





## ABSTRACT

### A STUDY OF THE EXPECTATIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, SIGNIFICANT OTHERS, AND SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS FOR THE ROLE OF SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER

By

Frederick John Walsh

#### Problem

The study sought to determine what secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary school teachers and secondary school guidance counselors), and School-Liaison Officers in Flint, Michigan, thought the role of the School-Liaison Officer should be. It identified issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers held convergent and divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.

#### Procedure

Questionnaires recorded the expectations which the four major respondent groups held for the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement: performance of selected law enforcement functions; performance of selected community relations functions; performance of selected education-related functions; and continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program. The analysis of variance statistic (significant at the level of .05) was applied to determine inter-group

differences, with a post hoc analysis of those areas where a significant difference was noted. More than 78% of the secondary school academic personnel in Flint submitted usable study responses.

### Findings

1 - The secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers as a group agreed on the performance of law enforcement functions, on the performance of community relations functions, on the performance of education-related functions, and for the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program.

2 - Among the secondary school principals there was majority agreement for all the areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. However, there was a minority divergence of expectations for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

3 - The significant others held a majority agreement for the School-Liaison Officer performing the functions in the four involvement areas. There was a minority divergence of expectations for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

4 - The School-Liaison Officers held a majority agreement for the School-Liaison Officer performance of functions in the four involvement areas. Among the School-Liaison Officers there was a minority divergence of expectations for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

5 - There was a convergence of expectations among the major groups in this study for the School-Liaison Officer's role in



performing selected law enforcement functions, selected community relations functions, and for Program continuation. This agreement for those three areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement in the secondary school setting offers avenues to follow in the utilization of School-Liaison Officers in the secondary schools.

6 - There was a divergence of expectations, albeit in the minority, among the groups for the School-Liaison Officer's role in performing selected education-related functions in the secondary schools. Although this was a minority group, the actual presence of this number and the personnel involved (four School-Liaison Officers, seven principals, ten counselors, and eighty-four teachers) may present areas of conflict which, in turn, could cause role conflicts among the secondary school personnel.

A STUDY OF THE EXPECTATIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL  
PRINCIPALS, SIGNIFICANT OTHERS, AND SCHOOL-LIAISON  
OFFICERS FOR THE ROLE OF SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER

By

Frederick John Walsh

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1969

661786  
4-27-70

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the many contributions that others have made to this project. Specifically, expressions of appreciation and thanks are extended to:

My wife, Mary Ann, for her invaluable understanding and labors that sustained, encouraged, and aided this graduate program.

My children, Fred Jr., Bill, Tom, Kathleen, and Maureen for their forbearance and tolerance for my occasional shortnesses with them.

My parents, Mr. and Mrs. Miles Walsh, for their assistance and patience throughout this graduate program.

Dr. Richard Featherstone, as committee chairman, for his advice, suggestions, and interest during the research.

Dr. J. Allan Beegle, Dr. Standley Hecker, and Dr. George Meyers for their valuable suggestions and recommendations for this research.

Lt. James Mills of the Flint Police Department; Dr. Jack Mobley, Director of Secondary Education of the Flint Public Schools; Mrs. Harriet Lattimer, Director of Testing and Research for the Flint Board of Education; and Mr. Lou Beer, Executive Director of the Flint Education Association for their assistance in this research project.

The many other individuals whose cooperation and participation made this study a reality.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I	INTRODUCTION..... 1
	Introduction to the Problem..... 1
	Statement of the Problem.....10
	Definition of Terms.....11
	Importance of the Study.....11
	Study Assumptions.....12
	Data Collection.....14
	Study Objectives.....15
	Research Questions.....16
	Data Analysis.....17
	Overview of the Study.....17
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....19
	Introduction.....19
	Role Theory.....19
	Role Expectations.....20
	Role Conflict.....28
	Role Interdependency.....31
	Related Role Research.....34
	Police in Schools - Uniform and Non-Uniform.....39
III	PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY.....41
	Introduction.....41
	General Methods of the Study.....41
	Development of the Instrument.....42
	The Sample.....45
	Statistical Hypotheses.....46
	Analysis Procedure.....48
	Summary.....49
IV	DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....50
	Introduction.....50
	The Instrument.....50
	Participation Summary.....52
	Inter-Group Analysis.....53
	Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School-Liaison Officers.....56

Chapter	Page
Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Principals...	62
Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Counselors...	67
Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Teachers.....	73
Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School-Liaison Officers.....	79
Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Principals...	85
Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Counselors...	90
Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Teachers.....	96
Summary: Intra-Group Relationships.....	102
Senior High School-Liaison Officers.....	102
Senior High School Principals.....	103
Senior High School Counselors.....	104
Senior High School Teachers.....	105
Junior High School-Liaison Officers.....	107
Junior High School Principals.....	108
Junior High School Counselors.....	109
Junior High School Teachers.....	110
Summary: Inter-Group Analysis.....	111
Individual Comments.....	116
Constructive Suggestions.....	116
Negative Comments.....	121
Favorable Comments.....	123
Unclassifiable Statements.....	128
Summary.....	129
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	130
Introduction.....	130
Summary.....	130
Conclusions.....	139
Recommendations.....	141
APPENDICES.....	
Appendix A.....	143
Appendix B.....	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	173

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
A      Juvenile Arrests.....	9
1      Participation Summary.....	53
2      Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School-Liaison Officers.....	57
3      Senior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	58
4      Senior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Age.....	59
5      Senior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Years as a Police Officer.....	60
6      Senior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Years as a School-Liaison Officer.....	61
7      Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Principals.....	62
8      Senior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	63
9      Senior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Age.....	64
10     Senior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	65
11     Senior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Years as a Principal in Flint.....	66
12     Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Counselors.....	67
13     Senior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	68
14     Senior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Age.....	69

Table		Page
15	Senior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Sex.....	70
16	Senior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	71
17	Senior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Years as a Counselor in Flint.....	72
18	Intra-Group Analysis: Senior High School Teachers.....	73
19	Senior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	74
20	Senior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Age.....	75
21	Senior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Sex.....	76
22	Senior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	77
23	Senior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Years of Experience in Flint.....	78
24	Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School-Liaison Officers.....	79
25	Junior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	81
26	Junior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Age.....	82
27	Junior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Years as a Police Officer.....	83
28	Junior High School-Liaison Officers' Responses Correlated with Years as a School-Liaison Officer.....	84
29	Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Principals....	85
30	Junior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	86
31	Junior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Age.....	87

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41



Table		Page
32	Junior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	88
33	Junior High School Principals' Responses Correlated with Years as a Principal in Flint.....	89
34	Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Counselors.....	90
35	Junior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	91
36	Junior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Age.....	92
37	Junior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Sex.....	93
38	Junior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	94
39	Junior High School Counselors' Responses Correlated with Years as a Counselor in Flint.....	95
40	Intra-Group Analysis: Junior High School Teachers.....	96
41	Junior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Educational Preparation.....	97
42	Junior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Age.....	98
43	Junior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Sex.....	99
44	Junior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Years as an Educator.....	100
45	Junior High School Teachers' Responses Correlated with Years as a Teacher in Flint.....	101
46	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Law Enforcement Functions in the Senior High Schools....	112
47	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Community Relations Functions in the Senior High Schools.....	112

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Table		Page
48	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Education-Related Functions in the Senior High Schools.....	113
49	Should the School-Liaison Officer Program Continue to Function in the Secondary Schools.....	113
50	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Law Enforcement Functions in the Junior High Schools....	114
51	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Community Relations Functions in the Junior High Schools.....	114
52	Should the School-Liaison Officer Perform Certain Education-Related Functions in the Junior High Schools.....	115
53	Should the School-Liaison Officer Program Continue to Function in the Secondary Schools.....	115

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Police departments throughout the United States are being faced with many similar problems: there is more juvenile crime with its concomitant problems of vandalism in schools and other public places; and young people seem to be involved in other forms of criminal activity, such as car-theft, larceny, breaking and enterings, as well as violations of existing drug laws.

"The problem: juvenile crime--a forty-seven per cent increase in the past five years, while the under-18 population has risen only seventeen per cent."<sup>1</sup>

Law enforcement agencies are looked upon as defenders of the status quo and with the young peoples' ideas of "we want our freedom now", there is seeming growing disrespect for all police agencies. With this apparent growing disrespect, juvenile crime is an increasing problem, as noted above, and various solutions have been offered.

"One solution: station a policeman in the school. Give him an office. Build a school-liaison program around him. Involve him, full-time, in activities calculated to prevent juvenile delinquency and enhance children's understanding of, and respect for, law enforcement."<sup>2</sup>

There is an ever increasing movement within our social milieu on the part of police departments and of law enforcement agencies in the United States to form better liaison with the public schools.

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Stocker, "Cops in the Schoolhouse", School Management, May, 1968, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, p. 46.

"The school-liaison policeman's purpose is five-fold: 1) to establish collaboration between the police and school in preventing crime and delinquency; 2) to encourage understanding between police and young people; 3) to improve police teamwork with teachers in handling problem youth; 4) to improve the attitudes of students toward police; and 5) to build better police-community relations by improving the police image."<sup>3</sup>

In a 1966 survey undertaken by the School of Police Administration and Public Safety at Michigan State University, it was pointed out that:

"While liaison with public schools was found to be a fairly common activity among the departments surveyed (92 per cent of the departments engaged in some type of this activity), only two departments have police officers assigned full-time to the schools in what has become known as a School-Liaison Program."<sup>4</sup>

In the three year interval since the above survey was made, a number of other communities and their respective school systems have become involved in this kind of a program. According to authors in recent Phi Delta Kappan, School Management, and in Police: Ann Arbor, Grand Blanc Township, Grand Traverse County, Jackson, Pontiac, Saginaw, Three Rivers, Flint, and Birmingham, Michigan; Arlington Heights, Elk Grove, Mt. Prospect and Wheeling, Illinois; Minneapolis and Edina, Minnesota; Tuscon, Arizona; Cincinnati, Ohio; Oxnard, California; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and Toronto Township, Ontario, have added or will add the School-Liaison Officer program to their school system. The Police Department of Pasadena, California, is in the process of departmental reorganization and will assign the School-Liaison Officers to the Pasadena Public Schools. Atlanta, Georgia, has had detectives

---

<sup>3</sup>George H. Shepard and Jesse James, "Police-Do They Belong in the Schools?" American Education, September, 1967, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup>National Center on Police and Community Relations, A National Survey of Police and Community Relations, (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967), p. 77.

assigned to the schools for over thirty-five years.

Since September, 1966, there has been a large-scale increase in those systems of public education which have had the School-Liaison Officer introduced within them by their communities' respective police departments. The Michigan State Police also have a Police-School-Liaison Officer Program in operation in certain school systems in the state. These programs function in those communities which do not have their own police agencies. The Police-School-Liaison Program began in 1966 in the Beecher School District, north of Flint. By 1969, the program was extant in the following districts: Beecher School District (grades kindergarten through twelfth); Hull School District of Benton Harbor (grades kindergarten through ninth); Willow Run School District near Ypsilanti (grades kindergarten through twelfth); Bridgeport School District near Saginaw (grades kindergarten through twelfth); and Reeths-Puffer School District near Muskegon (grades kindergarten through twelfth). The State Police-School-Liaison Officers' basic responsibility is educational and informational.

The police officers who are assigned to the schools bear a variety of titles, such as: School-Liaison Officer; School Resource Officer; School-Police Counselor; School-Police Officer; or School-Police-Liaison Officer. Regardless of the title of the officer concerned, their function is basically the same, reduction of the incidence of juvenile delinquency.

"Of the many attacks on juvenile delinquency, few are more successful--or more controversial--than the plan adopted in Tuscon, Flint, Atlanta, and Minneapolis of assigning police officers to schools in a four-fold

program of education, prevention, investigation, and rehabilitation."<sup>5</sup>

Each police department operates their own program as the chief police executive official and administrative policy dictates. Therefore, there are many different approaches to the School-Liaison Officer program.

"The team approach is the key to the success of the Flint program of policeman-in-the-school, which features a regional counseling team....The police counselor is the unique member of this team, for he is a member of the city police department, assigned full-time to one of the secondary schools."<sup>6</sup>

Again, in the same vein, the Michigan State University survey previously mentioned makes the following observation:

"Each secondary school in the city has a juvenile officer assigned in plain clothes but with standard equipment (gun, handcuffs, etc.). The officer has no academic responsibility and the department characterized his work as detecting and preventing crime at the onset. He tours the building, speaks to the students, and in many cases, questions them about possible trouble they have been in."<sup>7</sup>

There are apparently at least two major schools of thought concerning the advisability of placing police officers within a given school system. Within the city of Flint, Michigan, there are two major organizations which oppose the School-Liaison Officer Program. The Greater Flint Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union has examined the program and has made three major objections: (1) the confidentiality of school records is being violated; (2) protection of juvenile rights is not safeguarded; and (3) subsidization of a public law enforcement

---

<sup>5</sup>Donald W. Robinson, "Police in the Schools", Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1967, p. 278.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, p. 280.

<sup>7</sup>National Center on Police and Community Relations, A National Survey, p. 78.

agency on an annual basis by a private organization. They made the following recommendations: (1) that the Flint Board of Education withdraw the School-Police Liaison Program; (2) that the Flint Board of Education issue a statement to all personnel reaffirming the confidentiality of records and communications; and (3) that the Flint Police Department cease its dependency on a private foundation for annual appropriations; and (4) that the Flint Police Department develop specific and stringent guidelines to govern the police in their dealings with juveniles consistent with recent Supreme Court decisions. According to Mr. Edgar Holt, chapter president, the Flint Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has also made a number of similar objections to the program. These objections were as follows: (1) it is an intrusion of the rights of students; (2) the confidentiality of student records is being violated; (3) the police do not work aggressively in crime prevention; and (4) it is a hindrance to good police-community relations. The Flint Chapter of the NAACP has made three major recommendations: (1) The School-Police Liaison program should be dropped; (2) the confidentiality of student records should be maintained; and (3) the Flint Police Department should follow recent Supreme Court decisions concerning the treatment of juveniles. The police administration personnel are in favor of placing police officers in a given school system, while some lay-citizens and organizations, as noted above, are adamantly opposed.

"Although Flint has reported a 52 per cent decrease in complaints about juvenile misbehavior since adoption of the plan, and Tuscon claimed a 25 per cent reduction in criminal referrals from the schools served, there has been violent opposition in the latter city to the extension of SRO, the School Resource Officer program."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Robinson, "Police", Phi Delta Kappan, p. 278.



In discussing the School-Liaison Officer program with officials in the School of Police Administration and Public Safety at Michigan State University, they seemed to be highly in favor of the program and indicated that more and more police departments in the United States should develop a program somewhat similar to that extant in Flint, depending, of course, on local police department policies and manpower needs.

The Flint Program was started under a grant from the Charles S. Mott Foundation for a pilot study which began in the summer of 1958 in Bryant Junior High School, as a project in developing better communication between police and the young clientele of that particular junior high school. The first "Police Counselor" was Sergeant Frank Rutherford of the Juvenile Bureau of the Flint Police Department. Since that time, additional "police counselors" have been added and in 1968 there were a total of 12 officers: four Detective-Sergeants, one in each of the four Senior High Schools; and eight Detectives, one in each of the eight Junior High Schools. In an interview with Sergeant Frank Rutherford, now the assistant director of the School-Liaison Officer program, held on December 6, 1968, he stated that the school personnel "couldn't get along without them (Liaison Officers)", and also that "they (Liaison Officers) are accepted 100 per cent by the administration." He stressed that their main objectives is prevention.

Today (1969) the Mott Program of the Flint Board of Education subsidizes one-half of each detective's salary and car, and provides him with office space in the school building. The Flint Police Department provides the other one-half of the salary and car. The School-Liaison program is coordinated and supervised by Detective-Lieutenant James A.

Mills with offices in the Flint Police Department and whose salary is paid by the Police Department.

Vital to the success of the program is the detectives' relationship with faculty, students, administration and parents. He must earn acceptance from them. This is accomplished in great part by his attending many school functions, by knowing countless people in the school neighborhood, including merchants and members of civic and church organizations, and by ultimately becoming an integral part of the school community.

The detectives have their offices in the secondary schools, not only for convenience, but also because they find the bulk of their teen programs and student contacts at this level. Before classes begin in the morning, each officer attends roll call at the police station and then makes a regular patrol of the elementary schools in the area. On the average, five elementary schools feed each junior high school, and two junior high schools feed each senior high school. He makes a patrol of the area again during the noon hour and after school in order to observe and correct infractions of the safety rules or loitering by suspicious adults and older children. He checks on the complaints that come in from the department's Juvenile Bureau, which relate to his area and follows them up during the day. This may involve conferences with the student or contact with the parents.

According to Sergeant Rutherford, there are three major benefits which accrue from having a plain-clothes detective in the school: (1) good communication is developed between the schools and the police department, and a cooperative program for the guidance of young people is available; (2) when the detective becomes a friend of the youth of the

community, a greater respect for law enforcement is created; and (3) preventive work tends to develop a partial solution to the problems of juvenile anti-social behavior.

From the School of Police Administration and Public Safety of Michigan State University police department survey, the following quotation is cited:

"The Flint program has, however, had a number of worthwhile results. The officers, getting to know both the regular students at the school and those who have dropped out, is in a good position to recognize students after school hours. He attends all dances and events of the school, and has frequently been able to prevent instances of 'gate-crashing' by uninvited guests as he knows most of the youths in the area. The Flint School-Liaison officers are well accepted by most of the youth and it seemed clear that the respect of them increased as the amount of non-criminal contact increased."<sup>9</sup>

The Flint Police Department seems to be very enthused about the program and has held three Institutes for the Training of School-Liaison Officers. The first was held in April of 1967, the second was held in September of 1968, and the third was held in March of 1969. The Institutes are limited to seventeen enrollees and draw applicants from all over the United States and Canada. The enrollment has been oversubscribed for all three Institutes, which in a small way indicates a definite interest in such a program on behalf of other police departments and law enforcement agencies.

The Flint Police Department has noticed a marked decrease in the incidence of juvenile arrests during the period of time following the installation of School-Liaison Officers in the Flint Public Schools. See Table A.

---

<sup>9</sup>National Center on Police and Community Relations, A National Survey, pp. 78-79.

TABLE A

JUVENILE ARRESTS  
Flint & National  
1963-67

Year	Flint Arrests	% of Change	National Arrests	% of Change
1963	1144	--	638,671	--
1964	1269	+ 9.9%	905,128	+ 29.5%
1965	1400	+ 9.4%	1,019,301	+ 11.2%
1966	1360	- 2.9%	1,525,359	+ 33.2%
1967	1385	+ 1.9%	1,677,726	+ 9.1%

SOURCE: Flint Police Department, Records and Identification Bureau

In a conversation with Lieutenant William Schonnesen, Coordinator of the Police-School Liaison Program for the Minneapolis Police Department, he also mentioned a decrease in juvenile arrests for various offenses. Assault, down 19%; burglary of dwellings, down 18%; drinking, down 12%; larceny from businesses, dwellings and persons, down approximately 10%; and auto theft, down 21%. However, burglary of business is up 14% and robbery has increased by 12%. Lieutenant Schonnesen attributed the decrease to the use of School-Liaison Officers. The increase in the latter offenses is due to a corresponding increase in narcotics use among juveniles and the need to satisfy that use. In a related area, the Minneapolis Police Department has a narcotics education program which they would like to institute in the Minneapolis Public Schools. As of June 19, 1969, the program had been presented to the school administration for study and amplification.

A further comment is necessary at this point. In Minnesota, a person is considered a juvenile until he reaches his eighteenth birthday. Michigan has the sixteenth birthday as the cut-off point.

Captain Henry Wroblewski, Coordinator of School-Liaison Officers for the Edina, Minnesota Police Department, in a personal conversation also mentioned a decrease in the juvenile arrests and attributed this decrease to the School-Liaison Officer Program. He did not mention any specific criminal act or its corresponding percentage of decrease, but stated generally that a decrease had resulted.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study seeks to determine what secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary school teachers and secondary school

guidance counselors), and School-Liaison Officers in a selected community, specifically Flint, Michigan, think the role of the School-Liaison Officer should be and to examine the various viewpoints. It will identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others and School-Liaison Officers hold convergent and divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting. It will judge, on the basis of those expectations, the extent to which School-Liaison Officers should be involved in a specific educational setting.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms and their definitions which follow are stated so that the study itself and the results can be definitely understood and interpreted accurately.

- (a) Secondary School Principal - a public school executive officer whose full-time supervisory assignment includes grades 7-9, or grades 10-12.
- (b) Significant Others - teachers and counselors from the secondary schools in the school district involved in this study.
- (c) Secondary School Teacher - a fully certificated public school instructor who is teaching at least one-half time in grades 7-9, or grades 10-12.
- (d) Counselor - a fully certificated public school instructor with specialized professional training in Guidance and Counseling at the M.A. level or beyond, and who performs his activities on at least a one-half time basis in grades 7-9, or grades 10-12.
- (e) School-Liaison Officer - a police officer assigned to a secondary school building by his particular police department.
- (f) Expectation - "An evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position. This refers to what should happen, not to what will happen in the sense of anticipation."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958), p. 58.

- (g) Role - "A set of expectations, or evaluative standards, applied to an incumbent of a particular position."<sup>11</sup>
- (h) Role conflict - "Any situation in which the incumbent of a local position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations."<sup>12</sup>

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

In addition to the public school systems previously mentioned above, Sergeant Rutherford, in the same initial interview on December 6, 1968, remarked that Royal Oak, Michigan has added the School-Liaison Officer program to that community's public schools. With more and more local police departments installing School-Liaison Officers in the secondary schools of many public school systems, secondary school principals, teachers and counselors are being faced with somewhat the same enigma. What role should the School-Liaison Officer perform in a secondary school setting? Does he have a role in the secondary schools? Thus, there seems to be a need to determine what the roles should be. Once these roles are determined, guidelines can possibly be developed, which can then be followed by those secondary school personnel who find that their particular secondary school will have a School-Liaison Officer assigned to it by the local police department.

#### ASSUMPTIONS UPON WHICH THE STUDY IS BASED

The most important assumption being implied is that the role of the School-Liaison Officer can be determined, and that the viewpoints

---

<sup>10</sup>Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958), p. 58.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, p. 60.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid, p. 248.

of secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers can be analyzed. There is an assumption that data can be acquired on this problem. A third assumption is that any research that has been done relative to the School-Liaison Officer has no bearing on the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer. A fourth assumption is that the research and conclusions derived therefrom will be of value to those secondary school principals and other secondary school personnel who now have, or will have, the School-Liaison Officer in their respective buildings.

When a secondary school principal finds that through higher administrative decision, or through local governmental legislation, or through local law enforcement executive decision, he will have a School-Liaison Officer in the building, there may be some problems unique in having that officer present. The situation may quite realistically be that the secondary school principal has no authority to assign the School-Liaison Officer to any duties within the building, nor the authority to limit or restrict the officer's activities within the building. The School-Liaison Officer is to act as a "counselor", and repeating a citation previously made, "...the police counselor (the underlining is mine) is the unique member of this team."<sup>13</sup> This is a counselor in the educational sense. However, the School-Liaison Officer quite probably has had no training nor educational background in this area of competence. As such then, does the secondary school principal place this officer within the secondary school's Guidance and

---

<sup>13</sup>Robinson, "Police", Phi Delta Kappan, p. 278.



Counseling program? As a sidelight to this question, Sergeant Frank Rutherford mentioned that the Flint Police Department dropped the use of the term "counselor" in 1966 due to just this problem!

There are also certain assumptions being made concerning the data-gathering devices. There is an assumption that these devices will measure what I am attempting to determine -- the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer. An assumption is being made that the returns will be truthful and unbiased. An assumption is also being made that the data-gathering devices will be returned in sufficient numbers so as to warrant an adequate sampling. I also assume that the sampling will be purposive; that the data-gathering devices will be answered completely; and that the questions in the questionnaire are not ambiguous or embarrassing to the respondent. Finally, and most important, the assumption indigenous to the whole study is that the results of this study are statistically significant.

#### COLLECTION OF DATA

The information is to be obtained from those secondary school personnel in the four senior high schools and the eight junior high schools of Flint, Michigan. This study involves the following number of personnel: fifty principals and assistant principals; sixty-eight counselors; eight hundred teachers; and twelve School-Liaison Officers and their immediate supervisor. Due to the unfamiliarity with the School-Liaison program, those school personnel who are in their first year of teaching in the Flint Public School System will be excluded

from the final data figures. The data-gathering devices are to be questionnaires which will be sent to the secondary school principals, teachers, counselors and School-Liaison Officers concerning their expectations of the role of the School-Liaison Officer. The questionnaires used would cover three areas: (1) law enforcement; (2) community relations; and (3) education. The answers would be on a five point continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There would be several open-ended questions to which the respondents could add their personal comments or suggestions.

The data thus obtained will be presented in both table form and in paragraphical format, relating the expectations of secondary school principals, counselors, teachers and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer as determined by those who respond to the questionnaire. Permission to conduct the study has been received from the following: Director of Secondary Education; Director of Research and Testing; Senior High School Principals; Junior High School Principals, the Executive Board of the Flint Education Association; the Assembly of Association Representatives of the Flint Education Association; Chief of Police; Captain in command of the Juvenile Bureau; and the Coordinator of the School-Liaison Officer program for the Flint Police Department.

Any conclusions that are drawn from this study should be interpreted in the light that this study is based entirely upon expectations and as such are necessarily limited to one of a number of important perceptions.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Study objectives which are accurately formulated and stated provide a guide for an organized approach to a research project. In this study the research is planned to:

- (1) Report on the basis of the expectations held by secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers the extent to which the School-Liaison Officers should be involved in an educational setting.
- (2) Identify areas where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold convergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting. These could offer possible avenues to follow in the utilization of School-Liaison Officers in secondary schools.
- (3) Identify areas where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting. These possible areas of conflict may cause difficulties in secondary schools which utilize School-Liaison Officers, and may offer further avenues for investigation.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

These questions were drafted to assist the researcher in his analysis. They represent certain fundamental ideas that this study and the research therein could logically be designed to investigate.

1. Do secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers agree that School-Liaison Officers should be involved in an educational setting?
2. What expectations do secondary school principals have for the role of the School-Liaison Officer?
3. What expectations do secondary school teachers have for the role of the School-Liaison Officer?
4. What expectations do secondary school counselors have for the role of the School-Liaison Officer?
5. What expectations do School-Liaison Officers have for the role of the School-Liaison Officer?

6. Where do the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer converge?
7. Where do the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer diverge?

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The study of both the convergent and divergent expectations that the four respondent groups hold regarding the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting require statistical methods that are appropriate for both inter-group and intra-group analysis. The statistical method selected for this particular study is the Analysis of Variance. When the questionnaires are processed, the results of the Senior High School-respondents' similarities and differences will be analyzed as will the similarities and differences of the Junior High School respondents. The analyses to be undertaken will be done by the Analysis of Variance, with a post hoc analysis of those areas which show a significant difference. A level of significance at the five per cent point is established as the criterion for significant results.

#### OVERVIEW

The first chapter establishes the need for studying the problem of the utilization of the School-Liaison Officer in the educational setting. In addition to the problem statement, the assumptions underlying the study are stated, terms are defined, the scope and limitations of the study are outlined, objectives stated, research questions postulated, and methods of analysis formulated. Chapter II is a review

of the related research. Chapter III contains the study itself with its concomitant sampling, statistical hypotheses and alternate hypotheses, and Chapter IV presents the statistical analyses, the findings of the study and the results. Chapter V contains the summary and statement of conclusions regarding the study and also contains any recommendations that need to be made.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### INTRODUCTION

The focal point of the study is the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in the Junior and Senior High Schools of Flint, Michigan. Included in that involvement is the concomitant problem of the officer's role relationships with the academic personnel (i.e. principals, counselors and teachers) of the secondary schools. Police officers, at least historically in the United States, have not customarily been assigned by their respective police departments to individual secondary school buildings in an attempt to prevent delinquency. With the seemingly increasing trend in various local law enforcement agencies of assigning these Liaison Officers to school buildings and their service areas for the express purpose of delinquency prevention, there seems to be growing confusion and uncertainty as to their particular role in the educational setting. Since the author has accepted and defended role expectations and role recognition as being important to the study of the School-Liaison Officer, the first portion is the review of literature related to role theory. Subsequent sections deal with role related research in education and other research into the use of both uniform and non-uniformed police officers in the schools of the United States.

## ROLE THEORY

The language of role theory, like all vocabularies, consists of concepts and their designating terms. The concepts make it possible to properly identify and analyze the objects of study and the terms, for these concepts make communication possible. The concept of role is central in the language of role theory.

## ROLE EXPECTATIONS

In 1936, the anthropologist, Ralph Linton, proposed a distinction between status and role.

"A status, as distinct from the individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties...A 'role' represents the dynamic aspect of the status. The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role. Role and status are quite inseparable, and the distinction between them is of only academic interest. There are no roles without statuses or statuses without roles."<sup>1</sup>

Every person occupies positions within a number of status systems.

Brookover and Gottlieb state that, "Position may be defined simply as location in a social group or social system."<sup>2</sup> A status system may be thought of as a multi-dimensional map which locates different statuses in relation to one another and shows how they are interconnected.

"Status may be defined as the expectations which various persons or groups interacting with a particular position hold for any occupant of that position."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ralph Linton, The Study of Man, (Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1936), pp. 113-114.

<sup>2</sup>Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education, (American Book Company, New York, 1964), p. 323.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 323.

A person's position or status is represented by his location and his behavioral relationships on such a map. When Newcomb views a role as "the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a position"<sup>4</sup> he is using the word "expected" in its normative or evaluative standard sense. Similarly, Parsons and Shils view role expectations as "patterns of evaluation".<sup>5</sup> Status is necessarily a rational concept; it characterizes a person in terms of a set of rights and obligations that regulate his interaction with persons of other statuses. Hartley and Hartley define status in a similar vein.

"...we must define social role as an organized pattern of expectancies that relate to the tasks, demeanors, attitudes, values, and reciprocal relationships to be maintained by persons occupying specific membership positions and fulfilling definable functions in any group."<sup>6</sup>

Again, in a very similar vein, Newcomb makes the following statement:

"Each position carries with it definite prescriptions toward behaving toward other persons in related positions. Thus, the position of mother carries with it the implication of certain ways of behaving toward children, just as the position of store clerk carries with it certain ways of behaving toward customers, toward employers, and toward other clerks. Such ways of behaving toward others, which are defined for different positions, are called roles."<sup>7</sup>

Bennett and Tumin define a role as "....what the society expects of an individual occupying a given status. This implies that every status is

---

<sup>4</sup>Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology, (The Dryden Press, New York, 1951), p. 280.

<sup>5</sup>Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, (eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962), p. 191.

<sup>6</sup>Eugene Hartley and Ruth Hartley, Fundamentals of Social Psychology, (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948), p. 96.

<sup>7</sup>Newcomb, Social Psychology, p. 278.



functionally defined by the role attached to it."<sup>8</sup> In one monograph Parsons<sup>9</sup> viewed a role in approximately this manner, as have two other authors, Rose<sup>10</sup> and Komarovsky.<sup>11</sup> Sargent, for example, says, "a person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group."<sup>12</sup>

All societies, whether they are primitive or modern, are characterized by a large number of status roles within large numbers of status systems. According to Robert Linton:

"A role represents the dynamic aspect of status... When (the individual) puts the rights and duties, which constitute the status, into effect, he is performing a role."<sup>13</sup>

In some of these status systems, positions are allocated to individuals on the basis of what a person is -- in terms of course of his age, sex, family connections or religious affiliation. These positions are roles.

"The allocative foci of social systems or roles or role expectations. The social system is in a sense, composed of a variety of roles or role expectations."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>John W. Bennett and Melvin Tumin, Social Life, Structure and Function, (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948), p. 96.

<sup>9</sup>Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States", Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture, C. Kluckhohn and H. Murray (eds.), (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948), pp. 268-281.

<sup>10</sup>Arnold M. Rose, "The Adequacy of Women's Expectations for Adult Roles, Social Forces, Vol. XXX, 1951, pp. 69-77.

<sup>11</sup>Mirra Komarovsky, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. III, 1946, pp. 184-189.

<sup>12</sup>Stansfield Sargent, "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology", Social Psychology at the Crossroads, J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif (eds.), (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1951), p. 360.

<sup>13</sup>Ralph Linton, The Study of Man, (D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1936), p. 114.

<sup>14</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 62.

Again, Parsons and Shils define a role as "....a series of appropriate and expected ways of behaving relative to certain objects, by virtue of a given individual's status in a given social structure or institution."<sup>15</sup> Linton states that a role "includes the attitudes, values and behavior ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying the status," then, "It can even be extended to include the legitimate expectations of such persons with respect to the behavior toward them of persons in other statuses within the same system."<sup>16</sup>

In other social systems, positions are allocated on the basis of what an individual can do.

"The ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role (or, as many writers use the term, social role) associated with that position...A role...is something dynamic; it refers to the behavior of the occupants of a position--not to all their behavior, as persons, but to what they do as occupants of the position."<sup>17</sup>

By the process of exhaustively enumerating all of a person's statuses, it is at least theoretically possible to locate him with respect to the status systems of his society. A man may simultaneously occupy a number of positions, such as father, son, church member, teacher, member of an educational association, and a member of a bowling team. Such a list of all of a given individual's concurrent statuses or roles is termed his status set within a social system.

"For most purposes the conceptual unit of the social system is the role. The role is a sector of the

---

<sup>15</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 350.

<sup>16</sup>Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality, (D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1945), p. 77.

<sup>17</sup>Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology, (Dryden Press, New York, 1950), p. 280.

individual actor's total system of action. It is the point of contact between the system of action of the individual actor and the social system."<sup>18</sup>

Although through popular usage, the term "status" almost always refers to a position in a specific type of status system, more precisely the socio-economic system. The socio-economic status system is just one of many sub-systems which comprise the whole of a society. In the socio-economic status system, as well as in many other systems, people occupy positions forming a hierarchy in such a manner that the members of that society can judge the position on a graded scale.

Within a culture, each position or role has a set of norms or expectations associated with that position or role. Getzels says,

"Roles are defined in terms of role expectations. A role has certain normative obligations and responsibilities which may be termed 'role expectations', and when the role incumbent puts those obligations and responsibilities into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define for the actor, whoever he may be, what he should or should not do as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role."<sup>19</sup>

These expectations specify the behaviors which an occupant of that position may appropriately initiate toward an occupant of some other position. As Newcomb phrases it, "...the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role...associated with that position."<sup>20</sup> The converse is also true. Expectations specify the behaviors which an occupant of the other position may appropriately initiate toward the first. Yinger defines a role as,

---

<sup>18</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 190.

<sup>19</sup>Jacob Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process", Administrative Theory in Education, Andrew Halpin (ed.), (Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1958), p. 153

<sup>20</sup>Newcomb, Social Psychology, p. 280.

"....the list of what most members of a social group believe a position occupant should and should not, may and may not, do."<sup>21</sup> The entire concept of role is related to these expectations. Parsons and Shils make this statement, "What an actor is expected to do in a given situation both by himself and by others constitute the expectations of that role."<sup>22</sup>

In a cohesive and well-integrated social system, the members of that social system will correctly perceive the social norms that govern their behavior. The actual behavior of individuals tends to correspond to what they believe is "expected of them". As Gross et al phrase it, "An expectation which is felt to be legitimate will be called a perceived obligation."<sup>23</sup> Generally speaking, society uses the term role to denote the behavioral enactment of that part of the status which "prescribes how the status occupant should act toward one of the persons with whom his status rights and obligations put him in contact."<sup>24</sup> Of course, a specific status involves interaction with a great number of other people.

"A role....is a sector of the total orientation system of an individual actor which is organized about expectations in relation to a particular interaction context, that is integrated with a particular set of value-standards which govern interaction with one or more alters in the appropriate complementary roles."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>John Yinger, Toward a Field Theory of Behavior, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965), p. 100.

<sup>22</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 191.

<sup>23</sup>Neal Gross, Ward Mason and Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958), p. 248.

<sup>24</sup>H. C. Bredemeir and R. M. Stephenson, The Analysis of Social Systems, (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962), p. 31.

<sup>25</sup>Talcott Parsons, The Social System, (The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1951), pp. 38-39.

A school teacher, for example, may interact with his students and with the school administrators, with parents, and with fellow teachers within and without his own particular school building. With each opposite member, his status rights and obligations differ. The term "role set" denotes "the complement of role relationships which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status."<sup>26</sup>

The term "role" is usually applied to situations wherein the prescriptions for individual interaction are defined by the culture and are independent of the particular personal relationships which may exist between individuals occupying the positions. Sometimes roles are governed by expectations which are derived from distinctly personal relationships.

"A role is thus a series of appropriate and expected ways of behaving relative to certain objects, by virtue of a given individual's status in a given social structure or institution. Further, these expectations that individuals in given statuses will behave in such-and-such ways are called role-expectations. The term has a double meaning. It applies not only to the expectations of the alters ....that ego will behave in certain ways, the alters will meet his behavior with approval (or at any rate with lack of disapproval) and with other appropriate complementary, meshing behavior of their own."<sup>27</sup>

For example, the rights and obligations associated with the role of "friend" are defined by culture in a general way; between any given pair of friends, there may exist a particular pattern of obligations and rights which may be quite unique to this one particular friendship. As Getzels points out, "But roles are, of course, occupied by real individuals, and no two individuals are alike. Each individual stamps the

---

<sup>26</sup>R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (Rev. Ed.) (The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957), p. 369.

<sup>27</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 350.

particular role he occupies with the unique style of his own characteristic pattern of expressive behavior."<sup>28</sup>

Roles may become structured or patterned because within a given culture certain roles of behavior become quite well-defined and there appears to be a reasonably wide-spread agreement as to the type of behaviors expected from the incumbent of that particular position. As Parsons and Shils express the thought, "...the social system places every individual in a series of roles where he is expected to conform with certain expectations of behavior."<sup>29</sup> Because of this agreement involving role incumbent behavior expectations, it is useful to think of the role as stipulating a range of behaviors defined quite broadly. Within this range, all behavior of role incumbents is acceptable while as a person moves farther away from norm, the behavior becomes less and less acceptable.

The members of a social system can allocate positive sanctions to those individuals who properly act out the expected roles and can allocate negative sanctions to those who fall short of the accepted standards. This ability to allocate sanctions serves as one of the methods in which a social system motivates its members to perform their respective roles.

Znaniecki says that, "There is obviously a fundamental and universal, though unreflective, culture pattern in accordance with which all kinds of lasting relationships between individuals and their social milieus are normatively organized and which we denote by the term 'social role'."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>Getzels, "Administration as Social Process", Administrative Theory, p. 154.

<sup>29</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 148.

<sup>30</sup>Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge, (Columbia University Press, New York, 1940), p. 19.

Sarbin defines a role as "...a patterned sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation."<sup>31</sup> Newcomb distinguishes between role behavior or the actual behavior of position incumbents, and role as, "...the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position...."<sup>32</sup> Sargent speaks of "...the demands and expectations of those in the group."<sup>33</sup>

#### ROLE CONFLICT

Implicit is the fact that an individual's status set probably involves an extremely wide variety of role relations and expectations. During an individual's interaction with other persons in the status set, there is the possibility that he might find himself occupying a position which has incompatible role expectations or role requirements. Such a situation is well termed as role conflict. As Brookover and Gottlieb state, "...role conflict, then, is that situation in which the incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations in a particular area of behavior."<sup>34</sup> And Sarbin says, "A person must move cautiously and uncertainly when role expectations of others are partly known or entirely unknown. (Role) conflicts are likely to follow from ambiguous role expectations. The persisting need for solution of such conflicts may lead to socially invalid role enactment."<sup>35</sup> Role conflict may grow out of the status set in a number of ways. Two

---

<sup>31</sup>Theodore Sarbin, "Role Theory", Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 1, Gardner Lindzey (ed.), (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954), p. 225.

<sup>32</sup>Newcomb, Social Psychology, p. 280.

<sup>33</sup>Sargent, Social Psychology at Crossroads, p. 360.

<sup>34</sup>Brookover and Gottlieb, Sociology of Education, p. 344.

<sup>35</sup>Sarbin, Handbook of Social Psychology, p. 227.

positions may jointly demand more of a resource, such as time and energy, than one person is able to give. Many are familiar with the young, married, beginning teacher who moonlights at a second job after the teaching day is over. As a result of attempting to work at two different jobs during one day--both suffer. Or, two positions may make conflicting demands on an individual's loyalties. An example of this is the Board of Education member who, at the same time, is a member of a firm selling materials or services to the school system of which he is a Board member. This is known by the term "conflict of interest". Or, two positions may require the individual to have conflicting values. An example of this latter type would be a Roman Catholic surgeon being asked to perform an abortion on a woman merely on desired grounds, not on therapeutic grounds. Finally, some statuses are completely incompatible with certain other statuses simply because the culture by definition says that they are incompatible. An example of this culturally defined incompatibility is a brother and sister marrying. Getzels agrees substantially with both Brookover and Gottlieb and with Sarbin when he states the conditions and circumstances when role conflict appears.

"Role conflicts occur whenever a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to a number of expectations which are mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent, so that adjustment to one set of requirements makes adjustment to the other impossible, or at least difficult. Role conflicts in this sense are situational givens and independent of the personality of the role incumbent."<sup>36</sup>

Role conflicts differ in their severity and intensity. Some are merely innocuous and may be assumed for an extended period of time

---

<sup>36</sup>Getzels, Administrative Theory, p. 161.



without causing social censure or psychological disruption. More severe conflicts, on the other hand, may become the sources, quite often at least, of even profound disturbance. Roles vary in the relative incompatibility of their role prescriptions. The greater the number of prescriptions the two roles have in common, the less conflict will occur. Roles vary in the intensity with which their prescriptions are enforced. The more explicitly the roles are defined and the more stringently the prescriptions are enforced, the more difficult it is for a person to resolve the conflict by deviating from them. The less explicit the definition of roles and the less stringent enforcement of prescriptions, the easier it becomes for an individual to resolve the conflict. As Newcomb and others say, "Thus, the general principle is as follows: Insofar as a person shares with various role partners the same normative expectations concerning his own differentiated role relationships with them, the fact that the behavioral relationships are different will not be a source of conflict to him."<sup>37</sup>

Kahn et al. note that role conflict occurs when the members of a focal group find that significant others hold different expectations for the focal group.

"Much of role conflict, as we have defined it, can be thought of as a kind of inadequate role sending; lack of agreement or coordination among role senders produces a pattern of sent expectations which contains logical incompatibilities or which takes inadequate account of the needs and abilities of the focal person."<sup>38</sup>

And Toby supports Kahn and his associates, regarding a role conflict as a

---

<sup>37</sup>Theodore Newcomb, Ralph Turner and Philip Converse, Social Psychology, (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1965), p. 418.

<sup>38</sup>Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert Quinn, J. D. Snoek, and Robert Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1964), p. 21

product of certain situations where two or more groups make incompatible demands upon the focal group.<sup>39</sup> Seeman agrees that some role conflict stems from disagreement among criterion groups over the nature of the given role.<sup>40</sup> Gross et al. refers to role conflict as any situation in which the incumbent of a social position perceives that he is being confronted with incompatible expectations.<sup>41</sup> In fact, the literature extant on role conflict points typically to situations of this sort.

#### ROLE INTERDEPENDENCY

Roles, which are the essential features of role theory, are interdependent among the many groups and individuals involved. This interdependency of roles is basic to the study of role theory.

"....Roles are interdependent in that each role derives its meaning from other related roles in the institution. In a sense, a role is a prescription not only for the given role incumbent but also for the incumbents of other roles within the organization, so that in a hierarchial setting, the expectations of one role may to some extent also form the sanctions for a second interlocking role."<sup>42</sup>

As Parsons and Shils state:

"Once an organized system of interaction....becomes stabilized....the role occupants build up reciprocal expectations of each other's actions and attitudes which are the nucleus....of role expectations. (One) is expected to behave in a given situational condition in certain relatively specific ways...Reaction will then,

---

<sup>39</sup>Jackson Toby, "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis", Social Forces, Vol. XXX, March, 1952, p. 326.

<sup>40</sup>Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership", American Sociological Review, Vol. XVIII, August, 1953, p. 373.

<sup>41</sup>Gross et al., Explorations in Role Analysis, p. 47.

<sup>42</sup>Getzels, Administrative Theory in Education, p. 153.

"contingent on the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of his expectations, be different; with fulfillment leading to....favorable attitudes, and non-fulfillment leading to the reverse."<sup>43</sup>

And Getzels observes that:

"Roles are complementary. Roles are interdependent in that each derives its meaning from other related roles not only for the given role incumbent, but also for the incumbent of other roles within the organization, so that in a hierarchal setting the expectations of one role may to some extent also form the sanctions for a second interlocking role....It is this quality of complementarity which fuses two or more roles into a coherent, interactive unit and which makes it possible for us to conceive of an institution as having a characteristic structure."<sup>44</sup>

Hartley and Hartley hold that this interdependency exists in all institutions.

"To include all aspects of role requirements we must define social role as an organized pattern of .... (expectations) that relate to the task, demeanors, values and reciprocal relationships to be maintained by persons occupying specific membership positions and fulfilling desirable functions in any group...The failure of a person in one position to perform as he is expected to, interferes with the performance of people in other positions....Roles, therefore, are interdependent.

Many social roles could not exist without the existence of complementary roles....roles thus form interlocking systems in which each unit shapes and directs the other units in the system."<sup>45</sup>

The interrelationships among roles and role expectations implies that a given institution will function smoothly as long as the appropriate role expectations are realized. For example, Bidwell states:

"One of the chief motivations of individuals in an organization is the satisfaction of their individual

---

<sup>43</sup>Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory, p. 19

<sup>44</sup>Getzels, "Administration", Administrative Theory, p. 153.

<sup>45</sup>Hartley and Hartley, Fundamentals of Social Psychology, p. 486.

"needs. Means toward this satisfaction are scarce, so that their distribution must be organized in accord with the group values. This organization is a function of role expectations...."<sup>46</sup>

Role theory applies to all institutions and organizations. Schools are simply one form of an organization. As Etzioni states:

"There are at least nine frequently found types of normative organizations. In five of these, the normative pattern is highly pronounced....Less typical, in the sense that coercion plays an important secondary role, are schools..."<sup>47</sup>

Consequently, it can be concluded that harmonious role relationships should exist between all groups in all school systems. The roles of individuals (School-Liaison Officers) and groups (principals, teachers, and counselors) in institutions (schools) are arranged in a system of interlocking roles in which each unit shapes and directs the other units in a reciprocal relationship. Changes in one role cannot usually be made without affecting the other roles involved with it if role harmony is to be maintained.

This study deals with the possibility that expectations held by secondary school principals, significant others (secondary teachers and counselors), and Liaison Officers regarding the School-Liaison Officer's role in the secondary schools of Flint, Michigan, may present a role conflict for the School-Liaison Officers. Certainly, the existence and presence of such police officers and their active participation in the secondary schools may evoke differing expectations for his role from these principals, significant others, and from the School-Liaison Officer

---

<sup>46</sup>Charles E. Bidwell, "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching", Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. XXIX, Sept. 1955, p. 41.

<sup>47</sup>Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, (The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., New York, 1961), pp. 40-41.

himself. Such divergent expectations could generate role conflict for all those various groups with all the negative effects on educational practice that role theory implies. As Hartley and Hartley remind us:

"Each individual's accurate perceptions of his role in relation both to the roles that others are fulfilling and to his own adequate performance of that role is basic to the effective functioning of any organized society....for society these roles are a device to get the work done and to avoid chaos."<sup>48</sup>

The subjective character of role definition provides the background and rationale for this study. The applicable theoretical base consists of roles that are particularly defined in terms of expectations held by other groups concerning the role of the focal person. In this study, the focal person is the School-Liaison Officer and the other groups are the secondary school principals, counselors, and teachers. The role expectations of the respective groups must be clarified, particularly the areas of convergent and divergent expectations. These differing expectations may point to patterns for the involvement of the Liaison Officer in the educational setting that will best meet the observed expectations of all concerned and offer the least avenues open to role conflict.

#### RELATED ROLE RESEARCH

The following studies illustrate how role theory has been utilized as a tool of analysis in the investigation of role expectations which surround various educational positions.

Charles McKee's recent study<sup>49</sup> of the continuing education program of engineering manager, employed an analysis of the engineering manager's

---

<sup>48</sup>Hartley and Hartley, Fundamentals of Social Psychology, p. 486.

<sup>49</sup>Charles A. McKee, "A Study of the Role of the Engineering Manager and His Continuing Education Requirements", (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.)

role. He demonstrated how role theory has tentatively been accepted as an approach to educational problems in the field of business. This study shows many significant convergent and divergent expectations, with engineering managers showing the greatest agreement as a group.

Another related study, conducted by Getzels and Guba<sup>50</sup> focused on the problem of role conflict among teachers in public schools. The study used a measuring instrument for determining role conflict awareness in three areas. These areas were: the professional role; the citizen's role; and the socio-economic role. Approximately one-half of the teachers sampled made the suggestion that the role of a teacher is defined by a common core of expectations and by a mixture of expectations that relate to local school and community conditions. Getzels and Guba noted that some expectations were attached to other roles that the teacher occupied, and they concluded that these latter roles conflicted with the professional expectations and thus were impossible to reconcile with other roles.

Bidwell's study<sup>51</sup> of teacher role expectations and the administrator role expectations held by teachers suggested that convergence and divergence in the teachers' role expectation of an administrator and that convergence or divergence in the administrator's perception of the behavior of the teachers would either increase or decrease dependent upon the satisfaction of the teacher with his position as a teacher. Returns from respondents in the districts involved pointed out that:

---

<sup>50</sup>Jacob Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation", Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. XXIX, September, 1955, p. 40.

<sup>51</sup>Bidwell, Journal of Sociology, p. 47.

"Convergence of teacher's role expectations toward the administrator and their perceptions of his behavior will be accompanied by an expression by these teachers of satisfaction with the teaching situation. Divergence of teacher's role expectations toward the administrator and their perceptions of his behavior will be accompanied by an expression by these teachers of dissatisfaction with the teaching situation."

Louis Doyle's study<sup>53</sup> of the expectations held by elementary teachers, administrators, board members, and parents for the role of the elementary teacher, viewed some ninety-six teachers in three communities. He found significant discrepancies between the teacher-held expectations for elementary teachers and those expectations held by the administrators, board members and parents.

Stanley Morgan's study<sup>54</sup> investigated the public school principalship using the expectations of teachers, principals, superintendents and board members. The author concluded that the principal's role is completely distinct from that of a teacher. Specifically, there were different patterns of responsibility and authority that existed for the principal and for the teacher. And these patterns of responsibility and authority are commonly acknowledged by the groups involved even when they disagreed on how the tasks of the principal should be executed.

LaVerne Boss<sup>55</sup> studied the position of the Intermediate School

---

<sup>52</sup>Bidwell, Journal of Educational Sociology, p. 47.

<sup>53</sup>Louis A. Doyle, "A Study of the Expectation Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Roles", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1956.)

<sup>54</sup>Stanley R. Morgan, Jr., "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations By Relevant Groups", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1956.)

<sup>55</sup>LaVerne H. Boss, "Role Expectations Held for the Intermediate School District Superintendent in Michigan", (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963.)

District Superintendent in Michigan. He determined how the expectations held by the superintendents, selected members of their boards of education and experts in the field converged and diverged. Boss confirmed his hypothesis that the Intermediate School superintendents, their board of education members, and recognized experts often held conflicting expectations regarding various roles of the Intermediate School superintendent. This study also identified that potential role conflict existed in at least one-third of the roles that were analyzed.

Another study of the same general area was done by Doggett<sup>56</sup> in which he evaluated role relations within a public health organization. He found that incumbents of professional and non-professional positions assigned more functions to their own position than to the counter position. There was disagreement as to the expectations for attributes and job behavior, with professionals holding low expectations for the incumbents of non-professional positions, and the non-professionals held even higher expectations for the professional positions than the professionals held for themselves. It was concluded that role theory provided productive methods for identifying areas of dissent within such organizations.

Scott's study<sup>57</sup> of role conflict among white and Negro policemen is another in this same area. The findings supported the contention that role behavior is basically a social process even when buttressed by

---

<sup>56</sup>James C. Doggett, "An Analysis of Role Expectations of Professional and Indigenous Non-Professional Health Workers", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Public Health, University of Oklahoma, 1968.)

<sup>57</sup>James F. Scott, "A Study of Role Conflict Among Policemen", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Social Science, Indiana University, 1968.)



institutional supports which were assumed to exist for the roles of Negro and white policemen. In each case, appropriate role behavior was validated by shifting audiences within a context of continually changing roles.

Colwell's study<sup>58</sup> made an analysis of the minister's total amount of institutional role conflict which indicated that the minister's behavior conformed positively only to the perceived expectations of the denominational officials. An analysis of the minister's time distribution in relation to the individual's institutional roles indicated that the behavior conformity in the total range of institutional roles is confined almost exclusively to the administrator and organizer roles.

Tosi did a study<sup>59</sup> on salesmen from a wholesale drug firm and their respective customers. Customer expectations seemed to be a necessary condition for salesman effectiveness. Salesmen's expectations were related to the number of customer suppliers.

Still another study in the same area by Ashburn<sup>60</sup> made in Manila, Republic of the Philippines, tested a twelve and one-half per cent representative sample of the Manila Police Department which included all "rookies" of the class of April, 1965. A major finding which resulted

---

<sup>58</sup>Clarence A. Colwell, "Roles and Role Conflicts of the Parish Minister: A Study of Roles and Role Conflicts as Perceived By Ministers Selected From the Connecticut Conference of Congregational Churches", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Religion, The Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1964.)

<sup>59</sup>Henry L. Tosi, Jr., "The Effect of Role Consensus, Expectations, and Perceptions on the Buyer-Seller Dyad", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Economics, Ohio State University, 1964.)

<sup>60</sup>Franklin G. Ashburn, "A Study of Differential Role Expectations of Police Patrolmen in the Manila Police Department, Republic of the Philippines", (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Florida State University, 1966.)

from this study was: Multiple group memberships appeared to be a source of conflicting role expectations for the Manila patrolmen.

Perhaps one of the definitive studies of school superintendents and the analyses of their roles was done by Gross and associates<sup>61</sup>. This group investigated three areas: resolution of conflict; conformity to expectations; and problems of consensus. By a series of in-depth interviews with superintendents and board of education members, the team members tested a series of theoretical hypotheses which involved the expectations and behaviors of these educators as administrative position-incumbents, and particularly stressed the major role conflicts that most of the superintendents found.

In this present study, role expectations are used as the theoretical framework within which the problem of School-Liaison Officer involvement in the educational setting is investigated. No attempt is being made in this research to add to the existing social science knowledge of role theory.

#### POLICE IN SCHOOLS - UNIFORM AND NON-UNIFORM

There is a decided dearth of information available in literature concerning the use of police officers in schools. Officers are being utilized in the schools, but information concerning their use apparently is not thought to be of major importance and, therefore, with the exceptions cited below, is not being publicized.

In the early 1930's, the police department of Atlanta, Georgia, assigned detectives to school duty.<sup>62</sup> These officers wore plain clothes

---

<sup>61</sup>Gross et.al., Explorations in Role Analysis, p. 93.

<sup>62</sup>Robinson, Phi Delta Kappan, p. 278.

but carried the standard equipment of a police officer (gun, handcuffs, badge, etc.) Not until a quarter of a century later did other departments publicly place officers in the schools. On January 30, 1958, the New York City Police Department placed two uniformed officers on patrol inside P.S. 210 and JHS 258 in Brooklyn.<sup>63</sup> In September of that same year, in addition to the two school mentioned above, the High School of Commerce in Manhattan had a uniformed patrolman stationed in the lunch-room from eleven in the morning until two in the afternoon.<sup>64</sup> Flint, Michigan, as previously mentioned, started placing a plain-clothes officer in one Junior High School in September, 1958. In 1960, the Detroit Police Department placed uniformed officers in two of the inner city high schools on a patrol basis. St. Louis, Missouri, started their liaison program in 1955.<sup>65</sup> Tuscon, Arizona, has had police in schools since 1963,<sup>66</sup> and the Michigan State Police began their program in 1966.<sup>67</sup> Many additional police departments have added the program and were previously mentioned. Today there are at least twenty-two different police departments in the United States which place either plain-clothes or uniformed police officers in their cities' respective public schools.

---

<sup>63</sup>New York Times, Jan. 30, 1958, p. 13.

<sup>64</sup>New York Times, Sept. 26, 1958, p. 29.

<sup>65</sup>National Center on Police and Community Relations, A National Survey, p. 35.

<sup>66</sup>Stocker, School Management, p. 46.

<sup>67</sup>Interview with Staff Sergeant Charles Wiermann, Commander of Community Relations and Juvenile Sections, Michigan State Police, held on April 23, 1969.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

#### INTRODUCTION

This particular research had, as its major objective, the analysis of the selected role expectations that secondary school principals, secondary school teachers, secondary school counselors, and School-Liaison Officers hold for the role of School-Liaison Officer in the secondary school setting. Since convergent and divergent expectations were expected over the law enforcement, community relations, and education functions that are part of the School-Liaison Officer's daily performance of his duties, the research plan placed particular emphasis on these differences as indicators of potential conflicts and proposed to test these differences statistically.

#### GENERAL METHODS OF THE STUDY

As this study began, many secondary school principals, counselors, and teachers in Michigan, as well as in a number of other states, were being faced with similar questions. What role should the School-Liaison Officer perform in a secondary school setting? Should the School-Liaison Officer have a role in the secondary schools? Many secondary school principals, counselors, and teachers had had perfunctory contacts with police officers on an occasional basis, but certainly not on a daily in-school basis. Additionally, the School Liaison Officers were assigned to a secondary school building quite often without the fore-

knowledge of the academic personnel in that building. There was also the distinct possibility that the non-involvement of the secondary school personnel in the selection of these School-Liaison Officers caused resentment of the entire School-Liaison Program.

Research on involvement of police officers in the schools is limited. The concept of a liaison between the police and the schools began in 1958.<sup>1</sup> Research on the problem of the utilization of police in the schools was surveyed and little was found. Selected experts familiar with the School-Liaison Officer concept were also interviewed on the need for a study focusing on the School-Liaison Officer's role. Both the survey and the interviews indicated a considerable need for the determination of the selected roles that School-Liaison Officers should perform in the secondary school setting. Some expressed the fear that serious role conflicts lie in wait for secondary school personnel as the apparent trend toward the greater use of police officers in the schools grow. An analysis of the problem, based upon views extant in available literature, from experts active in the police field, and from practicing secondary school personnel, suggested that the initial step of ascertaining the expectations held by the secondary school principals, significant others, and the School-Liaison Officers could readily be secured through the use of a questionnaire.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

The development of a questionnaire specifically to determine what the study participants thought the role of School-Liaison Officers

---

<sup>1</sup>June Morrison, "The Controversial Police-School Liaison Program", Police, Volume 13, No. 2, Nov.-Dec. 1968, p. 62.

should be in the secondary school setting, presented a number of problems. Since the functions of a police officer cover a vastly broad arena of activities, it was necessary to select a limited number of functions that each respondent could readily understand and relate to School-Liaison Officer involvement. Since Liaison Officers could be in close contact with principals, or teachers, or counselors, or students, or parents, or community leaders, or with any combination of these six groups, or with none, any questionnaire needed to provide for each of the various ways that School-Liaison Officer involvement could occur. And finally, since certain fundamental principles govern the reliability of a questionnaire concerning content, construction, procedures, length and pre-testing, some criterion should be used as a procedural guide in the development of study questionnaires. The requirements of Goode and Hatt<sup>2</sup> were used as the criteria for questionnaire development.

The initial draft of the questionnaire consisted of responses organized into five sections: demographic and other data; law enforcement functions; community relations functions; educational functions; and the feasibility of continuing the School-Liaison Officer Program. At this stage, all-inclusiveness was emphasized in an attempt to encompass all pertinent suggestions from the available literature and from other resources. This initially cumbersome draft of questionnaire items was screened for appropriateness, completeness, and clarity with the assistance of the following: Director of Secondary Education for the Flint Public Schools; Director of Research and Testing for the Flint Public Schools; Director of Research for the Flint Education Association;

---

<sup>2</sup>William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods of Social Research, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1952,) pp. 134-69.

Coordinator of School-Liaison Officers for the Flint Police Department; staff members of the School of Police Administration and Public Safety of Michigan State University; and staff members of the Educational Research Bureau of Michigan State University. Many suggestions for the addition, deletion and combination of questions yielded a second and then a third draft. After repeated repetitions of this screening process, a revised questionnaire was produced which was ready for the pre-testing.

The revised questionnaires for secondary school teachers and counselors each included forty-one items: eleven requesting demographic data; and thirty involving responses to the three areas of School-Liaison Officers' functions. There was also the one area concerning the School-Liaison Officer Program continuation.<sup>3</sup> The revised questionnaires for secondary school principals had a total of forty-two items: twelve demographic; and thirty paralleling the questionnaires of the teachers and counselors.<sup>4</sup> The revised questionnaires for the School-Liaison Officers had a total of forty-two items: twelve requesting demographic data; and thirty paralleling the questionnaires of the other three groups.<sup>5</sup> Completion time for all questionnaires was estimated to average less than fifteen minutes.

Prior to their use in this study, the questionnaires were pre-tested in a neighboring high school which was not to be included in the study population. The participating groups: secondary school

---

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix B

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix B

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix B

principals, secondary school counselors; and secondary school teachers, each completed their respective questionnaires. No major difficulties in format, administration, clarity, or timing were encountered. After making some necessary minor adjustments in procedure and in form, the questionnaires were then adjudged ready for research use.

#### THE SAMPLE

The secondary schools of Flint, Michigan, comprised the population of this study. The four senior high schools and the eight junior high schools with their corresponding administrators, counselors, teachers, and School-Liaison Officers made up this population. The study population consisted of fifty administrators, sixty-eight counselors, eight hundred and fifty teachers, and twelve School-Liaison Officers. The School-Liaison Officer Coordinator who had been a School-Liaison Officer was also included in the study population. Due to unfamiliarity with the purpose and functions of School-Liaison Officers, all personnel with one year or less of experience in the secondary schools of the Flint Public School System were excluded from the study. Because of a practice instituted over fifteen years ago by the Flint Board of Education which states that persons not connected with the Flint system are not permitted to place material in the school mail boxes of the academic personnel, it was necessary to depend upon other individuals to distribute the questionnaire. Detective-Lieutenant James Mills, Coordinator of the School-Liaison Officer Program for the Flint Police Department, distributed the questionnaires to the Liaison Officers. The Association Representatives of the Flint Education Association for each secondary building distributed the questionnaires to the teachers and counselors. The author personally



distributed the questionnaires to the principals. Due to the aforementioned practice, the questionnaires had to be self administered. After answering the various questions and responding to the requests for the demographic data, each respondent returned the questionnaire to the author by mail. After excluding the seventy-one beginning teachers, seven hundred and thirty usable responses were obtained: specifically six hundred and twenty-one teachers of seven hundred and twenty-six; fifty-seven of sixty-eight counselors; thirty-nine of fifty principals; and thirteen of thirteen School-Liaison Officers.

#### STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

This study assumes that secondary school principals, significant others (secondary school counselors and teachers), and School-Liaison Officers hold certain expectations for the role of School-Liaison Officer in an educational setting, and the statistical hypotheses developed for this study are based upon that assumption.

Statistical hypotheses provide the framework for analysis in social science research and in educational research. In this study, the following hypotheses involving expectations will be examined for statistically significant differences.

$H_1$  - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_1-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_2$  - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_2-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relation functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_3$  - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_3-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools.

$H_4$  - There is significant difference among Senior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

$H_4-H_0$ : There is no difference among Senior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

$H_5$  - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

$H_5-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

$H_6$  - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools.

$H_6-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools.

H<sub>7</sub> - There is significant difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools.

H<sub>7</sub>-H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools.

H<sub>8</sub> - There is significant difference among Junior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

H<sub>8</sub>-H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference among Junior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

#### ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

A thorough study of the convergent or divergent expectations the four respondent groups hold regarding the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting, required statistical methods that were appropriate for both inter-group and intra-group analysis. The analysis of variance statistic was selected because it can compare two or more independent groups. And these four groups are independent. When the questionnaires were processed, the results of the four Senior High School groups were analyzed as were the eight Junior High School groups. Where differences were noted, a post hoc analysis was done to find where those specific differences lay. A level of significance at the five per cent point was established as the criterion for significant results.

In the inter-group analysis, responses of the four major groups

on School-Liaison Officers' role functions were compared on each of the four major areas of law enforcement, community relations, education and School-Liaison Officer Program continuation. The convergent and the divergent expectations were noted.

#### SUMMARY

This chapter has described the general methods of the study, particularly the development of the questionnaires. In addition, the hypotheses were stated in research form and the method of statistical analysis was postulated.

O

de

se

th

in

ed

am

Li

su

to

by

di

are

Sch

CHAPTER IV  
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS  
INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on how the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting is viewed by four groups of role definers: secondary school principals; secondary school counselors; secondary school teachers; and School-Liaison Officers. It analyzes the agreements and disagreements among and within these four groups in an attempt to clarify the School-Liaison Officers' role in an educational setting.

Similarities and differences in expectations presumably existed among the four sets of role definers regarding the roles of School-Liaison Officers. In the form of statistical hypotheses, this supposition was analyzed according to how the various groups responded to four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. Each research hypothesis was analyzed by the analysis of variance statistic. Any alpha level of .05 was considered significant.

Certain demographic data and other variables were analyzed and are presented as by-products of the basic research project.

THE INSTRUMENT

The research instrument<sup>1</sup> covered the following four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement:

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix B

- 1-Law Enforcement: - such functions as: patrolling school buildings and grounds; detecting and apprehending juvenile suspects; making secondary school personnel aware of juvenile offenders; acting as a consultant in law enforcement; and enforcing the law in the secondary schools.
- 2-Community Relations: - such functions as: conferring with parents, teachers, counselors, and principals of students displaying pre-delinquent or delinquent behavior; working with community groups to prevent delinquency; attending group meetings to acquaint them with the School-Liaison Officer Program; and promoting better understanding between police and youth.
- 3-Education-Related: - such functions as: being placed in the Guidance Department; wearing plain-clothes in the secondary schools; working with principals and teachers to enforce discipline; being placed in a secondary building; attending dances and parties in the school; examining the cumulative records of students (CA 39 or CA 60).
- 4-Program Continuation: - should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

Each of the above described areas was examined in terms of School-Liaison Officer involvement:

- 1 - Should School-Liaison Officers perform certain selected law enforcement functions in the secondary schools?
- 2 - Should School-Liaison Officers perform certain selected community relations functions in the secondary schools?
- 3 - Should School-Liaison Officers perform certain selected education-related functions in the secondary schools?
- 4 - Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

The research instrument identified the following data for each respondent: educational preparation; sex (except for Liaison Officers and principals); age; years as an educator or police officer; and present assignment in the schools. The secondary school principals had additional questions concerning the following: years as a principal; number of students in the building; number of teachers; and number of counselors. In addition, there was a final open-ended question to which

the

to t

seco

one,

clos

func

agre

comp

to e

five

Each

and

cate

deal

func

liab

co br

inst

does

place

auth

gathe

cents

State



the respondents could give their comments and/or suggestions relative to the functions of the School-Liaison Officer and his relationship with secondary school personnel. Each question, other than the open-ended one, was to be answered by circling one of the five choices which came closest to how the respondent thought the School-Liaison Officer should function in that particular area. The choices were: strongly agree; agree; undecided; disagree; and strongly disagree. Upon receipt of the completed instruments, the author arbitrarily assigned certain weights to each of the choices. These arbitrary weight assignments ranged from five for strongly agree down the continuum to one for strongly disagree. Each question in each general category, therefore, had a weight assigned and the sum of these weights was the score given to that particular category or part. Part I is the section on law enforcement; Part II deals with community relations; Part III is on the education-related functions; and Part IV deals with the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program.

#### PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

This study was planned around research questionnaires which were to be self-administered by the respondents. Because of a practice instituted over fifteen years ago by the Flint Board of Education which does not permit persons who are not connected with the Flint system to place material in the school mail boxes of the academic personnel, the author could not directly supervise the administration of the data-gathering devices. Upon completion of the questionnaires, the respondents were asked to return them to the author by means of the United States mail. The percentage of returns varied from seventy-eight per

cent to one hundred per cent. Table 1 illustrates the exact participation percentages.

TABLE 1  
PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

RESPONDENTS	POSSIBLE	ACTUAL	PER CENT
School-Liaison Officers	13	13	100.
Principals	50	39	78.0
Counselors	68	56	82.3
Teachers	799	695	86.9
Less first year teachers		-74	
TOTAL	930	729	78.4

All of the respondents who returned usable devices replied to the questions in the four areas of School-Liaison Officer participation. However, they did not respond as well to the questions in the demographic section. Again, not all of the respondents who replied to the questions on School-Liaison Officer involvement availed themselves of the opportunity to respond to the open-ended question. These latter replies are not part of the statistical data but are included later in this chapter. These replies indicate stated personal opinions or biases of secondary school personnel favoring the existence of School-Liaison Officers in schools and also the stated personal opinions or biases of those in disagreement with the concept of placing Liaison Officers in the schools.

#### INTER-GROUP ANALYSIS

The statistical hypotheses previously postulated describe inter-group comparisons. The raw data and statistical results are presented here as a matter of record. The summaries of all inter-group differences

can b

deca

from

sign

diff

are b

betwe

resu

exis

rece

vari

atio

The

leve

sign

can be found on pages 111-115.

$H_1-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools.

The responses for Part I support  $H_1-H_0$ . The F-score of 0.0598 indicates a very low difference of variance in the four groups of respondents from the Senior High Schools.

$H_2-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools.

The responses for Part II indicate an F-score of 3.893 which is significant beyond the .005 level. The F-score shows that significant differences do exist for certain respondent groups. These differences are between Liaison Officer and teacher, significant at alpha; and between counselors and teachers, significant at the .005 level. As a result,  $H_2-H_0$  is rejected.

$H_3-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools.

The responses for Part III indicate that no significant differences exist and there is support for  $H_3-H_0$ . The F-score of 2.088 with the necessary degrees of freedom shows no significant difference between variances of the four groups involved.

$H_4-H_0$ : There is no difference among Senior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

The responses indicate rejection of  $H_4-H_0$ , concerning the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools. The F-score of 5.869 indicates a variance significant beyond the .005 level. These differences exist between Liaison Officers and principals, significant beyond the .005 level; between Liaison Officers and

counselors, significant beyond the .005 level; between Liaison Officers and teachers, significant beyond the .005 level; and between counselors and teachers, significant between the .025 and .001 level.

$H_5-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

The responses from the Junior High School respondents indicate that no significant differences exist among the respondent groups. Therefore,  $H_5-H_0$  is not rejected as the F-score is 0.9371 which is not significant at the alpha level.

$H_6-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools.

The responses for Part II of the data gathering devices from the Junior High respondents indicate support for  $H_6-H_0$ . The F-score of 1.832 is not significant at alpha.

$H_7-H_0$ : There is no difference among respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools.

The responses from the Junior High School personnel for Part III indicate that significant differences do exist for certain respondent groups. The F-score of 3.018 is significant between .05 and .025. These differences are between Liaison Officer and teacher, significant between .05 and .025 level; between principals and counselors, significant between .025 and .01; and between counselor and teacher, significant between .025 and .01.

$H_8-H_0$ : There is no difference among Junior High School respondents who think the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.

The responses for Part IV from the Junior High School personnel support  $H_8-H_0$ . The F-score of 1.693 is not significant at alpha.

PERCEPTIONS OF GROUPS

Each of the groups involved in this study holds an opinion concerning the role of the School-Liaison Officer in an educational setting; a group opinion based upon the expectations of the respective group membership. These collective opinions or positions make it possible to identify areas where convergent or divergent expectations among groups exist. Once these areas of agreement or disagreement are identified, certain implications may be deduced from them relative to the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in the secondary school setting.

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

School-Liaison Officers are the focal group of this study and their expectations for their own role in the secondary schools constitute one of the primary group positions involved in this research. The position that School-Liaison Officers adopt must be identified for use in the analysis. The study made the assumption that the responses of four Senior High School-Liaison Officers, eight Junior High School-Liaison Officers, and the Coordinator of Liaison Officers for the Flint Police Department, who participated in this study, could be generalized to provide valid data on the role of School-Liaison Officer in the secondary schools, despite the variety of individuals involved.

Twenty-one per cent agreement in each choice category among the respondents will constitute majority agreement for that category in this particular study. Table 2 shows the responses of the four Senior High School-Liaison Officers and the Liaison Officer Coordinator

respondents to the four general areas of Liaison Officer involvement. As illustrated in Table 2, it was concluded that the Liaison Officer respondents do not hold an agreement position for their role in the Senior High Schools. Majority agreement was reached on the sections dealing with law enforcement, community relations, and program continuation. However, there was a divergence of expectations in the section dealing with the education-related functions of the School-Liaison Officer. Eighteen per cent strongly agreed, forty-five per cent agreed, two per cent were undecided, while twenty-four per cent disagreed and eleven per cent strongly disagreed. Again, there was near majority (.20 divergency of expectations for the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools.

TABLE 2

## INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD <sup>2</sup>
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	44%	38%	4%	12%	2%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	56%	44%	-	-	-
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	18%	45%	2%	24%	11%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	20%	60%	-	-	20%

Tables 3-6 summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistencies of the agreement among the Senior High School-Liaison Officers. They include the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years as a police officer; and years as a School-Liaison Officer. These statistics appear to be significant, but because of the small number of officers involved, their significance is minimized.

<sup>2</sup>In this table and in all following tables, the initials SA, A, U, D, and SD are used in place of Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree for the sake of brevity.

TABLE 3

## SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college		2			
Two or more years of high school		2	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					1.0 - N/S
					.30 N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college	2				
Two or more years of high school	1	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					1.0 - N/S
					.23 N/S

58

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college		2			
Two or more years of high school		1	1	1	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					1.0 - N/S
					.89 N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college	1				
Two or more years of high school		2	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-1.0 - sig. at .01
					.50 N/S



TABLE 4

**SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:**

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years or under		2			1.0 - N/S
Over forty years	2	1			-.95 N/S
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years or under	1	1			1.0 - N/S
Over forty years	2	1			-.99 sig. at .05
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years or under			1	1	1.0 - N/S
Over forty years			3		-.49 N/S
Should the School-Liaison Officer continue to function in the secondary schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years or under	1	1			1.0 - N/S
Over forty years	1	1			.28 N/S



TABLE 5

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A POLICE OFFICER:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under twenty years		2			
Twenty years and over		2	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-1.0 - N/S
					-.72 - N/S
<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under twenty years	1	1			
Twenty years and over	2	1			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-1.0 - N/S
					-.57 - N/S
<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under twenty years			1		
Twenty years and over		3		1	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-1.0 - N/S
					.50 - N/S
<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under twenty years	1	1			
Twenty years and over	1	1			1
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-1.0 - N/S
					.96 - N/S

TABLE 6

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under three years	2	2	1			.98 - N/S
Three years or more		2				-1.0 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under three years	1	2				.72 - N/S
Three years or more	2					-1.0 - N/S

61

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under three years			2	1		-.83 - N/S
Three years or more		1	1			1.0 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under three years	1	2				.50 - N/S
Three years or more	1				1	1.0 - sig. at .05

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The intra-group analysis of Senior High School principals involves sixteen principals from the four Senior High Schools. The titles of these administrators may be one of the following: principal; deputy principal; or assistant principal. The Senior High School principals, although not the focal group, are one of the eight groups involved in the study. Table 7 shows the responses of the Senior High School principal respondents to the four general areas of Liaison Officer involvement. According to the responses shown, it was concluded that the Senior High principals hold a majority agreement (21% or more agreement for each choice category constitutes majority agreement) for the role of School-Liaison Officer in the Senior High Schools.

TABLE 7

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	54%	24%	7%	13%	2%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	48%	37%	11%	4%	-
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	40%	31%	11%	13%	5%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	94%	6%	-	-	-

Tables 8 through 11 summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistencies of the agreement among the Senior High School principals for the role of School-Liaison Officer. The responses of the Senior High principals were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years as an educator; and years as a high school principal in Flint.

TABLE 8

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.		4	3		
Masters degree	3	6			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.40 - N/S
					.03 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	3	4			
Masters degree	3	6			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.46 - N/S
					-.52 - N/S

63

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	1	5	1		
Masters degree	3	4	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.32 - N/S
					.36 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	7				
Masters degree	8	1			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					0.0 - N/S
					-.21 - N/S

TABLE 9

---



---

 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:
 

---



---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	1	4			
Under forty-five years	2	6	3		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.31 - N/S
					.27 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	2	3			
Under forty-five years	4	7			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.03 - N/S
					-.36 - N/S

64

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	2	3			
Under forty-five years	2	6	3		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.50 - N/S
					-.61 - sig. at .05

---

 Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	5				
Under forty-five years	10	1			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					0.0 - N/S
					-.09 - N/S

TABLE 10

---



---

 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:
 

---



---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Twenty years or more	1	4				-.47 - N/S
Under twenty years	2	6	3			.20 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Twenty years or more	2	3				.08 - N/S
Under twenty years	4	7				-.47 - N/S

65

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Twenty years or more	2	3				.53 - N/S
Under twenty years	2	6	3			-.41 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Twenty years or more	5					0.0 - N/S
Under twenty years	10	1				-.15 - N/S



TABLE 11

---



---

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL IN FLINT:

---



---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	1	4	1			.07 - N/S
Five years and under	2	6	2			-.10 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	4	2				-.78 - N/S
Five years and under	3	7				.29 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	2	3	1			.03 - N/S
Five years and under	2	6	2			.04 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	6					0.0 - N/S
Five years and under	9	1				.61 - N/S

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

The intra-group analysis of the Senior High School counselors encompasses the thirty-three counselors who hold Masters degrees and who are employed full-time in the Counseling and Guidance Departments in the four Flint Senior High Schools. This group of thirty-three counselors are another of the eight groups involved in this study. Table 12 displays the responses of these thirty-three respondents to the four general areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. Twenty-one per cent or more agreement per category constitutes majority agreement. The Senior High School counselors display agreement for all four of the School-Liaison Officer involvement areas.

TABLE 12

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS:	50%	32%	7%	7%	4%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	64%	25%	5%	5%	1%
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	42%	34%	10%	10%	4%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	88%	12%	-	-	-

Tables 13 through 17 summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistencies of agreement among the Senior High School counselors for the role of School-Liaison Officer. These include the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; sex; years as an educator; and years as a counselor in Flint.

TABLE 13

---

 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR'S RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:
 

---

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	3	7	3			.10 - N/S
Masters degree	6	13	1			-.32 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	9	4				-.48 - N/S
Masters degree	8	11	1			-.09 - N/S

68

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	1	12				-.75 - sig. beyond .01
Masters degree	6	9	4	1		.25 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	11	2				-.05 - N/S
Masters degree	18	2				.11 - N/S

TABLE 14

---



---

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

---



---



---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or over	3	7	1			-.36 - N/S
Under forty years	6	13	3			-.26 - N/S

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or over	6	5				-.48 - N/S
Under forty years	11	10	1			.40 - N/S

69

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or over	2	8		1		-.11 - N/S
Under forty years	5	13	4			.26 - N/S

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or over	10	1				.43 - N/S
Under forty years	19	3				-.27 - N/S

TABLE 15

---

 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH SEX:
 

---

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	5	11	4			.11 - N/S
Female	4	9				.23 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	11	8	1			.01 - N/S
Female	6	7				.03 - N/S

70

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	4	12	4			-.04 - N/S
Female	3	9		1		-.06 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	17	3				.06 - N/S
Female	12	1				.20 - N/S

TABLE 16

---

 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:
 

---

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years or over	5	8	2			
Under fifteen years	4	12	2			-.19 - N/S .04 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years or over	10	5				-.45 - N/S
Under fifteen years	7	10	1			.23 - N/S

71

 Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years or over	2	12		1		-.06 - N/S
Under fifteen years	5	9	4			.07 - N/S

 Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?
 

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years or over	13	2				.12 - N/S
Under fifteen years	16	2				-.36 - N/S

TABLE 17

---



---

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A COUNSELOR IN FLINT:

---



---



---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Ten or more years	4	8				.09 - N/S
Under ten years	5	12	4			-.31 - N/S

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Ten or more years	7	5				-.30 - N/S
Under ten years	9	10	2			.03 - N/S

72

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Ten or more years	2	10				-.24 - N/S
Under ten years	5	11	4	1		-.12 - N/S

---

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

---

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Ten years or more	10	2				.26 - N/S
Under ten years	19	2				.20 - N/S

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

The fourth of the groups involved in this study are the two hundred and seventy-six Senior High School teachers who are employed full-time in the Flint Public School system and who have one or more years of teaching experience in the four Flint Senior High Schools. Twenty-one per cent or more agreement in each choice category among the respondents will constitute majority agreement for that category in this particular study. Table 18 shows the responses of the Senior High School teacher respondents to the four general areas of Liaison Officer involvement. As indicated in the table, it was concluded that the teachers held an agreement position for the role of School-Liaison Officer.

TABLE 18

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

<u>SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	45%	35%	9%	9%	2%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	40%	44%	9%	6%	1%
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	36%	39%	12%	9%	4%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	68%	28%	1%	-	3%

Tables 19 through 23 summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistencies among Senior High School teachers for the role of School-Liaison Officer. The variables selected are: educational preparation; age; sex; years in education; and years in Flint. Three of the teacher questionnaires were not classifiable because the page containing the demographic data was not returned to the author.



TABLE 19

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	22	16	5		
Masters degree	26	66	7	4	
Bachelors degree	30	71	24	3	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.21 - N/S
					.09 - N/S
					-.05 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	16	20	5	2	
Masters degree	19	74	8		2
Bachelors degree	37	76	15		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.07 - N/S
					-.07 - N/S
					.01 - N/S

74

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	13	23	6	1	
Masters degree	24	55	20	4	
Bachelors degree	46	53	25	4	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.25 - N/S
					.07 - N/S
					-.16 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	25	16	1		1	
Masters degree	68	33			2	
Bachelors degree	94	27	3		4	
						CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
						-.11 - N/S
						.02 - N/S
						-.14 - N/S



TABLE 20

## SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	16	58	24	3	
Thirty to forty-five years	36	63	10	4	
Over forty-five years	26	32	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.06 - N/S
					.31 - sig. beyond .01
					-.02 - N/S

  

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	18	69	12		
Thirty to forty-five years	34	67	12		
Over forty-five years	20	35	3	2	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.08 - N/S
					.18 - N/S
					.15 - N/S

  

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	26	48	23	4	
Thirty to forty-five years	39	51	19	4	
Over forty-five years	20	31	8	1	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.21 - sig. at .05
					.22 - sig. at .05
					.07 - N/S

  

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	68	27	4		
Thirty to forty-five years	82	28			
Over forty-five years	38	21			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.07 - N/S
					.19 - N/S
					-.10 - N/S

TABLE 21

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH SEX:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	52	91	15	4		.09 - N/S
Female	26	62	21	3		-.12 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	38	104	16	2	2	-.05 - N/S
Female	34	67	11			.08 - N/S

76

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	51	77	26	8		.03 - N/S
Female	34	53	24	1		-.02 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	108	44	4		6	-.08 - N/S
Female	79	32			1	.14 - N/S

TABLE 22

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under six years	20	51	22	3	
Six to fifteen years	30	70	12	4	
Sixteen years and over	28	32	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.05 - N/S
					.34 - sig. beyond .01
					-.11 - N/S

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under six years	24	59	13		
Six to fifteen years	23	77	12	2	
Sixteen years and over	25	35	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.10 - N/S
					.07 - N/S
					-.21 - N/S

77

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under six years	30	41	22	3	
Six to fifteen years	33	55	22	6	
Sixteen years and over	22	34	6		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.01 - N/S
					.20 - sig. at .05
					.06 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under six years	68	22	3		
Six to fifteen years	80	31	1		
Sixteen years and over	39	23			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.12 - N/S
					.16 - N/S
					-.34 - sig. at .01

TABLE 23

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN FLINT:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under five years	21	59	30	5	
Five to ten years	28	55	6	2	
Eleven years or over	29	39			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.04 - N/S
					-.01 - N/S
					-.16 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	
Under five years	25	77	13			
Five to ten years	26	53	10		2	
Eleven years or over	21	41	4	2		
						CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
						.16 - N/S
						.08 - N/S
						.10 - N/S

78

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	
Under five years	33	48	28	6		
Five to ten years	31	42	16	2		
Eleven years or over	21	40	6	1		
						CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
						.15 - N/S
						.02 - N/S
						.01 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	
Under five years	76	31	2		6	
Five to ten years	66	23	2			
Eleven years or over	45	22			1	
						CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
						-.01 - N/S
						-.11 - N/S
						-.24 - sig. at .05

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

As mentioned previously, the School-Liaison Officers are the focal group of this study, and their expectations for their own role in the secondary schools constitute one of the primary group positions involved in this research. The position that the Junior High School-Liaison Officers adopt must be identified for use in the analysis. The study made the assumption that the responses of those Liaison Officers who participated in this study could be generalized to provide valid data on the role of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting, despite the variety of individuals involved.

Twenty-one per cent or more agreement in each choice category among respondents will constitute majority agreement for that category in this particular study. Table 24 shows the responses of the Junior High School-Liaison Officers for the four general areas of Liaison Officer involvement, and it was concluded that the Junior High School-Liaison Officers held an agreement position for their role in the Junior High Schools. There is some divergence of opinion, however, on the Liaison Officer performing education-related functions. Collectively, twenty-eight per cent disagree on these functions.

TABLE 24

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	49%	35%	5%	10%	1%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	59%	35%	1%	3%	-
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	29%	35%	8%	14%	14%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	63%	37%	-	-	-

Tables 25 through 28 summarize the data which pertain to the internal consistencies of the agreement among Junior High School-Liaison Officers for their role of School-Liaison Officer. These include the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years as a police officer; and years as a School-Liaison Officer.



TABLE 25

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college	1	3			
Two or more years of high school		3	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.33 - N/S
					.33 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college	1	3			
Two or more years of high school	2	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.33 - N/S
					-.41 - N/S

81

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college		1	3		
Two or more years of high school		3	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.72 - N/S
					-.37 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Two or more years of college	3	1			
Two or more years of high school	2	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.42 - N/S
					.25 - N/S

TABLE 26

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or under	1	3				-.56 - N/S
Over forty years		3	1			.58 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or under	1	3				-.11 - N/S
Over forty years	2	2				.26 - N/S

82

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or under		1	3			-.51 - N/S
Over forty years		3	1			-.72 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Forty years or under	3	1				.43 - N/S
Over forty years	2	2				.19 - N/S

TABLE 27

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A POLICE OFFICER:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Sixteen years and under	1	3			
Over sixteen years		3	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.61 - N/S
					.92 - N/S
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Sixteen years and under	1	3			
Over sixteen years	2	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.15 - N/S
					.92 - N/S
					83
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Sixteen years and under		1	3		
Over sixteen years		3	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.54 - N/S
					.15 - N/S
Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Sixteen years and under	3	1			
Over sixteen years	2	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.33 - N/S
					.58 - N/S

TABLE 28

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Three years or less	1	3			
Over three years		3	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.47 - N/S
					.97 - sig. between .05 and .01

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Three years or less	2	2			
Over three years	1	3			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.32 - N/S
					.28 - N/S

84

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Three years or less	2	2			
Over three years		2	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.73 - N/S
					.29 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Three years or less	3	1			
Over three years	2	2			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.58 - N/S
					-.39 - N/S

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The intra-group analysis of the Junior High School principals involves twenty-three principals from the eight Junior High Schools. The titles held by these administrators may be: principal; deputy principal; or assistant principal. These Junior High School administrators, although not the focal group, are one of the major groups involved in this study. Table 29 shows the responses of the Junior High School principal respondents to the four general areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. Twenty-one per cent or more agreement per category constitutes majority agreement. On the basis of the data shown in the table, it was concluded that the principals of the Flint Junior High Schools held agreement on all four of the School-Liaison Officer involvement areas.

TABLE 29

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	42%	34%	9%	12%	3%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	58%	33%	7%	2%	-
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	39%	38%	7%	11%	5%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	87%	13%	-	-	-

Tables 30 through 33 summarize the data which pertain to the internal consistencies of the agreement among Junior High principals for the role of School-Liaison Officer. These include the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years as an educator; and years as a Junior High principal in Flint.

TABLE 30

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.		8	2			.31 - N/S
Masters degree	2	8	3			-.21 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	5	5				.15 - N/S
Masters degree	6	7				-.22 - N/S

86

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	3	7				-.35 - N/S
Masters degree	2	10	1			-.14 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	9	1				-1.0 - sig. beyond .01
Masters degree	10	3				.16 - N/S

TABLE 31

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	1	6	1		
Under forty-five	1	10	4		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.28 - N/S
					-.63 - sig. between .05 and .01
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	3	5			
Under forty-five	8	7			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.04 - N/S
					-.18 - N/S
					87
Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	2	5	1		
Under forty-five	3	12			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.01 - N/S
					-.05 - N/S
Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty-five years and over	7	1			
Under forty-five	12	3			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.22 - N/S
					.09 - N/S

TABLE 32

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Eighteen years and over		7	3		
Under eighteen years	2	9	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.50 - N/S
					-.30 - N/S

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Eighteen years and over	4	6			
Under eighteen years	7	6			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.05 - N/S
					-.19 - N/S

88

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Eighteen years and over	1	8	1		
Under eighteen years	4	9			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.60 - N/S
					-.44 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Eighteen years and over	9	1			
Under eighteen years	10	3			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.25 - N/S
					-.14 - N/S



TABLE 33

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL IN FLINT:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years		8	1			.17 - N/S
Five years and under	2	8	4			-.18 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	6	3				.23 - N/S
Five years and under	5	9				.15 - N/S

89

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	1	8				.29 - N/S
Five years and under	4	9	1			.24 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Over five years	8	1				.17 - N/S
Five years and under	11	3				-.32 - N/S

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

The intra-group analysis of the seventh of the eight groups which make up the population of this study is the Junior High School counselors. This group is made up of the twenty-three counselors who have Masters degrees and who are employed full-time in the Counseling and Guidance Departments in the eight Flint Junior High Schools. Table 34 displays the responses of these respondents to the four general areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. Twenty-one per cent or more agreement in each choice category among respondents will constitute majority agreement for that category in this particular study. The conclusion reached is that the Junior High School counselors are in agreement for the role of School-Liaison Officer.

TABLE 34

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	41%	34%	10%	8%	7%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	44%	41%	8%	5%	2%
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	35%	38%	6%	8%	13%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	61%	39%	-	-	-

Tables 35 through 39 present the summaries of the data which pertain to the internal consistencies of the agreement among Junior High School counselors for the role of School-Liaison Officer. These include the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; sex; years as an educator; and years as a counselor in Flint.

TABLE 35

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	1	6	3			-.39 - N/S
Masters degree	4	5	4			.50 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	3	7				-.20 - N/S
Masters degree	2	4	7			-.38 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	2	6	2			-.03 - N/S
Masters degree		8	3	1	1	-.81 - sig. between .01 and .05

## Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	6	4				-.10 - N/S
Masters degree	9	4				.19 - N/S

TABLE 36

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years and over	5	5	2		
Under forty years		6	5		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.08 - N/S
					-.30 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years or over	2	9	1		
Under forty years	3	6	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.01 - N/S
					.01 - N/S

92

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years and over	2	8	1		1
Under forty years		6	5		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.07 - N/S
					.04 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Forty years and over	9	3			
Under forty years	6	5			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.05 - N/S
					-.15 - N/S

TABLE 37

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH SEX:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	2	7	6			.20 - N/S
Female	3	4	1			.11 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	3	9	3			.25 - N/S
Female	2	6				.13 - N/S

93

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	1	8	5		1	.10 - N/S
Female	1	5	2			.05 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer continue to function in the secondary schools?						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Male	10	5				.03 - N/S
Female	5	3				.01 - N/S

TABLE 38

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years and over	5	4	2			.02 - N/S
Under fifteen years		7	5			.62 - sig. between .05 and .01

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years and over	3	7	1			-.04 - N/S
Under fifteen years	2	8	2			-.32 - N/S

94

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>						
	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years and over	2	8			1	-.10 - N/S
Under fifteen years		6	6			-.22 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Fifteen years and over	10	1				.14 - N/S
Under fifteen years	5	7				-.36 - N/S

TABLE 39

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A COUNSELOR IN FLINT:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Ten or more years	5	4	3		
Under ten years		7	4		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.19 - N/S
					-.32 -N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Ten or more years	4	6	2		
Under ten years	2	8	1		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.29 - N/S
					.01 - N/S

95

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Ten or more years	2	8	1		1
Under ten years		6	5		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.03 - N/S
					.23 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Ten or more years	9	3			
Under Ten years	6	5			
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.52 - N/S
					.05 - N/S

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

The intra-group analysis of the Junior High School teachers who are employed at least one-half time in the Flint Public Schools, and who have one or more years of teaching experience in the Flint secondary schools, is based upon the three hundred and forty-five teacher questionnaires which were classifiable. Twenty-one per cent or more agreement in each choice category among respondents will constitute majority agreement for that category in this particular study. Table 40 shows the responses for the Junior High School teacher respondents for the four general areas of Liaison Officer involvement. As indicated in the table, it was concluded that the teachers held an agreement position for the role of School-Liaison Officer.

TABLE 40

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER BE INVOLVED IN:					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS?	45%	35%	8%	9%	3%
II-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS?	44%	41%	10%	4%	1%
III-EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS?	36%	38%	12%	9%	5%
IV-PROGRAM CONTINUATION?	65%	27%	5%	1%	2%

Tables 41 through 45 summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistencies of agreement among the three hundred and forty-five Senior High School teachers for the selected role aspects of School-Liaison Officer. One response was unclassifiable because the demographic data page was not returned. The variables selected were: educational preparation; age; sex; years as an educator; and years as a teacher in Flint.



TABLE 41

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	15	21	7			.07 - N/S
Masters degree	34	69	14			-.07 - N/S
Bachelors degree	38	118	26	2	1	.07 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	20	21	2			.07 - N/S
Masters degree	48	56	13			.06 - N/S
Bachelors degree	49	120	14	1	1	.13 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	14	23	4	2		.03 - N/S
Masters degree	28	78	10	1		.11 - N/S
Bachelors degree	50	90	38	4	3	.11 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Masters degree plus 30 sem. hrs.	31	9	1		2	-.09 - N/S
Masters degree	85	28	4			.02 - N/S
Bachelors degree	109	55	11	4	6	.01 - N/S

TABLE 42

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	28	91	27	2	1
Thirty to forty-five years	33	82	14		
Over forty-five years	26	35	6		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.02 - N/S
					-.04 - N/S
					-.04 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	36	92	19	1	1
Thirty to forty-five years	45	75	9		
Over forty-five years	37	28	2		
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.05 - N/S
					-.06 - N/S
					-.15 - N/S

98

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	39	73	33	2	2
Thirty to forty-five years	28	80	19	1	1
Over forty-five years	27	36	2	2	
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.08 - N/S
					.06 - N/S
					-.20 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Under thirty years	93	40	8	4	4
Thirty to forty-five years	84	36	7		2
Over forty-five years	48	16	1		2
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.02 - N/S
					-.03 - N/S
					.02 - N/S

TABLE 43

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH SEX:

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Male	50	116	24	2	1
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					-.16 - sig. between .05 & .01
Female	37	92	23		
					.16 - sig. at .05

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High School?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Male	64	108	19	1	1
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.02 - N/S
Female	53	88	11		
					.19 - sig. between .05 & .01

99

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High School?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Male	44	113	27	6	3
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.05 - N/S
Female	49	77	25	1	
					.23 - sig. between .01 & .005

<u>Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?</u>					
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Male	126	48	8	3	8
					CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
					.05 - N/S
Female	99	44	8	1	
					.14 - N/S

TABLE 44

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS AN EDUCATOR:

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under six years	28	89	27	2	1	-.03 - N/S
Six to fifteen years	33	84	13			.01 - N/S
Sixteen years and over	26	35	7			.13 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under six years	35	93	17	1	1	.03 - N/S
Six to fifteen years	48	73	9			.10 - N/S
Sixteen years and over	34	31	3			-.01 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under six years	36	68	35	5	3	-.11 - N/S
Six to fifteen years	32	84	14			.04 - N/S
Sixteen years and over	26	37	3	2		.16 - N/S

## Should the School-Liaison Officer continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under six years	91	35	11	4	6	.01 - N/S
Six to fifteen years	85	41	4			-.12 - N/S
Sixteen years and over	49	16	1		2	-.14 - N/S

TABLE 45

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A TEACHER IN FLINT:

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under five years	38	114	29	2	1	.11 - N/S
Five to ten years	19	56	10			.19 - N/S
Eleven years and over	30	37	9			.11 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under five years	51	110	21	1	1	.17 - sig. at .05
Five to ten years	34	45	6			.14 - N/S
Eleven years and over	32	41	3			.03 - N/S

Should the School-Liaison Officer perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under five years	51	84	42	5	2	.12 - N/S
Five to ten years	17	60	7		1	.04 - N/S
Eleven years and over	25	46	3	2		.24 - sig. at .05

Should the School-Liaison Officer Program continue to function in the secondary schools?

	SA	A	U	D	SD	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
Under five years	111	52	12	4	5	.14 - N/S
Five to ten years	63	18	3		1	-.01 - N/S
Eleven years and over	51	22	1		2	-.07 - N/S

SUMMARY: INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

The Senior High School-Liaison Officers' responses for the four areas of Liaison Officer involvement were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years of experience as a police officer; and years of experience as a School-Liaison Officer. The extremely small number of School-Liaison Officers at the Senior High School level presented a problem in the presentation of the correlation statistics. Some of the material presented in the tables appears to be statistically significant but, in reality, is not because of the small number of individuals involved.

Table 3 shows the responses of the School-Liaison Officers as correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found.

The responses of the Liaison Officers as correlated with age are displayed in Table 4. No significant differences were found for the School-Liaison Officer involvement in law enforcement functions, in education-related functions, and in program continuation. There was a significant difference, however, for the community relations functions among those officers in the age group over forty years. There was no difference in this same area for those officers under the age of forty.

There were no significant differences among the responses of the School-Liaison Officers when correlated with years as a police officer. This is shown in Table 5.

Table 6 shows the responses of the Liaison Officers correlated with years of experience as a School-Liaison Officer. No significant differences were found.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The Senior High School principals' responses to the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a principal in Flint.

Table 8 displays the principals' responses as correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found for this selected variable.

Senior High School principals' responses correlated with age are grouped in Table 9. No significant differences were found for School-Liaison Officer involvement in law enforcement functions, in community relations functions, and in program continuation. However, among those principals who were under the age of forty-five, there was a significant difference for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. They had a negative correlation of .61 which is significant at the alpha level.

The responses of the Senior High School principals correlated with years of experience as an educator are shown in Table 10. No significant differences were found among the respondents based upon this variable.

Table 11 shows the responses of these same individuals correlated with years of experience as a principal in Flint. No significant differences, based upon administrative experience, were found.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

The responses of the Senior High School counselors to the four School-Liaison Officer involvement areas were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; sex; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a counselor in Flint.

Table 13 shows the counselors' responses when correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found for law enforcement functions, community relations functions, and for program continuation. There was a difference significant between .01 and .005 for the performance of the education-related functions by the School-Liaison Officer for those counselors holding the Masters degree plus thirty semester hours.

The Senior High counselors' responses as correlated with age are shown in Table 14. No significant differences were found for the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement among the counselors' responses as based upon age.

The counselors' responses when correlated with sex are displayed in Table 15. No significant differences were found as based on sex.

Table 16 shows the counselors' responses correlated with their years of experience as an educator. No significant differences were found among Senior High School counselors based upon their years as an educator.

There were no significant differences among the responses of the Senior High School counselors correlated with their years of experience as a counselor in Flint. These are shown in Table 17.



INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

The responses of the Senior High School teachers to the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement were correlated with the selected variables of: educational preparation; age; sex; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a teacher in Flint.

Table 19 shows the responses of these Senior High teachers when correlated with their educational preparation. No significant differences were found using educational preparation as a criterion for correlation with the responses for the areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement.

The responses of the Senior High teachers correlated with age are displayed in Table 20. No significant differences were found in the responses for the performance of community relations functions and for program continuation. There was difference significant between the .01 and .005 probability level for the age group thirty to forty-five years for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools. The age group thirty to forty-five also showed a difference significant at the alpha level for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. The age group of under thirty years also had a difference significant at the alpha level for the performance of certain education-related functions by the Liaison Officer at the Senior High School level.

Table 21 displays the responses of the Senior High teachers correlated with sex. No significant differences were found.

The responses of the Senior High teachers correlated with their years of experience as an educator are shown on Table 22. No significant differences were found for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools. There was a significant difference beyond the .01 probability level for the six to fifteen years of experience group for the Liaison Officer performing certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools. This same age group also displayed a difference significant at the alpha level for the Liaison Officer performing certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. The sixteen years of experience and over group showed a difference significant at the .01 probability level for the School-Liaison Officer Program continuing to function in the secondary schools.

Table 23 shows the responses of the Senior High teachers correlated with years of experience in the Flint Public School system. No significant differences were found for the areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement in law enforcement functions, in community relations functions, and in education-related functions. A difference significant at alpha was found for the eleven years and over of experience in the Flint system for the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

The Junior High School-Liaison Officers' responses for the four areas of involvement were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years of experience as a police officer; and years of experience as a School-Liaison Officer. Table 25 shows the responses of the School-Liaison Officers correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found for the four areas of involvement.

The responses of the Junior High School-Liaison Officers correlated with age are displayed in Table 26. No significant differences were found.

There were no significant differences found among the responses of the Junior High School-Liaison Officers when correlated with years of experience as a police officer. This information is shown in Table 27.

Table 28 shows the Junior High Liaison Officers' responses correlated with years of experience as a School-Liaison Officer. No significant differences were found in the responses for the community relations functions, for the education-related functions, and for program continuation. A difference significant between the .05 and .01 level was found for those officers who had served as a School-Liaison Officer for over three years and the performance of certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The Junior High School principals' responses to the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a principal in Flint.

The responses of the principals as correlated with educational preparation are shown in Table 30. No significant differences were found for the involvement areas of law enforcement functions, community relations functions, and education-related functions. However, a difference significant beyond the .01 level of probability was found for those principals holding the Masters degree plus thirty semester hours and the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools.

Table 31 shows the responses of the Junior High principals correlated with age. No significant differences were found for the involvement areas of community relations functions, education-related functions, and program continuation. A difference significant between the .05 and .01 level of probability was found for the age group under forty-five and the performance of certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

No significant differences were found for the responses of the principals correlated with years of experience as an educator. This is shown in Table 32. There were also no significant differences found in the responses of the principals correlated with years of experience as a principal in Flint and are displayed in Table 33.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

The responses of the Junior High School counselors to the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement in certain law enforcement functions, in certain community relations function, in certain education-related functions, and program continuation were correlated with the selected variables of: educational preparation; age; sex; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a counselor in Flint.

Table 35 shows the counselors' responses correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found for the areas of law enforcement, community relations, and program continuation. There was a difference significant between the .01 and .005 level of probability for those with the Masters degree and the education-related functions of the School-Liaison Officer.

No significant differences were found for the counselors' responses to the four areas of involvement when correlated with age. This is shown in Table 36.

Table 37 shows no significant differences between the Junior High School counselors' responses correlated with sex.

No significant differences were found between years of experience as an educator and the Junior High counselors' responses to the sections on community relations functions, education-related functions, and program continuation. There was, however, a difference significant between the .05 and .01 level for those counselors with less than fifteen years of experience as an educator and the School-Liaison Officer performance of certain law enforcement functions in the

Junior High Schools. This is shown in Table 38.

There were no significant differences in the counselors' responses correlated with years of experience as a counselor in Flint, as displayed in Table 39.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS:  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

The responses of the Junior High teachers to the four areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement were correlated with the following selected variables: educational preparation; age; sex; years of experience as an educator; and years of experience as a teacher in Flint.

Table 41 gives the responses of the Junior High School teachers correlated with educational preparation. No significant differences were found.

No significant differences were found based upon answers to the four areas when correlated with age, and are shown in Table 42.

When the responses of the Junior High teachers were correlated with sex, however, there were some significant differences found in law enforcement functions, in community relations functions, and in education-related functions, but not in program continuation. Both males and females had a significant difference for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools. The males had a difference significant between the .05 and .01 level while the females had a difference significant at alpha. Females had a correlation coefficient significant between the .05 and

.01 level for the Liaison Officer performing certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools. In the section dealing with the performance of certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools by the School-Liaison Officer, again the females showed a difference significant between the .01 and .005 level of probability. This information is shown in Table 43.

Table 44 shows the Junior High teachers' responses correlated with years of experience as an educator and no significant differences were noted.

The responses of the teachers correlated with years of experience in the Flint Public School System are shown in Table 45. No significant differences were noted for performance of law enforcement functions and for program continuation. Those teachers employed in the Flint system for less than five years showed a difference significant at alpha for the performance of community relations functions by the School-Liaison Officer. There was also a difference significant at alpha for those teachers who had taught in the Flint system for eleven or more years and for the performance of certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools.

#### SUMMARY: INTER-GROUP ANALYSIS

Chapter IV began with a statistical analysis of the study data to determine the convergent and divergent expectations held by the four major respondent groups. Agreements and differences between groups regarding the role of School-Liaison Officers were identified in each of the involvement categories. The individual responses to each question on the questionnaire for the groups involved in this study are shown in Appendix B.

Hypothesis I - (Table 46) attempted to determine whether School-Liaison Officers should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools.  $H_1$  was rejected; all four Senior High respondent groups agreed in principle.

TABLE 46

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-SENIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	44%	38%	4%	12%	2%
II-SENIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	54%	24%	7%	13%	2%
III-SENIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	50%	32%	7%	7%	4%
IV-SENIOR HIGH TEACHERS	45%	35%	9%	9%	2%

Hypothesis II - (Table 47) examined the premise that School-Liaison Officers should perform certain community relations functions in the Senior High Schools.  $H_2$  was accepted. Significant differences existed between the Liaison Officers and teachers; and between counselors and teachers.

TABLE 47

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-SENIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	56%	44%	-	-	-
II-SENIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	48%	37%	11%	4%	-
III-SENIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	64%	25%	5%	5%	1%
IV-SENIOR HIGH TEACHERS	40%	44%	9%	6%	1%



Hypothesis III - (Table 48) postulated that the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Senior High Schools.  $H_3$  was rejected as there were no significant differences among the four major respondent groups.

TABLE 48

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS IN THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-SENIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	18%	45%	2%	24%	11%
II-SENIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	40%	31%	11%	13%	5%
III-SENIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	42%	34%	10%	10%	4%
IV-SENIOR HIGH TEACHERS	36%	39%	12%	9%	4%

Hypothesis IV - (Table 49) attempted to determine if there were any differences among the respondents who thought the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools.  $H_4$  was accepted as significant differences existed between Liaison Officers and principals; between Liaison Officers and counselors; between Liaison Officers and teachers; and between counselors and teachers.

TABLE 49

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PROGRAM CONTINUE TO FUNCTION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-SENIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	20%	60%	-	-	20%
II-SENIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	94%	6%	-	-	-
III-SENIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	88%	12%	-	-	-
IV-SENIOR HIGH TEACHERS	68%	28%	1%	-	3%

Hypothesis V - (Table 50) examined the premise that there was difference among the Junior High School respondents who thought the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools. The four Junior High respondent groups rejected  $H_5$  with no significant difference.

TABLE 50

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-JUNIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	49%	35%	5%	10%	1%
II-JUNIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	42%	34%	9%	12%	3%
III-JUNIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	41%	34%	10%	8%	7%
IV-JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS	45%	35%	8%	9%	3%

Hypothesis VI - (Table 51) attempted to determine if the Junior High School respondents thought the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain community relations functions in the Junior High Schools. The responses indicate rejection for  $H_6$ .

TABLE 51

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-JUNIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	59%	37%	1%	3%	-
II-JUNIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	58%	33%	7%	2%	-
III-JUNIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	44%	41%	8%	5%	2%
IV-JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS	44%	41%	10%	4%	1%

Hypothesis VII - (Table 52) postulated that there was significant difference among the Junior High respondents who thought the School-Liaison Officer should perform certain education-related functions in the Junior High Schools.  $H_7$  was accepted as significant differences existed for certain respondent groups: between Liaison Officers and teachers, between principals and counselors; and between counselors and teachers.

TABLE 52

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PERFORM CERTAIN EDUCATION-RELATED FUNCTIONS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-JUNIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	29%	35%	8%	14%	14%
II-JUNIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	39%	38%	7%	11%	5%
III-JUNIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	35%	38%	6%	8%	13%
IV-JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS	36%	38%	12%	9%	5%

Hypothesis VIII - (Table 53) attempted to determine if any difference existed among Junior High respondents who thought the School-Liaison Officer Program should continue to function in the secondary schools. There was no significant difference among respondents; therefore,  $H_8$  was rejected.

TABLE 53

SHOULD THE SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER PROGRAM CONTINUE TO FUNCTION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS?

	SA	A	U	D	SD
I-JUNIOR HIGH LIAISON OFFICERS	63%	37%	-	-	-
II-JUNIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS	87%	13%	-	-	-
III-JUNIOR HIGH COUNSELORS	61%	39%	-	-	-
IV-JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS	65%	27%	5%	1%	2%

## INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

This concluding section contains the personal comments made by some of the respondents. It was not included as a part of the statistical data but has been added to give more of a personal flavor to the views of those few who responded to the open-ended portion of the questionnaire. The comments are divided into four categories: constructive suggestions; negative comments; favorable comments; and those which could not be placed in any of the foregoing categories.

## CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

"A police officer in a school should not enforce the discipline policies of the school. He is there as a police officer and as such can only enter into situations involving local or state criminal laws."

"Investigating police complaints takes most of my time and not enough contact with students in elementary schools."

"It is the opinion of the writer that the faculty should bear in mind that the Liaison Officers are Police Officers and want to continue their status. There appears to be a tendency for the faculty to use them as attendance personnel, hall guards, whipping boys, etc. IT IS for this reason that several capable Officers no longer wish to remain in the program."

"With the emphasis on prevention I would feel the program would be more effective at the elementary level with the officer cooperating with the school principal and social worker."

PRINCIPAL

"The Liaison Officer is first a policeman--his services are secondary to the school situation."

"We need our police counselor here from before the school day begins until the close of day; the same as administrators' hours."

"Right now they are spread too thin -- 1 more to 1 school."

COUNSELORS

"I think the school-liaison officers should be in uniform and drive a police car."

"Keep him free to assist school officials when he is required to perform law enforcement duties."

"Like anything else, the effectiveness of this program, as I see it, depends on the personality of the officer involved. I have worked with 4 different officers. Two of them in my estimation were very beneficial to the school while the two others were marginal in my estimation."

TEACHERS

"I feel a certain distinction should be kept between the police counselor and regular counselors."

"S-L Officers ought to communicate more frequently with classroom personnel re: mutual problems."

"I do not feel they should be armed on routine school business."

"This officer should play a large role in direct contact with problem students -- acting, not in the capacity of a counselor, but

a figure of authority and friendship. To often I feel they neglect many students when they should be most concerned with the potential criminals!"

"School-Liaison Officers should, as all policemen, receive more training, both sensitivity and educational training. Too many 'cops' are in schools poisoning minds with 'their cop' mentality. They must be screened educationally and psychologically."

"These liaison officers should be screened in depth concerning racial and religious prejudice. They should be open, friendly persons with kids and school personnel, but VERY FIRM on enforcement."

"Should be in uniform and 'look the part' -- His role is being a policeman."

"The School-Liaison Officers shouldn't be in the schools as a threat, and this should be made clear to the pupils, teachers, administration, and community. A positive picture of these officers should be promoted and understood. The majority of people should be able to talk to these officers without negative attitudes."

"Work with school officials and maintain order on the outside premises but not be present continually in the school."

"The teachers should be informed more of what he is doing and how it affects his or her students."

"We have this program but everything is so 'hush-hush' there is no visible help to classroom teachers."

"This officer should be a degreed person with courses in sociology and psychology."

"I feel that the role of this officer should be a more positive

role. Working on prevention not apprehension."

"If the school-liaison officer has the main role of arresting, then he should wear a uniform; if his main role is investigation, detection and reforming, then no uniform would be required. A gun should be used only if it has proven to be necessary in the past. Otherwise, there is no need for one, and it would upset radical students less."

"All Jr. High Schools and High Schools should have at least two uniformed officers on duty at all times. Students would then become accustomed to seeing such uniformed officers and thereby, the sensation and shock of seeing police in the school would be reduced. The influence of a uniform can be a positive one."

"If a S-L program is to be continued, let the officer wear a uniform. A uniform alone can be a deterrent."

"It is not the purpose of a liaison officer to prevent delinquency--this is being ideal and not realistic--rather he should examine referrals from the school staff."

"Too often we pay school-liaison people just to sit in the office and listen to complaints. If they were more active or just seen occasionally in the buildings by the students I don't believe we would have so many complaints."

"We need men who can develop good relations with people and still come on strong when necessary, not sit in a corner. A leader in short."

"Inform the school personnel on the present job of the School-Liaison Officers."

"Should also function in 5th and 6th grade programs. Many problems could be resolved before junior high."

"The present program is effective. However, officer should only be responsible for the hard core cases, and minor infractions should be handled by the principal and teachers."

"Continue to put well qualified men in these positions. In inner city schools which are predominantly Negro, the liaison officer should be Negro, if qualified. I'm white."

"This has proven to be a very helpful position in our inner-city school without which we would have had many more difficulties than have occurred. My concern is that such a position would not be overloaded with 'consulting' situations to the detriment of the delinquency area."

"Be part of the Building staff. Have administrative authority to suspend or discipline students."

"I would like more communication between him and teachers."

"Act more as a counseling agent."

"The School-Liaison Officer should be a policeman whose patrol is the school. He should apprehend anyone on school property who is violating a law of society or a law of the school."

"The officer shouldn't have so many responsibilities that he becomes ineffective."

"We have had many instances in which the Liaison man was out of the building when sorely needed, so I'm concerned about the PR portion of his duties such as attending service club meetings to explain his program, etc....We seem to be having more problems with the girls



than ever before. It appears to me that we need a female Liaison officer."

"I would suggest officer's duties be clearly defined and limited to maintaining a safe and secure atmosphere in which education can function in and around the school. He should be involved in only matters over and above the application of normal disciplinary procedures, which I believe to be an administrative and staff responsibility."

"One man won't have time to do all the desirable things you have listed. He should under no circumstances worry about being 'friends' with the Students."

"A school-liaison officer should realize fully that teachers are trained to teach ∴ are, I hope, professional people."

"Include in the elementary schools."

"He should be given more power."

#### NEGATIVE COMMENTS

##### SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

"Liaison men in the high schools do not function as the original philosophy of the program: crime prevention and the early detection of delinquent behavior. Separate programs of junior high versus senior high should be outlined."

##### PRINCIPALS

There were no negative comments from any of the principals involved in this study.

##### COUNSELORS

No negative comments were made by those counselors who were

involved in this study.

#### TEACHERS

"As I have indicated in preferences, I believe they should be much more active in the school community. Up to now they are practically unseen, unknown and unoccupied during the school day -- their worth in their present capacity -- nil."

"I believe that the employment of School-Liaison Officers is unnecessary, irrational, immoral and expensive. They are still 'cops' and often poor ones."

"On general principles I disagree with placing policemen in the schools."

"They should have no function in a public school. It is a form of intimidation to have police in the school. Some of the methods used, and right wing racist statements made by our Police-Liaison Officer make him unfit to be in a place where a free education is being offered."

"DO AWAY WITH THEM ALL."

"It is my observation that the police liaison officers do things that should be done by school officials, that the youngsters still know him as a policeman whether plain-clothes or not, and that it would be far more straight-forward to put police in uniform in and around the school buildings -- function as uniformed police on hand to serve in a police capacity -- i.e. prevention of crime and apprehension of lawbreakers."

"I feel they should be withdrawn from the schools. To me they are aimed specifically at the Black Community! and they are ANATHEMA

TO BLACK PEOPLE! -- all they do is enforce middle class white ethics and mores."

"A policeman's job is to enforce the laws of the community. He can do this in schools insofar as these laws are concerned, and should not have special privileges which permit him to abridge the civil liberties of the student."

#### FAVORABLE COMMENTS

##### SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

"The relationship has been excellent with tremendous results, which have prevented delinquent acts, and aided in clearing acts that have occurred."

##### PRINCIPALS

"In our building we feel we have a very good working relationship between counseling, administrative staff, and the School-Liaison Officer."

"I have found this resource of great value, and I am certain his services have been a deterrent."

"I have worked with this program since its inception. I feel that it has been a tremendous success. It is unfortunate that because of changing conditions in schools that much of the counseling function has been displaced by 'police work'."

"We have had excellent personnel at our school. I firmly support the program."

"I have worked personally with School-Liaison Officers for several years. The relationship -- working and personal -- has

been excellent. I have nothing but the highest regard for this program."

"We have had excellent personnel at our school. I firmly support the program."

"This has been one of the most constructive things we have done in the schools. We can now work together instead of going our separate ways as we did before the start of this program."

"Very beneficial and helpful program, especially in large city areas."

"I do not feel I could do my job justice without the help of our Liaison Officer."

#### COUNSELORS

"A good cooperative effort to work very closely with counselors, teachers, and students in all behavioral situations which might prevent delinquency or irresponsible behavior."

"We certainly appreciate our School-Liaison Officer."

"In the Flint Schools, since tension and stress is so great and the crime rate is high in this area -- the school-liaison officer is a MUST! We are fortunate in our building to have an officer who uses discretion when working with students, parents, and school personnel. Much of his information is confidential and he respects the rights and confidences when working with all people. This is most important in this program."

"We have a fine School-Liaison Officer who helps our school in many of the ways pointed out in this questionnaire. In the troubled times of 1969 I feel we need a strong person who is

sophisticated enough in the crime situation to recognize the significance of actions and events which have criminal or antisocial overtones or implications."

"Today this is a necessary function in our schools."

"I think the Flint Program is a fine start. Services have not changed or expanded since the program began 4 or 5 years ago. There should and must be improvement periodically for if you maintain status quo, you lose ground from year to year."

#### TEACHERS

"A stronger police force must be put in our schools. If the present situation continues, teachers will not be able to stay in our public schools."

"I obviously feel that they should be more than just a law enforcement agent."

"As I understand the system and see it in operation, I am satisfied with it in most respects."

"I feel that this program is a good one."

"It should function at all levels of schooling."

"The program seems to be working well in our building, largely because it is fairly unobtrusive, and our officer has good rapport with the students. I think it would fail completely if the officer were asked to enforce school discipline. If the officer stopped counseling and started ordering students around, I would be very much against the program."

"I feel our School-Liaison Officer has done a fine job in most of the areas mentioned above. I think it is a good program."

"I feel the liaison officers are doing a fine job and the program should be kept or expanded."

"All of my contacts have been very fine BUT in Time of Trouble -- All areas of the School should be watched -- during Disturbances the Teachers NEED Extra Help and police power I think IS The Answer."

"They are doing fine just as they are."

"School-Liaison Officers are needed! Get back to the system where the 'cop' on the beat knows his neighborhood family. Have an adequate number of officers to allow personal contact. Break barriers of distrust! People have a tendency not to do something bad if they think someone who knows them is watching."

"The liaison officers should definitely be kept in the secondary schools."

"I feel that this is a very important part of the secondary school system."

"Have seen this program work. Feel that it is fine."

"Our program has been very successful; however, this would depend on the personality of the police counselor. I understand the project has not been equally successful at all schools."

"I would hate to think of what our building would be without this program."

"Please keep them in the secondary schools."

"Our officer is doing a great job."

"Keep the program--give more training to the officers."

"Considering the situations which we have in our school systems today it would be a great loss if we did not have such a person on

our staff."

"I feel that we need these liaison officers in the schools. We need all the help we can get."

"We don't have enough of them, and we need all the professional help to support us that we can possible get -- our situation is truly becoming desperate."

"I feel we need more than one and one officer as head of any number. This would provide a closer look at problem students and could be done in more areas."

"Officers fill a needed role -- a) detective and intelligence operations; b) crime prevention; c) 'presence' that does keep many students in line. Officers appeal to me as a necessary link between the community--and duties of a principal. Especially since so much crime is tried by youth. Positive good -- like helping to steer youth clear of crime -- is welcomed by whoever has talent and skill in this area."

"I feel this program is very much needed."

"I don't believe that educators would seriously consider eliminating School-Liaison Officers from the secondary schools. They are needed as much as counselors."

"A School-Liaison Officer is very much needed in the schools."

"I started teaching in the Flint Schools at the time the P.L.P. was initiated. I have witnessed a marked favorable change in general student attitude toward the police counselor. I feel that by working at the building and community level the Police Counselor has been able to help many youngsters by directing them away from a life of crime."

"Each year, it seems, they are needed more and should have greater

power in making arrests, etc....There is still too much loitering, assaults, stealing, in each school building."

#### UNCLASSIFIABLE STATEMENTS

##### SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS

No unclassifiable statements were made by the Liaison Officers.

##### PRINCIPALS

No unclassifiable statements were made by the principals.

##### COUNSELORS

No unclassifiable statements were made by the counselors.

##### TEACHERS

"I don't believe in police in schools, but I can see the necessity for them in certain areas. When police are necessary there is something drastically wrong with the system, and the system should be changed. I would have to, therefore, strongly disagree with any police in schools except in emergencies. And yet at the same time I agree that they are necessary in this poor educational system."

"I don't like to have police in school -- BUT since people, both in school and out, have created a situation which makes police protection necessary, lets give a good man a free hand to deal with the small minority so that the majority can work and learn in safety."

"I dislike the idea of having police in the schools but this modern generation seems to warrant this type of supervision. It is unfortunate but we have to be realistic and face the facts."

"I believe the objections against the school-liaison program is



a part of the effort to hurt America. Anyone who does not believe so should acquaint himself with the reports of the Unamerican Activities Committee of Congress and of J. Edgar Hoover."

"It is regrettable that it is necessary to have school-liaison officers. However, it is also very regrettable that we have a few students who insist on threatening teachers and disrupting schools. Since many of these disruptive students are allowed to remain in schools I must support a strong School-Liaison Officer program."

"A school-liaison officer is much better than having uniformed police at dances, etc...."

#### SUMMARY

The author has presented the statistical analyses of the four major groups of role definers and has presented the tables showing the analysis of the selected variables. In addition to the statistical analyses, the comments given by the respondents were included to give more of a personal flavor of the actual feelings of the respondents.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken in an attempt to clarify the role of the School-Liaison Officer in the secondary school setting by determining what secondary school principals, secondary school counselors, secondary school teachers, and School-Liaison Officers thought that role should be. Expectations held by the four major respondent groups for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in performing selected law enforcement functions; performing selected community relations functions; performing selected education-related functions; and the continuation of the program were correlated with certain selected variables. Inter-group differences were sought as potential areas of role conflict.

#### SUMMARY

##### SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS:

The School-Liaison Officers who were involved in this study included one Detective-Lieutenant, four Detective-Sergeants, and eight Detectives. The Detective-Lieutenant is the Coordinator of School-Liaison Officers for the Flint Police Department and had been

a Liaison Officer in one of the Senior High Schools prior to becoming a Lieutenant. The remaining twelve officers were active as Liaison Officers. These thirteen police officers were the focal group for this particular study.

The Senior High Liaison Officers and the Liaison Officer Coordinator held majority agreement for the Liaison Officer performing certain selected law enforcement functions, performing certain selected community relations functions, and for program continuation. However, there was a divergence of expectations in the section dealing with the performance of certain selected education-related functions. An arithmetical percentage of 21 agreement in each choice category among the respondents constituted majority agreement for that particular category in this study. There was a majority agreement of 24% in the disagree category and 11% in the strongly disagree category. There was also a near majority agreement of 20% in the strongly disagree category for the continuation of the program.

The Junior High Liaison Officers held a majority agreement for all four of the Liaison Officer involvement areas, although they did have 14% level for strongly disagreeing and a 14% level for disagreeing with the continuation of the program.

The responses of both groups for the four areas of involvement correlated with educational preparation showed no significant differences.

The correlation of responses to age showed no significant differences in the four areas for the Junior High respondents. However, for the Senior High respondents, there was a significant difference for the second area, that of the performance of community



relations functions. Those officers in the age group over forty years did display a significant difference for the performance of community relations functions. Those under the age of forty did not show any significant differences for this same area.

The responses correlated with years of experience as a School-Liaison Officer for the Senior High School respondents did not display any significant differences. Among the Junior High respondents, however, there was a significant difference for one of the involvement areas. A significant difference was found for those officers who had served as a School-Liaison Officer over three years and for the performance of certain selected law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools. In the remaining areas of involvement, no significant differences were found the the Junior High School-Liaison Officers.

In response to the open-ended question, six officers responded. Four officers made constructive comments, one made a negative comment, and one made a favorable comment.

#### SECONDARY PRINCIPALS:

The secondary school principals involved in this study included sixteen from the four Senior High Schools and twenty-three from the eight Junior High Schools. Although they could be classified in Flint as a principal or deputy principal or assistant principal, for the purposes of this study, they are classified under the single category of principal.

The Senior High School principals and the Junior High School principals held a majority agreement (21% or more per choice category),



either strongly agreeing or agreeing on all four of the School-Liaison Officer involvement areas.

The correlation of the Senior High responses with educational preparation showed no significant differences for the four areas of involvement. No significant differences were found for the Junior High principals' responses correlated with educational preparation in the involvement areas of law enforcement functions, community relations functions, and education-related functions. There was a significant difference for those principals holding the Masters degree plus thirty semester hours and the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer program in the secondary schools.

The Senior High principals' responses when correlated with age showed no significant differences for the School-Liaison Officer involvement in selected law enforcement functions, selected community relations functions and in program continuation. There was a significant difference among those Senior High principals under the age of forty-five and the School-Liaison Officer performing certain selected education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. The Junior High principals' responses when correlated with age showed no significant differences for the Liaison Officer involvement in community relations functions, in education-related functions, and in program continuation. A significant difference was found for those Junior High principals under the age of forty-five and the performance of certain selected law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools by the Liaison Officers.

There were no significant differences found for either of the principal group responses when they were correlated with years of

experience as an educator.

No significant differences were found in either principal group responses when correlated with years of experience as a principal in Flint.

From the open-ended question, there were three constructive suggestions, no negative comments, eight favorable remarks, and no unclassifiable remarks.

#### SECONDARY COUNSELORS:

The secondary school counselors involved in this study included thirty-three from the Senior High Schools and twenty-three from the Junior High Schools. The fifty-six secondary school counselors held a majority agreement (21% or greater agreement per choice category) for the four School-Liaison Officer involvement areas.

The Senior High counselors' responses when correlated with educational preparation revealed that no significant differences existed for the School-Liaison Officer performing certain selected law enforcement functions, certain selected community relations functions, and for program continuation. There was a significant difference for the performance of certain selected education-related functions by the School-Liaison Officer and those counselors holding the Masters degree plus thirty semester hours. The Junior High School counselors' responses correlated with educational preparation showed no significant differences for the Liaison Officer performing certain selected law enforcement functions, selected community relations functions, and for program continuation. There was, however, a significant difference for the Junior High counselors with the



Masters degree and the performance of certain selected education-related functions by the School-Liaison Officer.

No significant differences were found for either counselor groups when their responses for the four Liaison Officer involvement areas were correlated with age.

When the responses of the two counselor groups for the four involvement areas were correlated with sex, no significant differences were noted.

The Senior High counselors' responses to the four Liaison Officer involvement areas were correlated with years of experience as an educator and revealed that there were no significant differences for any of the areas. No significant differences were found in the years of experience as an educator correlated with the Junior High counselors' responses for the Liaison Officer involvement areas of community relations functions, education-related functions, and program continuation. There was a significant difference for those counselors with less than fifteen years of experience and the Liaison Officer performing certain selected law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools.

No significant differences were found for either respondent group when their responses were correlated with years of experience as a counselor in Flint.

Three constructive suggestions were made by the counselors in response to the open-ended portion of the questionnaire. No negative comments were elicited, six favorable comments were made, and no unclassifiable statements came from the counselors.

#### SECONDARY TEACHERS:

When the secondary teachers involved in this study and who returned

the demographic data for classification purposes included two hundred and seventy-six Senior High School teachers and three hundred and forty-five Junior High School teachers. The secondary teachers held a majority agreement (21% or greater agreement per choice category) for the School-Liaison Officer involvement in the four areas of this study.

When the Senior High School and Junior High School teachers' responses were correlated with their educational preparation, no significant differences were found.

The responses of the Senior High School teachers when correlated with age showed no significant differences between responses and performance of selected community relations functions, nor between responses and program continuation. There was a significant difference between the responses of the age group thirty to forty-five years and the performance of selected law enforcement functions in the Senior High Schools by the School-Liaison Officer. This same age of thirty to forty-five also displayed a significant difference between their responses and the Liaison Officer performing certain selected education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. The age group of under thirty years also showed a significant difference between their responses and the Liaison Officer performing selected education-related functions in the Senior High Schools. However, no significant differences were found among the Junior High responses when correlated with age for any of the four areas of Liaison Officer involvement.

There were no significant differences for the Senior High School teachers' responses for the four involvement areas when correlated with sex. When the Junior High School teachers' responses were

correlated with sex, some significant differences were found in the School-Liaison Officer's performance of selected law enforcement functions, selected community relations functions, and in selected education-related functions. No significant differences were noted for program continuation. Both males and females had a significant difference in their responses for the School-Liaison Officer performing selected law enforcement functions in the Junior High Schools. The female teachers also had a significant difference for the Liaison Officer performing selected community relations functions in the Junior High Schools. In the section dealing with the School-Liaison Officer performing selected education-related functions in the Junior High Schools, the females had a significant difference between their responses and this activity.

The correlation of Senior High School teachers' responses to the variable of years of experience as an educator showed no significant difference for the School-Liaison Officer performing selected community relations functions in the Senior High Schools. There was a significant difference between the responses of six to fifteen years of experience group and the performance of selected law enforcement functions by the School-Liaison Officer. This same group also showed a significant difference for the School-Liaison Officer performing selected education-related functions at the Senior High level. The sixteen years of experience and over group displayed a significant difference between their responses and the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools. The Junior High School teachers' responses when correlated with years of experience as an educator showed no significant differences for the four areas



of School-Liaison Officer involvement.

The responses of the Senior High School teachers were correlated with years of experience in the Flint system and no significant differences were noted for the Liaison Officer involvement areas of law enforcement functions, community relations functions, and education-related functions. There was, however, a significant difference between the responses of the eleven years and over of experience in the Flint system and the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program in the secondary schools. The responses of the Junior High School teachers correlated with years of experience in the Flint system showed no significant differences for the performance of selected law enforcement functions and for program continuation. Those Junior High teachers employed in the Flint system for less than five years showed a significant difference between their responses and the performance of selected community relations functions in the Junior High Schools by the Liaison Officers. There was also a significant difference between the responses of those Junior High teachers who had taught in the Flint system for eleven years or more and the performance of selected education-related functions by the Liaison Officer in the Junior High Schools.

In response to the open-ended portion of the questionnaire, thirty-five teachers made constructive suggestions, eight made negative comments, thirty made favorable comments, and six unclassifiable statements were made by those responding to that portion of the questionnaire.

Caution must be exercised in attempting to generalize beyond the research population involved in this study, since any conclusions

that are drawn from the data must be governed by the following limitations: responses were restricted to secondary school principals, secondary school counselors, secondary school teachers, and School-Liaison Officers; the data was drawn from a restricted geographic area; the total number of secondary school personnel in the Flint Public School system were not represented in this study; and the small number of School-Liaison Officer respondents complicated and limited the statistical analysis.

### CONCLUSIONS

A study such as this quite naturally leads to several conclusions. These conclusions are based on the data gathered during the period of time this study consumed. The conclusions are distinct and separate from the recommendations. The latter will be presented at a later point in this chapter.

I- The secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers as a group agreed on the performance of law enforcement functions, on the performance of community relations functions, on the performance of education-related functions, and for the continuation of the School-Liaison Officer Program.

II- Among the secondary school principals there was majority agreement for all the areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement. However, there was a minority group who thought the School-Liaison Officer should not perform selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

III- The significant others held a majority agreement for the

School-Liaison Officer performing those functions in the four involvement areas. There was a minority divergence of expectations for the School-Liaison Officer performing selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

IV- The School-Liaison Officers held a majority agreement for the School-Liaison Officer's performance of functions in the four involvement areas. Among the School-Liaison Officers there was also a minority divergence of expectations for the School-Liaison Officer performing selected education-related functions in the secondary schools.

V- There was a convergence of expectations among the major groups in this study for the School-Liaison Officer's role in performing selected law enforcement functions, selected community relations functions, and for program continuation. This agreement for these three areas of School-Liaison Officer involvement in the secondary school setting offer avenues to follow in the utilization of School-Liaison Officers in the secondary schools.

VI- There was a divergence of expectations, albeit in the minority, among the groups for the School-Liaison Officer's role in performing selected education-related functions in the secondary schools. Although in the minority, the actual presence of this number and the personnel involved (four School-Liaison Officers; seven principals; ten counselors; and eighty-four teachers) may present areas of conflict which could cause role conflicts among the secondary school personnel.





## RECOMMENDATIONS

This particular study was designed to determine whether School-Liaison Officers should be involved in an educational setting. This research has suggested some direction for the involvement of the School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting. Specifically, the author would make the following recommendations:

I - A re-examination of the education-related functions of the School-Liaison Officer by the Flint Board of Education, Administration, and the Flint Police Department;

II - The Flint Police Department Command and Supervisory Staff should take steps to re-evaluate the present School-Liaison Officer selection program;

III - A re-assessment of the School-Liaison Officer Program every three years by representatives from the Flint Board of Education, the Administration, the Flint Education Association<sup>1</sup>, and the Flint Police Department. This re-assessment should be undertaken in light of changing legal opinions and judicial decisions regarding juveniles;

IV - An in-depth, in-service training program, conducted by the Flint School Administration, to acquaint all secondary school academic personnel with the School-Liaison Officer Program and the primary functions of the School-Liaison Officer;

V - The establishment of different programs for the Junior High Schools and for the Senior High Schools.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Flint Education Association is now known as the United Federation of Teachers.

There is relatively little doubt that the School-Liaison Officer Program will continue to grow with more and more communities developing such a program for their respective school systems. Hopefully, this study has suggested certain steps which would lead to a School-Liaison Officer Program where there would be less divergent expectations and thus, less role conflict between secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer.

## APPENDIX A

### LETTERS USED IN THIS STUDY

Directory	Page
Letter to Flint Chief of Police.....	144
Letter to Flint Education Association President.....	145
Letter to Flint Education Association Executive Director.....	146
Letter to Flint School Pupil-Personnel Director.....	148
Letter from Police Chief Approving of Study.....	150
Letter from Flint Education Association Director Approving of Study.....	151
Letter from Flint Pupil-Personnel Director Approving of Study.....	152
Letter to Liaison Officers.....	153
General Information Data Sheet: School-Liaison Officers.....	154
Letter to Administrators.....	156
General Information Data Sheet: Secondary Principals.....	157
Letter to Counselors and Teachers.....	158
General Information Data Sheet: Counselors and Teachers.....	159



(Letter to Mr. James Rutherford, Chief of Police, requesting permission to conduct the research project, using the School-Liaison Officers.)

February 13, 1969

Mr. James Rutherford  
Chief of Police  
Flint Police Department  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Dear Chief Rutherford:

I am a Doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Michigan State University. My major field is school administration. Through conversations with Professors Arthur Brandstatter and Louis Radelet I have developed an interest in the School-Liaison Officer Program. I have talked to Sergeant Frank Rutherford in December and he gave me some of the historical development of the Program. As a result of my interest I have selected this School-Liaison Officer Program as my doctoral dissertation topic. My tentative topic is a study of the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary school teachers and secondary school counselors), and School-Liaison Officers for the role of the School-Liaison Officer.

The major study objectives provide a guide to an organized approach for a research project. In this study, the research is formulated to:

1. Judge, on the basis of the expectations held by secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers, the extent to which the School-Liaison Officer should be involved in an educational setting.
2. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others and School-Liaison Officers held convergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.
3. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.

In order to determine the expectations and perceptions of the School-Liaison Officers, it will be necessary to involve them in the study. Therefore, I request departmental permission to send questionnaires to the twelve School-Liaison Officers involved in the Program.

Upon completion of the study, a copy of the data will be forwarded to you. If there are any questions, please feel free to call me. My telephone number is 332-5937.

Sincerely,

Frederick J. Walsh

(Letter to Mrs. Virginia Miller, President of the Flint Education Association, requesting permission to conduct the research project, using the FEA members.)

February 13, 1969

Mrs. Virginia Miller, President  
Flint Education Association  
1005 W. Third Avenue  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Dear Mrs. Miller:

I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Mr. Lou Beer, Executive Director of the Flint Education Association, asking for the permission and cooperation of the Flint Education Association in conducting a Doctoral research study on the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary teachers and counselors), and School-Liaison Officers for the role of the School-Liaison Officer in the Flint secondary school system.

I would appreciate any help you can give me in facilitating the gathering of the necessary data. If you have any questions, feel free to call me. My telephone number is 332-5937.

Sincerely,

Frederick J. Walsh

Enclosure



(Letter to Mr. Lou Beer, Executive Director, Flint Education Association, requesting permission to conduct the research project, using secondary school personnel holding membership in the FEA.)

Mr. Lou Beer  
Executive Director  
Flint Education Association  
1005 W. Third Avenue  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Dear Mr. Beer:

I am a Doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Michigan State University. My major field is school administration. Presently, I am in the process of getting approval of my dissertation research. The research involves a study of the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary teachers and counselors), and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer in the Flint secondary schools.

The secondary school personnel who would be involved in this study are: the twelve school principals; the guidance counselors; the teachers; and the twelve School-Liaison Officers to whom questionnaires would be directed. A request to involve the latter group in this study has been made to James Rutherford, Flint Chief of Police.

The Study Objectives for the research are formulated to:

1. Judge, on the basis of the expectations held by secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary school teachers and secondary school guidance counselors), and School-Liaison Officers, the extent to which the School-Liaison Officer should be involved in an educational setting.
2. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold convergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.
3. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.





- 2 -

The foregoing objectives outline the principal format of study. I request the permission and cooperation of the Flint Education Association to conduct this study among the secondary school personnel concerned. Mr. Clifford Worden, a former teaching colleague and presently Executive Secretary of the Lansing School Employees Association, gave me your name and address. When the study is completed, a copy of the data will be forwarded to you. If there are any questions, please feel free to call me. My telephone number is 332-5937.

Sincerely,

Frederick J. Walsh

cc.-Mrs. Virginia Miller  
President-Flint Education Assoc.



(Letter to Mr. Lester B. Ehrbright, Director, Pupil Personnel Services, requesting permission to conduct the research project, using secondary school personnel employed by the Flint Public School System.)

February 13, 1969

Mr. Lester B. Ehrbright, Director  
Pupil Personnel Services  
Flint Community Schools  
923 E. Kearsley Street  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Dear Mr. Ehrbright:

I am a Doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Michigan State University. My major field is school administration. Presently, I am in the process of getting approval of my dissertation research. The research involves a study of the expectations of secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary teachers and counselors), and School-Liaison Officers for the role of School-Liaison Officer in the Flint secondary schools.

The secondary school personnel who would be involved in this study are: the twelve school principals; the guidance counselors; the teachers; and the twelve School-Liaison Officers to whom questionnaires would be directed. A request to involve the latter group in this study has been made to Mr. James Rutherford, Flint Chief of Police.

The Study Objectives for this research are formulated to:

1. Judge, on the basis of the expectations held by secondary school principals, significant others (i.e. secondary school teachers and secondary school guidance counselors), and School-Liaison Officers, the extent to which the School-Liaison Officer should be involved in an educational setting.
2. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold convergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.
3. Identify issues where secondary school principals, significant others, and School-Liaison Officers hold divergent expectations for the involvement of School-Liaison Officers in an educational setting.

- 2 -

The foregoing objectives outline the principal format of study. I request the permission and cooperation of the Flint Public School System to conduct this study among the secondary school personnel concerned. When the study is completed, a copy of the data will be forwarded to you. If there are any questions, please feel free to call me. My telephone number is 332-5937.

Sincerely,

Frederick J. Walsh

(Letter from the Department of Public Safety, City of Flint, Michigan, granting permission to conduct the research project.)

February 14, 1969

Frederick J. Walsh  
1551 Parkvale Avenue  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Walsh:

Please be advised that you have my permission to forward questionnaires to the 12 School-Liaison Officers of the Flint Police Department. I might further suggest that you send one to Lt. James A. Mills, who is the coordinator of the program and acts as the department's representative with the Mott Programs relative to problems and suggestions for improvements in the program.

If there is any other way we can be of service to you please rest assured that we would be more than happy to assist you. Looking forward to seeing you in the near future, I remain,

Sincerely,

James W. Rutherford,  
Chief of Police

:bz

(Letter from the Flint Education Association, Flint, Michigan, granting permission to conduct the research project with the F.E.A. members.)

February 19, 1969

Mr. Frederick J. Walsh  
1551 Parkvale Avenue  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Walsh:

Thank you for your letter of February 13, 1969, requesting our cooperation in your doctoral research.

We would be happy to cooperate in any way we can in this project. However, I should inform you that of the school personnel you mentioned only the teachers and counselors are members of our bargaining unit. The FEA does not include administrators and, of course, the school-liaison officers are employed by the City Police Department.

Please feel free to contact me at your convenience about what specific help you might need.

Sincerely yours,

FLINT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Louis D. Beer  
Executive Director

LDB/r

(Letter from the Administration Building, Flint Community Schools,  
concerning my request to conduct the research project in the Flint  
Public Schools.)

February 28, 1969

Mr. Frederick J. Walsh  
1551 Parkvale Avenue  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Walsh:

Your letter of February 13, 1969, indicating your readiness to  
start you work on the Police Liaison Program is very interesting.

I have shown it to Dr. Jack Mobley, our Director of Secondary  
Education. He would like very mucy for you to get in touch with  
him before you prepare any schedule.

Due to pending efforts of the ACLU to have the program withdrawn  
from our system, he would like to have you meet with him and appropriate  
secondary principals.

He can be reached at this same address.

Sincerely,

Lester B. Ehrbright, Director  
Pupil Personnel Services  
923 E. Kearsley Street  
Flint, Michigan 48502

LBE/cw

cc: Mrs. Harriet Latimer  
Dr. Jack Mobley



(Copy of the letter mailed to the Liaison Officer requesting their cooperation in the research project.)

Dear Liaison Officer:

In most educational research, much information is needed from those individuals who work in the schools. You are one of those people who are naturally involved in this research on School-Liaison Officers because of your function. Permission to conduct this study has been given by Chief Rutherford, Lt. Mills and Dr. Mobley, the Director of Secondary Education for the Flint Community Schools.

The material that follows begins with a general information page, followed by a continuum type of questionnaire. This has been timed and it probably will take you less than 15 minutes to complete. Please do not identify yourself or your school by name. Upon completion of the questionnaire, please mail it back to me using the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. Discard this cover letter. I would very much like to receive this no later than May 1, 1969.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your professional assistance. Results of this study will be forthcoming as soon as they are available.

Appreciatively,

Frederick J. Walsh

## GENERAL INFORMATION: School-Liaison Officers

1. How many years have you been: (Please respond numerically to each item)

- a- a police officer \_\_\_\_\_
- b- a police officer in Flint \_\_\_\_\_
- c- a School-Liaison Officer \_\_\_\_\_
- d- a School-Liaison Officer in grades 7-9 \_\_\_\_\_
- e- a School-Liaison Officer in grades 10-12 \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is the highest level of education you have reached? (check one)

- a- below 12th grade \_\_\_\_\_
- b- high school graduate \_\_\_\_\_
- c- at least two years of college \_\_\_\_\_
- d- Bachelor's degree \_\_\_\_\_
- e- Master's degree \_\_\_\_\_
- f- other (please specify)  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

4. What is your present assignment? (Please check one choice)

- a- a School-Liaison Officer in grades 7-9 \_\_\_\_\_
- b- a School-Liaison Officer in grades 10-12 \_\_\_\_\_
- c- other (please specify)  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Have classroom teachers in your building been cooperative in their dealings with you?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(continued on next page)

6. Has the building principal been cooperative in his dealings with you?

---

---

7. Have you had access to school records of those students in whom you were interested?

---

---

8. Would you personally like to continue in this work?

---

---

(Copy of the letter mailed to the principals requesting their cooperation in the research project.)

Dear Administrator:

In most educational research, much information is needed from those people who make things happen. You are one of those people and thus you are involved in this research on secondary school personnel and School-Liaison Officers. Permission to conduct this study has been given by the Director of Research; Director of Secondary Education; the Senior High Principals and the Junior High Principals.

The material that follows begins with a general information page, followed by a continuum type of questionnaire. This has been timed and it probably will take you less than 15 minutes to complete. Please do not identify yourself or your school by name. Upon completing the questionnaire, please mail it back to me, using the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope, discarding this cover letter. I would like to receive this no later than May 1, 1969.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your professional assistance. Results of this study will be forthcoming as soon as they are available.

Appreciatively,

Frederick J. Walsh

## GENERAL INFORMATION: Secondary School Principals

1. How many years have you been: (Please respond numerically to each item)

- a- an educator \_\_\_\_\_ years
- b- an educator in your present district \_\_\_\_\_ years
- c- a teacher in grades 7-9 \_\_\_\_\_ years
- d- a teacher in grades 10-12 \_\_\_\_\_ years
- e- a secondary school principal \_\_\_\_\_ years
- f- a secondary school principal in  
your present district \_\_\_\_\_ years

2. What is the highest degree you hold? (Please check one choice)

- a- Bachelor \_\_\_\_\_
- b- Master \_\_\_\_\_
- c- Masters plus 30 semester hours \_\_\_\_\_
- d- Specialist \_\_\_\_\_
- e- Doctor \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

4. What grades do you supervise? (Circle one)

7 - 9

10 - 12

5. What is the total student enrollment in your building? \_\_\_\_\_

6. How many (what number) of your teachers are assigned at  
least one-half time to teaching in grades 7-9 or 10-12? \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many counselors (full or part-time) holding an M.A.  
degree or higher and assigned to the Guidance and Coun-  
seling Department are there in your building? \_\_\_\_\_

(Copy of the letter mailed to the counselors and teachers requesting their cooperation in the research project.)

Dear Colleague:

In most educational research, much information is needed from those people who make things happen.- You are one of those people and thus you are involved in the research on secondary school personnel and School-Liaison Officers. Permission to conduct this study has been given by the school administration, and the Flint Education Association has agreed to cooperate in any way possible.

The material that follows begins with a general information page, followed by a continuum type of questionnaire. This has been timed and it probably will take you less than 15 minutes to complete. Please do not identify yourself or your school by name. Upon completing the questionnaire, please mail it back to me, using the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope, discarding this cover letter. I would very much like to receive this no later than May 1, 1969.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your professional assistance. Results of this study will be forthcoming as soon as they are available.

Appreciatively,

Frederick J. Walsh

## GENERAL INFORMATION: Teacher or Counselor (Please circle your position)

1. How many years have you been: (Please respond numerically to each item)

- a- an educator \_\_\_\_\_ years
- b- an educator in your present school district \_\_\_\_\_ years
- c- a teacher or counselor in grades 7-9 \_\_\_\_\_ years
- d- a teacher or counselor in grades 10-12 \_\_\_\_\_ years
- e- a teacher or counselor in your present district \_\_\_\_\_ years
- f- a principal of any kind (specify) \_\_\_\_\_ years
- \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is the highest degree you hold? (Please check one choice)

- a- Bachelor \_\_\_\_\_
- b- Masters \_\_\_\_\_
- c- Masters plus 30 semester hours \_\_\_\_\_
- d- Specialist \_\_\_\_\_
- e- Doctor \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_

4. What is your sex? \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is your present assignment? Check one No. of sections

- |                                      |       |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| a-Art, Music                         | _____ | _____ |
| b-Business Educ.; Distributive Ed.   | _____ | _____ |
| c-English, Speech, Foreign Lang.     | _____ | _____ |
| d-Industrial Arts, Home Ec., Dr. Ed. | _____ | _____ |
| e-Math, Science                      | _____ | _____ |
| f-Social Science                     | _____ | _____ |
| g-Physical Educ.                     | _____ | _____ |
| h-Librarian, Aud. Vis.               | _____ | _____ |
| i-Guidance counselor                 | _____ | _____ |
| j-Other type of counselor            | _____ | _____ |

6. Is more than 1/2 of your teaching day spent in the secondary school?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

## APPENDIX B

### QUESTIONNAIRE AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

#### TABLES USED IN THIS STUDY

Directory	Page
Composite of Questionnaire for all respondent groups.....	161
Table 54 - Senior High School-Liaison Officers.....	165
Table 55 - Senior High School Principals.....	166
Table 56 - Senior High School Counselors.....	167
Table 57 - Senior High School Teachers.....	168
Table 58 - Junior High School-Liaison Officers.....	169
Table 59 - Junior High School Principals.....	170
Table 60 - Junior High School Counselors.....	171
Table 61 - Junior High School Teachers.....	172



**DIRECTIONS:** On the next several pages are a number of possible functions and certain relationships of School-Liaison Officers with secondary school personnel. Some of these functions may be contrary to existing legal provisions or accepted practices, but have been included to avoid limiting your range of choice. For each item, CIRCLE THE NUMBER IN FRONT of the one response that comes closest to how you think.

### I. Law Enforcement

AS A SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR/TEACHER OR SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER, DO YOU THINK A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER SHOULD.....

1. Investigate delinquency complaints in the secondary school service area?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

2. Patrol school buildings, grounds, and parking lots during the school day?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

3. Act to prevent crime and delinquency in the secondary school?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

4. Detect, apprehend and arrest juvenile suspects in the secondary school service area?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

5. Prevent loitering on or near secondary school grounds?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

6. Make secondary school principals aware of the identification of juvenile offenders?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

7. Make secondary school teachers aware of the identification of juvenile offenders?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

8. Make secondary school counselors aware of the identification of juvenile offenders?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

9. Act as a consultant in law enforcement and juvenile procedures for secondary school personnel?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

10. Act strictly as a law enforcement agent in the secondary schools?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

## II. Community Relations

AS A SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR/TEACHER OR SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER, DO YOU THINK A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER SHOULD.....

1. Attempt to increase the level of cooperation between school and police?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

2. Confer with counselors of pupils displaying pre-delinquent or delinquent behavior?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

3. Confer with parents of pupils displaying pre-delinquent or delinquent behavior?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

4. Confer with teachers of pupils displaying pre-delinquent or delinquent behavior?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

5. Confer with principals of pupils displaying pre-delinquent or delinquent behavior?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

6. Work with members of the community to help prevent delinquency?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

7. Work with merchants to prevent shop-lifting and vandalism?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

8. Attend meetings of service groups to acquaint them with the delinquency prevention function of the School-Liaison Officer Program?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

9. Attend church-sponsored men and women's groups to make them aware of the delinquency prevention function of the School-Liaison Officer Program?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

10. Work toward creating better understanding between police and young people?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

### III. Education

AS A SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR/TEACHER OR SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER, DO YOU THINK A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER SHOULD.....

1. Be placed as a counselor in the Guidance Department?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

2. Wear plain-clothes while working in the secondary schools?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

3. Work with the principal and teachers to enforce disciplinary policies?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

4. Be placed in a secondary school building?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

5. Attend P.T.A. meetings to discuss prevention of delinquency?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

6. Attend school dances, parties, and other extra-curricular activities to prevent disturbances by both in-school and out-of-school youths?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

7. Act as a resource person in a classroom situation when invited by a teacher?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

8. Conduct student discussion groups on special problem areas?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Undecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

9. Have permission to examine the Cumulative Anecdotal Records  
(CA 39 or CA 60) of students?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Uncecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

10. Serve in some other capacity? (Please specify)

\_\_\_\_\_

IV. Other

AS A SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR/TEACHER OR SCHOOL-LIAISON  
OFFICER, DO YOU THINK A SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICER SHOULD.....

1. Continue to function in the secondary schools?

1-Strongly agree; 2-Agree; 3-Uncecided; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly disagree

2. Function in some other manner? (Please specify)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- - - - -

I would welcome any comments or suggestions about the functions of  
School-Liaison Officers or the relationship between the School-Liaison  
Officers and the secondary school personnel which you would care to  
make.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND THE TIME YOU TOOK TO FILL OUT THIS  
QUESTIONNAIRE.

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD <sup>1</sup>
1	4	-	-	1	-
2	-	4	-	1	-
3	4	1	-	-	-
4	3	2	-	-	-
5	3	2	-	-	-
6	3	2	-	-	-
7	2	1	2	-	-
8	2	2	-	1	-
9	1	4	-	-	-
10	-	1	-	3	1
PART II - Community Relations					
1	4	1	-	-	-
2	3	2	-	-	-
3	3	2	-	-	-
4	2	3	-	-	-
5	3	2	-	-	-
6	3	2	-	-	-
7	2	3	-	-	-
8	2	3	-	-	-
9	2	3	-	-	-
10	4	1	-	-	-
PART III - Education-Related					
1	-	-	1	3	1
2	3	1	1	-	-
3	-	-	-	3	2
4	-	4	-	-	1
5	1	4	-	-	-
6	-	4	-	-	1
7	1	3	-	1	-
8	1	3	-	1	-
9	1	1	-	-	1
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	1	3	-	-	1

---

<sup>1</sup>In this and the following tables, the initials SA, A, U, D, and SD are used in place of Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree for the sake of brevity.



TABLE 55

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	10	4	1	1	-
2	9	4	1	2	-
3	13	3	-	-	-
4	10	3	1	1	1
5	12	3	-	1	-
6	13	3	-	-	-
7	4	2	3	7	-
8	5	8	2	1	-
9	10	6	-	-	-
10	-	2	3	8	3
PART II - Community Relations					
1	13	3	-	-	-
2	6	7	3	-	-
3	4	9	2	1	-
4	2	3	8	3	-
5	9	6	1	-	-
6	11	5	-	-	-
7	7	6	2	1	-
8	7	9	-	-	-
9	6	8	1	1	-
10	12	4	-	-	-
PART III - Education-Related					
1	-	1	2	8	5
2	11	4	-	-	1
3	3	3	2	7	1
4	12	4	-	-	-
5	5	9	2	-	-
6	9	6	1	-	-
7	8	6	2	-	-
8	3	6	5	2	-
9	6	6	1	2	1
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	15	1	-	-	-

TABLE 56

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	21	6	3	-	3
2	13	13	4	2	1
3	23	9	1	-	-
4	16	9	4	1	3
5	19	14	-	-	-
6	19	13	1	-	-
7	9	13	6	4	1
8	18	15	-	-	-
9	23	8	2	-	-
10	3	4	3	16	7
PART II - Community Relations					
1	21	12	-	-	-
2	25	8	-	-	-
3	26	5	2	-	-
4	14	10	7	2	-
5	22	9	2	-	-
6	24	8	-	1	-
7	15	7	3	8	-
8	21	9	-	3	-
9	17	8	3	4	1
10	27	6	-	-	-
PART III - Education-Related					
1	5	3	7	14	4
2	21	10	2	-	-
3	10	9	6	4	4
4	26	7	-	-	-
5	18	9	2	3	1
6	10	15	3	4	1
7	12	19	1	1	-
8	10	15	4	3	1
9	11	13	6	2	1
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	29	4	-	-	-



TABLE 57

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

## SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS:

---



---

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	125	115	21	14	1
2	110	102	23	25	16
3	181	83	7	3	2
4	140	94	28	12	2
5	144	93	18	17	4
6	144	102	12	12	6
7	92	84	45	38	17
8	127	122	18	9	-
9	137	119	15	2	3
10	53	45	48	103	27
PART II - Community Relations					
1	143	112	12	5	4
2	122	129	14	9	2
3	125	124	13	12	2
4	85	115	36	32	8
5	114	123	22	13	4
6	121	130	17	6	2
7	79	106	34	46	11
8	93	137	30	12	4
9	66	115	60	31	4
10	161	109	2	2	2
PART III - Education-Related					
1	33	53	62	92	36
2	131	115	10	10	10
3	100	82	40	41	13
4	156	99	12	2	7
5	88	132	42	10	4
6	112	104	38	18	4
7	109	139	15	9	4
8	73	128	45	23	7
9					
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	189	76	4	-	7

TABLE 58

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL-LIAISON OFFICERS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	7	1	-	-	-
2	3	2	-	3	-
3	7	1	-	-	-
4	4	4	-	-	-
5	6	2	-	-	-
6	5	3	-	-	-
7	1	4	2	1	-
8	-	6	1	1	-
9	5	2	1	-	-
10	1	3	-	3	1
PART II - Community Relations					
1	7	1	-	-	-
2	2	6	-	-	-
3	5	3	-	-	-
4	1	5	-	2	-
5	4	4	-	-	-
6	7	1	-	-	-
7	6	2	-	-	-
8	4	4	-	-	-
9	3	4	1	-	-
10	8	-	-	-	-
PART III - Education-Related					
1	-	1	2	1	4
2	7	1	-	-	-
3	-	1	-	2	5
4	1	7	-	-	-
5	3	5	-	-	-
6	4	4	-	-	-
7	5	3	-	-	-
8	1	2	2	3	-
9	-	1	2	4	1
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	5	3	-	-	-

TABLE 59

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	16	6	-	-	1
2	4	7	5	6	1
3	17	6	-	-	-
4	11	10	1	1	-
5	15	7	-	1	-
6	11	10	1	1	-
7	2	3	6	11	1
8	7	13	2	1	-
9	12	9	2	-	-
10	1	7	3	8	4
PART II - Community Relations					
1	17	6	-	-	-
2	12	8	3	-	-
3	13	9	1	-	-
4	6	4	8	5	-
5	16	7	-	-	-
6	19	4	-	-	-
7	16	7	-	-	-
8	11	11	1	-	-
9	6	13	4	-	-
10	17	6	-	-	-
PART III - Education Related					
1	-	1	6	9	7
2	13	10	-	-	-
3	2	4	4	10	3
4	14	9	-	-	-
5	11	8	3	1	-
6	14	9	-	-	-
7	14	9	-	-	-
8	8	14	-	1	-
9	5	15	2	1	-
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	20	3	-	-	-

TABLE 60

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS:

PART I - Law Enforcement					
Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	12	11	-	-	-
2	9	8	1	3	2
3	14	8	-	-	1
4	11	8	1	3	-
5	15	5	3	-	-
6	8	10	4	1	-
7	5	3	7	5	3
8	7	11	5	-	-
9	12	10	-	-	1
10	1	4	3	6	9
PART II - Community Relations					
1	11	12	-	-	-
2	9	13	1	-	-
3	9	9	4	1	-
4	2	2	10	8	1
5	6	13	3	1	-
6	16	7	-	-	-
7	13	8	-	1	1
8	10	12	-	-	1
9	9	11	1	1	1
10	15	7	-	-	-
PART III - Education-Related					
1	2	2	1	7	11
2	14	8	-	1	-
3	2	3	2	5	11
4	12	11	-	-	-
5	8	14	-	-	1
6	12	10	-	1	-
7	9	13	-	-	1
8	9	11	2	-	1
9	5	6	7	3	2
PART IV - Program Continuation					
1	14	9	-	-	-

TABLE 61

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS:

## PART I - Law Enforcement

Question	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	187	136	10	8	4
2	129	117	40	47	12
3	223	112	5	4	1
4	159	121	31	32	2
5	183	115	27	19	1
6	175	134	24	11	1
7	117	114	53	57	4
8	171	145	20	8	1
9	154	152	29	7	3
10	43	66	47	124	65

## PART II - Community Relations

1	167	153	19	3	3
2	152	165	17	10	1
3	163	141	25	12	4
4	110	145	61	27	2
5	153	152	22	16	2
6	179	135	20	10	1
7	137	126	47	33	2
8	128	167	39	10	1
9	109	135	70	29	2
10	220	112	9	4	-

## PART III - Education-Related

1	29	65	93	97	61
2	167	135	24	11	8
3	89	96	47	78	35
4	181	131	21	9	3
5	136	150	37	20	2
6	125	152	34	28	6
7	148	157	28	8	4
8	116	158	49	18	4
9	122	144	50	20	9

## PART IV - Program Continuation

1	225	92	16	4	8
---	-----	----	----	---	---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS

- Bennett, John W., and Tumin, Melvin. Social Life, Structure and Function. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- Bredemeir, H. C., and Stephenson, R. M. The Analysis of Social Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Brookover, Wilbur, and Gottlieb, David. A Sociology of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1964.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Getzels, Jacob. "Administration as a Social Process". Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew Halpin. Midwest Administration Center. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul K. Methods of Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.
- Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Hartley, Eugene, and Hartley, Ruth. Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Jenkins, David H., and Blackman, Charles A. Antecedents and Effects of Administrative Behavior. Columbus, Ohio: University Press, Ohio State University, 1956.
- Kahn, Robert L.; Wolfe, Donald M.; Quinn, Robert; Snoek, J. D.; and Rosenthal, Robert. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Study of Man. New York: D. Appleton, Century Company, 1936.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised edition. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1957.

- Getzels, Jacob, and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation." Journal of Educational Sociology. Vol. XXIX. September, 1955.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. III. 1956.
- Morrison, June. "The Controversial Police-School Liaison Program." Police. Vol. 13. November-December, 1968.
- New York Times, January 30; September 26, 1958.
- Robinson, Donald W. "Police in the Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1967.
- Rose, Arnold M. "The Adequacy of Women's Expectations for Adult Roles." Social Forces. Vol. XXX, October, 1951.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership." American Sociological Review. Vol. XVIII. August, 1953.
- Shepard, George H., and James, Jesse. "Police--Do They Belong in the Schools?" American Education. September, 1967.
- Smith, Ewart E. "The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. LV. May, 1957.
- Selby, Bruno. "The Role Concept in Job Adjustment." Sociometry. Vol. VII. February, 1944.
- Stocker, Joseph. "Cops in the Schoolhouse." School Management. May, 1968.
- Toby, Jackson. "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis." Social Forces. Vol. XXX. March, 1952.
- Winstead, Philip C., and Hurlburt, Allan. "Agreement on Principal's Role." Phi Delta Kappan. September, 1967.

#### UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Ashburn, Franklin C. "A Study of Differential Role Expectations of Police Patrolmen in the Manila Police Department, Republic of the Philippines." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.
- Boss, LaVerne H. "Role Expectations Held for the Intermediate School District Superintendent in Michigan." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.



National Center on Police and Community Relations. A National Survey of Police and Community Relations. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

Newcomb, Theodore. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_. Social Psychology. Second Edition. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_; Turner, Ralph; and Converse, Philip. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Parsons, Talcott. "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States." Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture. Edited by C. Kluckhohn and H. Murray. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_; and Shils, Edward. Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_; Blau, P. M.; and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Sarbin, Theodore. "Role Theory." Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 1. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.

Sargent, Stansfield. "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology." Social Psychology at the Crossroads. Edited by J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Yinger, John. Toward a Field Theory of Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Znaniecki, Florian. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

#### PERIODICALS

Biddle, Bruce J.; Rosencranz, Howard A.; and Rankin, Earl F. "Positional Differences in Teacher Role." Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Social Psychology Laboratory. Vol. III. University of Missouri, June, 1961.

Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching." Journal of Educational Sociology. Vol. XXIX September, 1955.

- Colwell, Clarence A. "Roles and Role Conflicts of the Parish Minister: A Study of Roles and Role Conflicts as Perceived By Ministers Selected From the Connecticut Conference of Congregational Churches." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1964.
- Doggett, James C. "An Analysis Role Expectations of Professional and Indigenous Non-Professional Health Workers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.
- Doyle, Louis A. "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Roles." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956.
- McKee, Charles A. "A Study of the Role of the Engineering Manager and His Continuing Education Requirements." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Morgan, Stanley R., Jr. "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Relevant Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956.
- Scott, James F. "A Study of Role Conflict Among Policemen." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.
- Tosi, Henry L., Jr. "The Effect of Role Consensus, Expectations, and Perceptions on the Buyer-Seller Dyad." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293104806629