, but again, the respondents were selected to participate in this study because of their interest in intergroup relations problems, and their association with their school's Human Relations Committee.

Table 4.20 is concerned with which area of in-school source of intergroup conflict is the Director of Intergroup Relations least helpful. Again a large number (18) simply did not respond. It was in the area of "Insensitive Teachers" that the respondents indicated that the Director of Intergroup Relations is least helpful; however, this is not a teacher judgment since only one teacher indicated a concern in this area. The data could be interpreted to mean that insensitivity problems of teachers could be the responsibility of the administrators as opposed to the Director of Intergroup Relations.

Table 4.19. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: In Which Area Is The Director of Intergroup Relations Most Helpful? (Item #17).

In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict

- a. Student grievances
b. Insensitive administrators
c. Insensitive teachers
d. Lack of minority group staff
e. Irrelevant curricula

f. Absence of minority group from texts
g. Poor counseling
h. Discrimination in handling discipline
i. Segregation in ability grouping
j. Other

	a			b			c			d			e		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	2	25		1	12.5		1	12.5		0	0		1	12.5	
Parent	5	38.5		3	23.1		0	0		0	0		1	7.7	
Student	4	26.7		0	0		1	6.7		2	13.3		2	13.3	
Counselor	5	45.5		0	0		0	0		2	18.2		1	9.1	
Teacher	2	14.3		1	7.1		5	35.7		0	0		0	0	
	f			g			h			i			j		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	0	0		0	0		0	0		2	25		0	0	
Parent	0	0		0	0		1	7.7		0	0		0	0	
Student	0	0		0	0		0	0		1	6.7		0	0	
Counselor	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Teacher	1	7.1		1	7.1		0	0		0	0		0	0	

Table 4.20. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: In Which Area Is The Director of Intergroup Relations Least Helpful? (Item #18).

In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| a. Student grievances | f. Absence of minority group from texts |
| b. Insensitive administrators | g. Poor counseling |
| c. Insensitive teachers | h. Discrimination in handling discipline |
| d. Lack of minority group staff | i. Segregation in ability grouping |
| e. Irrelevant curricula | j. "Other" |

		a			b			c			d			e		
		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	1	12.5	0	0	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0
Parent	0	0	2	15.4	3	23.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student	1	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Counselor	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	18.2	0	0	1	9.1	0	0	0	0
Teacher	3	21.4	3	21.4	1	7.1	0	7.1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
		f			g			h			i			j		
		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	0	0	1	12.5	2	25	1	12.5	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0
Parent	0	0	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0
Student	4	26.7	1	6.7	0	0	4	26.7	0	0	4	26.7	0	0	0	0
Counselor	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	0	18.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Teacher	0	14.3	1	0	1	7.1	0	7.1	0	0	0	7.1	0	0	0	0

Table 4.21 is concerned with which area of in-school source of intergroup conflict is the Director of Intergroup Relations able to be more effective than a teacher or administrator.

Examination of the data revealed that 24 individuals did not respond. Yet only 10 persons in Table 4.18 indicated that they were "not familiar" with the role of Director of Intergroup Relations. The writer is not able to conclude whether the lack of responses means that there is role conflict, whether the role of the Director of Intergroup Relations is threatening, or whether intergroup relations are viewed as social in nature rather than educational; and therefore, the Director of Intergroup Relations should not be involved in "school" problems. Nevertheless, examination of the data indicated that he is most effective with "Student Grievances".

Table 4.22 asked: What skills and qualities contribute most to the success of the Director of Intergroup Relations.

Examination of the data indicated that "Skill in Promoting Intergroup and Interpersonal Relations" is most important to the success of the Director of Intergroup Relations; however, fewest responses were directed to "Training and Background" which may suggest once again that technical skills are subordinate to human skills for success in intergroup relations.

Table 4.21.

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: In Which Area Is The Director of Intergroup Relations Able To Be More Effective Than A Teacher Or Administrator? (Item #19)

In-School Sources of Intergroup Conflict

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. Student grievances
b. Insensitive administrators
c. Insensitive teachers
d. Lack of minority group staff
e. Irrelevant curricula | f. Absence of minority group from texts
g. Poor counseling
h. Discrimination in Handling Discipline
i. Segregation in ability grouping
j. "Other" |
|---|---|

	a			b			c			d			e		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	0	0		0	0		0	0		1	12.5		0	0	
Parent	2	15.4		1	7.7		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Student	4	26.7		1	6.7		1	6.7		0	0		0	0	
Counselor	1	9.1		1	9.1		0	0		2	18.2		1	9.1	
Teacher	0	0		2	14.3		1	7.1		3	21.4		1	7.1	
	f			g			h			i			j		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
Administrator	2	25		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Parent	1	7.7		1	7.7		2	15.4		1	7.7		0	0	
Student	1	6.7		1	6.7		1	6.7		1	6.7		0	0	
Counselor	0	0		0	0		1	9.1		0	0		0	0	
Teacher	2	14.3		1	7.1		0	0		1	7.1		0	0	
5 administrators, 6 parents, 5 students, 5 counselors and 3 teachers did not respond.															

Table 4.22. Frequencies and Percentages of Responses To The Question: What Skills and Qualities Contribute Most To The Success Of The Director Of Intergroup Relations? (Item #16).

	Familiarity With Special Problems Of Minority Group		Ethnicity		Visibility In Community		Training and Background		Skill In Promoting Intergroup and Interpersonal Relations		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administrator	3	37.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	62.5	0	0
Parent	1	7.7	0	0	4	30.8	1	7.7	7	53.8	0	0
Student	4	26.7	2	13.3	1	6.7	0	0	4	26.7	0	0
Counselor	2	18.2	3	27.3	0	0	2	18.2	3	27.3	0	0
Teacher	3	21.4	2	14.3	2	14.3	0	0	6	42.9	0	0

1 parent, 4 students, 1 counselor and 1 teacher did not respond.

Item #40 Appendix A is open-ended and permits free response to the question: What academic training is necessary for a successful Intergroup Relations Specialist?

Some comments of respondents follow:

Administrators

Background in the social science with particular emphasis in urban sociology, educational psychology, and psychology.

T-grouping, counseling.

The basic training should be sociology and a broad spectrum of human development and environment.

Dedication and sincerity are more important than training in this area.

Parents

Heavy concentration on history of minority groups.

An understanding of human nature.

I don't feel a degree (as such) is much in this case.

A social worker or psychologist with exposure and work experience with ethnic groups and their problems.

None. Honesty with himself and experience with people whom he is supposed to serve.

Students

I guess going to college and being in groups that talk to people and understand their feelings.

You should be familiar with the situation facing each ethnic group so that you will be able to counsel everyone.

You should know how to view the problem from the views of both races.

I don't believe it can be learned in class.

He must understand conflict in the community where he is working.

Counselors

Adult and child psychology.

Group therapy.

The ability to deal effectively with people.

Clinical psychology.

Teachers

Internship in actual cases of intergroup conflict.

Afro-American history.

Background in humanities and religion.

Summary

From the data, the writer is convinced that perhaps some school people are beginning to realize that they can no longer evade social problems and that they can not serve the purposes of modern society until they address themselves to intergroup relations problems and successfully involve students in meaningful intergroup relations education programs. The analysis presented in this chapter sought to identify the qualities pertaining to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, identify sources of intergroup conflict, and explore the need for intergroup education programs. It was found that the Intergroup Relations Specialist must have Skill

in promoting Intergroup and Interpersonal Relations, that he is most helpful in the area of "Student Grievances", and that he is least helpful with problems pertaining to "Insensitive Teachers". Tabulation of the data indicated that "Racism" is a major societal source of intergroup conflict, that "Student Grievances" is a major in-school source of intergroup conflict, and that "Outsiders" are the major source of intergroup conflict in the Pontiac School District. The data further revealed that no formal courses in intergroup education are taught in the Pontiac School District, and that most intergroup conflict may have a racial and ethnic basis.

The summary, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

We may agree that all youth of secondary age need to assume their responsibilities and understand their rights in a democratic society; nevertheless, we are faced with the necessity for applying this principle in a specific socio-cultural and psycho-dynamic context. How free do teachers feel to permit their minority-group students to express their feelings of frustration and their anxieties concerning the rights which majority-group people take for granted?¹

Intergroup discrimination is a feature of most modern societies.² Since 1965 our country has eased its immigration laws, which have altered considerably our ethnic profile. The New York Times reveals the following patterns of immigration to the United States since 1965:

<u>1965</u>		<u>1970</u>	
Canadians	40,013	Filipinos	25,417
British	29,747	Italians	24,397
Italians	10,344	Greeks	16,414
Chinese	2,628	Chinese	16,274

¹Charlotte Epstein, Evaluating Intergroup Relations Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1960, p.1.

²Henri Tajfel, Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination, Scientific American, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, November, 1970, Volume 223, Number 5, p.2.

<u>1965</u>		<u>1970</u>	
Filipinos	2,545	Jamaicans	15,309
Koreans	2,193	British	13,880
Greeks	2,100	Portuguese	13,291
Jamaicans	2,100	Canadians	12,266
Portuguese	2,100	Indians	10,739
Indians	2,100	Koreans	9,651

Most of the above will gravitate toward the large cities.

Our schools will have to change.¹ Educators need to understand the pressures, both external and internal, which may interfere with a child's need to feel accepted.

In order to minimize the problems of intergroup conflict and hostility, understand the subtleties of prejudice, and develop an appreciation for the culture, religion and ethnicity of all people, we must understand the causal factors pertaining to discrimination, segregation and separation in the classroom and on the playground. Self-segregation in clubs, during lunch, and in parent-teacher association groups could be an obstacle to the development of sound intergroup relations. The employment of an Intergroup Relations Specialist in our schools should be considered in order to plan and implement educational activities in this field. Such a position should provide for a continuing program of school-community relations and intergroup relations education.²

General Summary

A review of the literature found information pertaining to the Intergroup Relations Specialist sadly lacking; however, there

¹New York Times, Bill Kovach, June 14, 1971, Volume CXXX, Number 41,414, p.1.

²Gunsky, op. cit., p. 187.

was an adequate amount of material pertaining to intergroup relations, human relations and intercultural relations, terms that were used interchangeably throughout this study.

A review of the literature further revealed the need for an Intergroup Relations Specialist in urban school systems. Since intergroup problems seem inevitable, the Intergroup Relations Specialist may be the focal point of change within the educational system as we address ourselves to the issues of ethnic and cultural differences, desegregation, and school-community relations.

This study did not attempt to develop any evaluative criteria that could be used to test the effectiveness of the Intergroup Relations Specialist. However, to initiate evaluation, one can begin by evaluating the perception of those involved in a change process. To initiate change, there must first be an attitudinal revolution, which would result in a change in one's thinking and insights.

An opinion questionnaire, such as the one used in this study, allows for respondents to be highly subjective. This was very evident in the personal kinds of statements some used in answering the open-ended questions (Items 40 and #41, Appendix A). Consequently this was kept in mind in drawing conclusions from this study.

The major purpose of the study was to identify the qualities pertaining to the success or failure of the Intergroup Relations Specialist, sources of intergroup conflict and the need for intergroup education in the Pontiac School District.

The population of the study was the secondary schools of the Pontiac, Michigan Public School District. Data were gathered through the use of an instrument designed by the writer and a member

of the Department of Research and Evaluation, Michigan State University. The instrument was administered to a highly selective sample of eight secondary school principals, two parents, two students, two counselors and two classroom teachers from each of the secondary schools, a total of 72. Data were then analyzed, examined, and presented.

Conclusions

Based upon the analysis of the data, major findings were:

1. The schools are racially and ethnically imbalanced.
2. Administrators and teachers may not be aware of the crosscultural clashes that beset schools.
3. The Intergroup Relations Specialist is least helpful with problems pertaining to "Insensitive Teachers".
4. "Racism" is a major societal source of intergroup conflict.
5. "Student Grievances" are a major in-school source of intergroup conflict.
6. "Outsiders" are identified as the major source of intergroup conflict in the Pontiac Public School District.
7. Most intergroup conflict may have a racial and ethnic basis in the Pontiac Public School District.
8. No formal courses in intergroup relations education are offered to students.
9. Most respondents indicated that the Intergroup Relations Specialist is most helpful in the area of "Student Grievances".

10. Most respondents indicated that Skill in Promoting Intergroup and Interpersonal Relations is the most important quality for the success of the Director of Intergroup Relations.

Based upon the analysis of the findings of the present investigation, the following conclusions are presented:

Intergroup conflict may be inevitable in our schools.

The schools will have to plan programs and use strategies to respond to societal and in-school sources of intergroup conflict.

If racism is a major societal source of intergroup conflict, there may be a need for teacher-preparation institutions to provide programs that will help educators understand, appreciate and deal with pupils, colleagues and constituents that are different from the dominant Anglo-Caucasian, middle-class norm.

Whereas, total moral conversion is needed in this country, we will continue to have incidences of violence unless there is an attitudinal revolution on the part of educators. They will need the kind of pre-service and in-service experiences that cause them to be aware of the ethnic and racial pride among minorities.

Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which set up the "War on Poverty", there has been an increasing effort on the part of low-income groups to be involved in making policies and decisions that effect them. These concerns are transmitted into our schools

through the parents of students in urban areas and through mass media. Our students, encouraged by civil rights protests and college student protests, want an enlargement of their role in making policy in the schools.

Intergroup Relations Education Programs can negate the divisive influence in our schools. Educators have a chance to make a unique contribution by openly addressing themselves to the issues of ethnic and cultural differences. We will thus be able to respond to problems of providing awareness programs for staff, integration of staff, increased community contacts, intergroup relations education programs, and ethnic and racial contributions in our textbooks.

The Intergroup Relations Specialist can be the catalytic agent who provides the kind of leadership and guidance to deal with some of the social problems that interfere with the learning process.

Recommendations

As had been indicated, majority and minority group educators need to be taught constructively and creatively about racial, cultural, ethnic and socio-economic differences between people, that utilization of the services of an Intergroup Relations Specialist in urban school systems and the implementation of a meaningful intergroup relations education program may be an effective means of overcoming educational handicaps of all pupils. With this in mind, the writer recommends that:

1. Educators provide for intergroup relations education programs, so vitally necessary for the dignity and self-

respect of all pupils.

2. Experiences be provided whereby all students, and especially minority group students, are involved in the decision making processes of their schools.

3. Intergroup education be a regular dynamic part of the school curriculum.

4. All school personnel be encouraged to accept the major objective of intergroup education, i.e., recognizing the fact that a pupil must be helped to develop the type of self-concept that enables him to think and act positively toward individuals unlike himself.

5. Classroom teachers become involved in awareness programs whereby they cease to impose patterns of conformity and learn to cherish what each pupil brings from his culture into the school setting.

6. School systems plan for all personnel in-service training which deals with conflict management.

7. Central administration should include an assistant superintendent for intergroup relations. A partial list of his services could be the following:

a. Furnish major help in the selection of textbooks which provide fair and balanced treatment of minorities.

b. Provide analytical services in the area of school-community relations.

c. Provide district-wide workshops in human relations in addition to a similar service for school

human relations committees which would include parents and students.

8. The position of Intergroup Relations Specialist be created in all urban school systems.

9. In-depth studies be made by universities pertaining to the reduction of intergroup conflict and hostility.

10. School-communities work cooperatively toward a realistic evaluation of the consequences of change in intergroup practices.

11. More teacher preparation institutions offer graduate and post-graduate degrees in human relations, and include in the curriculum, undergraduate program experiences that will enable the teacher to be more cognizant of the human element of the pupil. Also that the curriculum offer more practical and effective ways of raising the student's self-concept.

12. The combined issues of trust and power represent themes for responding to intergroup crises, since many of our constituents have lost faith in school people to serve their interests. Without such faith, one would have no choice but to seek means to control one's personal and academic growth.

The Intergroup Relations Specialist, in the opinion of the writer, is the focal point of change within the educational system as we attempt to relate to the needs of different ethnic groups, social classes, school desegregation, school community relations and the elimination of cultural blindness.

In conclusion, Jeffery A. Moss writes a quote from Ted Neff's article, "What Do We Know About Desegregation," "To put it simply,

no child receives a democratic education in a school which is not democratic."¹

¹Jeffery A. Moss, Discernible Effects Attendant To De Facto Segregation In Public Schools, Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Southern California, January 1970, p. 168.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allport, Gordon W. Basic Principles In Improving Human Relations. Conference on Educational Problems of Special Cultural Groups. New York: 1949 Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Resolution of Intergroup Tensions. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952.
- Berry, Brewton. Intergroup Relations. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, Third Edition, 1965.
- Cooke, Lloyd and Cooke, Elaine. School Problems in Human Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Series in Education, 1957.
- Davis, Allison. Light From Anthropology On Intercultural Relations, Cultural Groups and Human Relations. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.
- Dean, John P. and Rosen, Alex. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. New York: New York University Press, 1964.
- Grambs, Jean Dresden. Intergroup Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Johnson, Charles S. Cultural Groups and International Problems. Conference on Educational Problems of Special Cultural Groups, New York: 1949 Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
- Kilpatrick, William H. The Genesis of the Problem. New York: Anti-Defamation League, B'Nai B'Rith, 1955.
- Kurokawa, Minako. Minority Responses. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Melby, Ernest O. Human Relations in Education. New York: Anti-Defamation League, B'Nai, B'Rith, 1955.

Sherif, Muzafer. Light From Psychology On Intercultural Relations. New York: 1949 Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1951.

Smiley, Marjorie B. Intergroup Education and the American College. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

Smith, B. Othaniel, Cohen, Saul B. and Pearl, Arthur. Teachers For the Real World. N. W. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Taba, Hilda and Intergroup Education Staff. Elementary Curriculum In Intergroup Relations. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

Taba, Hilda. Leadership Training in Intergroup Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1953.

Tumin, Melvin M. Research Annual on Intergroup Relations. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970.

Vickery, William E. and Cole, Stewart G. Intercultural Education In American Schools. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Vollmer, Howard M. and Mills, Donald L. Professionalization. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Williams, Robin M. Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council, Second Edition, 1965.

Periodicals and Newspapers

Hentoff, Nat. "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights", Saturday Review, (May 22, 1971) 60.

Illich, Ivan. "Alternative to Schooling", Saturday Review, (June 19, 1971) 60.

The Michigan Chronicle. Gerald A. Tilles, Detroit: Volume 35:25 (October 17, 1970) 1.

The New York Times. Bill Kovach, New York: Volume: CXXX-No. 41, 414, (June 14, 1971) 1.

Ortega, Phillip D. "Schools for Mexican Americans: Between Two Cultures", Saturday Review, (April 17, 1971) 80.

Publications of Societies and Organizations

- Bailey, Stephen K. "Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools", National Association of Secondary School Principals, N. W. Washington, D.C., (November 1970) 8-11.
- Chesler, Mark. "Alternative Responses in School Disruption", The Newsletter of the Western Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors, (Spring, 1969) 1.
- Gunsky, Frederic R. "Problems and Opportunities in Intergroup Relations", Journal for Instructional Improvement. California: State Department of Education, (October 1966) 181-188.
- Human Relations in the Classroom. "A Study of Problems and Situations Reported by 1,075 Second Year Secondary School Teachers", North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, (1962) 20.
- Mornell, Eugene S. "Sources of Intergroup Conflict", California: State Department of Education, (May 1966) 1-3.

Journals and Pamphlets

- Blumenberg, Eleanor. "The School Intergroup Relations Specialist: A Profession in Process", Sociology of Education, (Spring 1968, Volume 41:2) 221-226.
- Chesler, Mark A. "Student and Administration Crises", Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, (October 1969) 1.
- Giles, H. Harry, "Conflict Episode Analysis--A Tool for Education in Social Technology", The Journal of Educational Sociology, (May 1953) 418-432.
- Routh, Frederick B. and Bragdon, Marshall. "The Role of the Intergroup Relations Worker", Journal of Intergroup Relations, (Fall 1970) 48.
- Tajfel, Henri. "Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination", Scientific American, (November 1970, Volume 223, Number 5) 2.

Unpublished Materials and Statements

- Allen, James E. Jr. "Obligation of the Educator With Respect to School Desegregation", Statement by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, (March 1970).

Epstein, Charlotte. "Evaluating Intergroup Relations Education", University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1960. (Mimeographed).

Moss, Jeffery A. "Discernible Effects Attendant to De Facto Segregation in Public Schools", Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Southern California, (January 1970) 168.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE



TO: ALL SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS,
PONTIAC PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

FROM: THE DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
CENTRAL OFFICE BUILDING
PONTIAC PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

DATE: May 8, 1971

SUBJECT: A Study Of The Inter-
group Relations Specialist:
A "Professional in Process"
in Urban School Systems

Since ethnic tensions have erupted in this country in the past several years, many are asking questions such as WHY? Could it happen here? When will it happen here? How will it be avoided?

Research alone will not solve the problems, but a knowledge of the nature of group differences and an understanding of the sources of intergroup conflict may minimize the strained relationships between members of different ethnic, religious, racial, and national groups.

A study titled, THE INTERGROUP RELATIONS SPECIALIST: A Professional in Process In Urban School Systems is being made in cooperation with the Pontiac Public School System. Each secondary school principal is being asked to respond to the questionnaire enclosed, and select 2 counselors, 2 teachers, 2 parents, and 2 students preferably those who are members of his school's Human Relations Committee and are familiar with the work of the Department of Intergroup Relations.

Your cooperation in returning these responses by May 20, 1971 to Mr. Wesley Maas, Department of Secondary Education, Central Office Building, Pontiac Public School System, will be greatly appreciated.

Please respond to each question as it pertains to your school situation.

DIRECTIONS:

*ADMINISTRATORS ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS

**COUNSELORS AND TEACHERS ARE TO RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS EXCEPT #7 AND #8.

***PARENTS ARE REQUESTED TO OMIT #6, #7 AND #8.

****STUDENTS ARE TO COMPLETE #3 AND THEN BEGIN WITH #9.

ANY ANSWER NOT KNOWN OR NOT APPLICABLE, LEAVE BLANK.

1. AGE

_____ less than 30
 _____ 30-35
 _____ 36-40
 _____ 41-50
 _____ over 50

2. SEX

_____ Female
 _____ Male

3. ETHNIC ORIGIN

_____ Black
 _____ White
 _____ Oriental
 _____ Spanish-speaking
 _____ Other

4. MARITAL STATUS

_____ Married
 _____ Single
 _____ Divorced
 _____ Widowed

5. CURRENT WORK ASSIGNMENT

_____ Administrator
 _____ Parent
 _____ Student
 _____ Counselor
 _____ Teacher
 _____ Director of Secondary Education
 _____ Intergroup Specialist

6. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
(Current Job)

_____ less than 1
 _____ 1-5
 _____ 6-10
 _____ 11-19
 _____ 20 or more

7. SIZE OF STAFF

_____ less than 25
 _____ 25-49
 _____ 50-99
 _____ 100-149 _____ 150 or more

8. ETHNIC ORIGIN OF STAFF
How Many?

- _____ Blacks
_____ Whites
_____ Orientals
_____ Spanish-speaking
_____ Other

9. Have you had any intergroup conflict in the past two years? Intergroup conflict may be defined as events which significantly interfere with the learning process that have a racial, ethnic, or religious basis.

_____ Yes _____ No

10. Rank the following societal sources of intergroup conflict. Place the number "1" by the most serious source, number "2" by the next most serious source, number "3" by the third most serious source, etc.

- _____ a. Incidence of violence in this country.
_____ b. Civil rights protests of the 1960's.
_____ c. College student protests.
_____ d. Expressions of racial and ethnic pride.
_____ e. Poverty.
_____ f. Racism: Black and White.
_____ g. Mass Media.
_____ h. Other (please indicate).

11. Rank the following frequent in-school sources of intergroup conflict.

- _____ a. Student grievances.
_____ b. Insensitive administrators.
_____ c. Insensitive Teachers.
_____ d. Lack of minority group staff.
_____ e. Irrelevant curricula.
_____ f. Absence of minority group from texts.

- _____g. Poor Counseling.
- _____h. Discrimination in handling discipline.
- _____i. Segregation in ability grouping.
- _____j. Other (please indicate).

12. Rank the following forms of intergroup conflict as they relate to your school situation.

- _____a. Teacher boycott or strike.
- _____b. Student boycott or strike.
- _____c. Arson.
- _____d. Property damage.
- _____e. Rioting.
- _____f. Student-teacher physical confrontation.
- _____g. Picketing or parading.
- _____h. Presence on school grounds of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons.
- _____i. Abnormal unruliness
- _____j. Other (please indicate),

13. Indicate the extent of racial basis of your major form of intergroup conflict.

- _____ Substantial racial basis.
- _____ Somewhat racial basis.
- _____ No racial basis.

14. Indicate your degree of familiarity with the function of the Pontiac School System's Department of Intergroup Relations.

- _____ Substantially familiar.
- _____ Somewhat familiar
- _____ Not familiar

15. Indicate your degree of familiarity with the role of the Director of Intergroup Relations.

_____ Substantially familiar.

_____ Somewhat familiar.

_____ Not familiar.

16. Which One of the following skills or qualities contribute most to the success of the Director of Intergroup Relations?

_____ Familiarity with special problems of minority groups.

_____ His ethnic origin.

_____ Visibility in community at large.

_____ Training and background.

_____ Skill in intergroup and interpersonal relations.

_____ Other.

17. In which One of the sources of intergroup conflict listed in #11 is the Director of Intergroup Relations able to be of most help?

_____ (Indicate by "letter").

18. In which One of the sources of intergroup conflict listed in #11 is the Director of Intergroup Relations least helpful?

_____ (Indicate by "letter").

19. In which One of the sources of intergroup conflict listed in #11 is the Director of Intergroup Relations able to be more effective than a teacher or an administrator?

_____ (Indicate by "letter").

20. Have you had any formal or informal intergroup relations program for students this school year?

_____ Yes

_____ No

21. Do you have a human relations or intergroup relations committee in your school?

_____ Yes

_____ No

22. Are parents members of your human relations or intergroup relations committee?

_____ Yes

_____ No

23. Are students members of your human relations or intergroup relations committee?

_____ Yes

_____ No

24. Have you had any programs in the past two years with schools whose ethnic population is different from yours?

_____ Yes

_____ No

25. Are there any agencies in your school-community working to improve intergroup relations?

_____ Yes

_____ No

26. Do you have a formal or informal program of social attitude testing in your school?

_____ Yes

_____ No

27. Is there minority group representation in all clubs and organizations?

_____ Yes

_____ No

28. Do certain groups consistently avoid membership in some clubs and organizations?

_____ Yes

_____ No

29. Is there a continuous formal or informal program of intergroup relations education for your staff?

_____ Yes

_____ No

30. Are parents part of your intergroup relations in-service program?

_____ Yes

_____ No

31. Are outside professionals with training in intergroup relations part of your in-service program?

_____ Yes

_____ No

32. Does your school offer a course for students in intergroup relations education?

_____ Yes

_____ No

33. Do those who teach intergroup relations education have training in this field?

_____ Yes

_____ No

34. Is there evidence of racial tension among students?

_____ Yes

_____ No

35. Do students use racial epithets when they are in conflict?

_____ Yes

_____ No

36. Is there evidence of fear of racial, religious, or national groups in your school?

_____ Yes

_____ No

37. Is there a pattern of mischief by one group or against one group?

_____ Yes

_____ No

38. Are there intergroup fights among students outside of school?

_____ Yes

_____ No

39. Does your administrative staff and teachers meet with staff of other schools to compare intergroup experiences?

_____ Yes

_____ No

40. What academic training is necessary for the success of an Intergroup Relations Specialist?

41. What recommendations would you make for improving the intergroup relations educational program?

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE PREPARED BY PARENT MEMBERS

OF THE

PONTIAC SCHOOL DISTRICT CITIZENS

COMMITTEE ON

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

TO

PONTIAC CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

April 18, 1971

APPENDIX B

PONTIAC SCHOOL DISTRICT CITIZENS
COMMITTEE ON INTERGROUP RELATIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE

In recent months a number of incidents a number of incidents have occurred, and we feel a need to try to help you identify and solve some of the problems as you see them. This questionnaire is for you to list in order of importance, the problems facing you as an individual in school.

No person will be held accountable in any way for any answer on this questionnaire. If you choose not to answer some of the questions leave them blank.

I AM A STUDENT AT CENTRAL _____ NORTHERN* _____

CLASS: _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior

SEX: _____ Male _____ Female _____ Age _____ Race _____

Please check in 1-2-3 order the most important to you.

1. The most pressing problem at my school is (check 5).

_____ drugs	_____ class size
_____ administration	_____ counselors
_____ teachers	_____ assistance in going to college
_____ cafeteria conditions	_____ way disciplinary problems are handled
_____ too much emphasis on school policies instead of studies	_____ tickets for games
_____ hall and door guards	_____ more college prep courses such as psychology, political science, sociology

*Did not respond.



- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ reorganize gym
class to include: | ☐ too much freedom
given to White students |
| ☐ more student activities
evenings | ☐ racism is the major problem |
| ☐ too much freedom
given Blacks | ☐ outside students visiting
school |
| ☐ different rules for
Black or White students | |

Other: _____

2. Which method would you use to bring about change?

- ☐ protest (non-violent)
- ☐ through the administration change of policies
- ☐ protest (violent)
- ☐ conferences with administrators, teachers
- ☐ effective drug program
- ☐ keep police away from schools
- ☐ more police protection in the school
- ☐ set up student jury system to hear complaints

3. What are you willing to do to solve the problem?

4. Would you be willing to work with other students to solve the problem?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

5. Would you be willing to work with the administration?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

6. Would you be in favor of going before a student jury in cases of discipline?

_____ Yes

_____ No

7. Would you be willing to work with the I.G.R. Committee to solve problems?

_____ Yes

_____ No

COMMENTS: _____

APPENDIX C
TABULATION OF RESULTS OF RESPONSE
TO
APPENDIX B

April 28, 1971

APPENDIX C

PONTIAC SCHOOL DISTRICT
CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON INTERGROUP RELATIONS
QUESTIONNAIRES

Tabulation Results
(Response to Appendix B)

<u>Problem</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>
I. Drugs	906
Cafeteria	888
Administration	822
Teachers	693
School policies instead of studies	309
Hall and door guards	555
Class size	165
Counselors	99
Assistance in going to college	74
Handling of discipline problems	732
Tickets for games	339
More college prep courses	87
Reorganize gym classes	84
More student activities	90
Too much freedom given Blacks	246
Different rules for Black or White students	315
Too much freedom given to Whites	171
Racism	708
Outside students visiting school	225
II. <u>Methods To Bring About Change</u>	
Protest (non-violent)	369
Through administration-change of policy	318
Protest (violent)	192
Conference with administrators and teachers	246
Effective drug program	132
Keep police away from school	252
More police protection in the school	141
Set up student jury system to hear complaints	
IV. Would you be willing to work with other students to solve the problem?	

Yes - 1,128

No - 182



V. Would you be willing to work with the administration?

Yes - 643

No - 792

VI. Would you be in favor of going before a student jury in cases of discipline?

Yes - 454

No - 656

VII. Would you be willing to work with the I.G.R. Committee to solve the problem?

Yes - 368

No - 273

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293101655862