

---

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION:

CONTRASTING MODELS OF RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Mark A. Chesler

James E. Crowfoot

Bunyan I. Bryant

July 1979

---

CRSO Working Paper No. 199

Copies available through:  
Center for Research on  
Social Organization  
University of Michigan  
330 Packard Street  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

July, 1979

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION:  
CONTRASTING MODELS OF RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Mark A. Chesler

James E. Crowfoot

Bunyan I. Bryant

Mark A. Chesler is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and a Project Director at the Center for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan. James E. Crowfoot is an Associate Professor in the School of Natural Resources and the Program in Urban-Regional Planning, University of Michigan. Bunyan I. Bryant is an Associate Professor in the School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan.

This working paper is an expanded and revised version of an article by the same authors appearing in *LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS*, 1979. The major differences appear in sections II and III, where we have greatly expanded our discussion of the intellectual background and alternative paradigms underlying current policy decisions and school programs. We are grateful to the Duke University Center for Policy Studies, the National Institute of Education, and Community Resources Ltd. for their support of our general inquiries in this area.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term "racial desegregation" stands as a symbol for many American realities. In simplest terms it denotes some form of racial mixture in living, working or schooling patterns. Thus, it is an alternative to thoroughly segregated situations in which whites and blacks (or hispanics and other minorities) lived in totally homogeneous neighborhoods, were employed in racially homogeneous work groups and strata, and attended racially separated schools. Although the most dramatic and exclusive forms of segregation have passed from the American scene in the past three decades, much partial segregation still exists in suburban and urban housing, in employment, and in school attendance. The direct force of law is now absent as a sustaining agent; but governmental regulations, institutional practices, and private traditions of thought and action have helped maintain partially segregated and highly stratified social systems. Moreover, the character and quality of racial mixture, when it does occur in large degree, varies considerably throughout the society.<sup>1</sup>

Some Alternative Meanings of Desegregation

Current efforts to advance desegregation, especially in schools, represent examples of both the continuing press for racial change and traditional resistance to new patterns. Thus, desegregation triggers a variety of images, feelings, and actions among Americans. For some people and groups, it represents a violation of fundamental constitutional rights, to be avoided by multiple forms

---

<sup>1</sup> Distinctions have been drawn between physical desegregation (wherein people come into new forms of contact with one another), cultural desegregation (wherein customs, speech, and other traditions are shared), and structural desegregation (wherein joint interaction in clubs and informal associations occur). With special respect to schools, "desegregation" (indicating physical heterogeneity and mixing) is often distinguished from "integration" (which usually signifies a positive set of educational, cultural, and structural interactions among members of different races).

of resistance. For others, it is one of several nuisances perpetrated and supported by the federal government, to be obeyed with as little serious commitment and energy as possible. Some see it as one more means by which affluent whites can maintain control of minority populations, and shut off minority efforts at self-governance, control of their own schools, etc. Others see desegregation as an end in itself, as a goal or a right long denied. Or it may be seen primarily as a means to other ends, as an opportunity to create minor reforms in the generally positive operation of schools. It can also be seen as a means to surface and mobilize energy for making fundamental changes in schools, local communities, and national socio-political patterns.

The definition of desegregation as a school condition or situation also varies considerably. For instance, depending upon who is doing the defining or observing, desegregation can mean, or can be measured by, any of the following criteria:

- number of predominantly black or predominantly white or predominantly hispanic schools in a unitary district;
- comparisons of the percent minority enrollment (or staff allocation) in each school in a system;
- comparisons of the percent minority enrollment in each class or curriculum focus in a school;
- comparisons of the percents of majority vs. minority students achieving at grade level "norms";
- percents of minority or majority students with positive racial attitudes and interactions;
- percents of minority and/or majority students with positive educational and occupational expectations.

The various criteria and meanings of desegregation reflect the reality that different communities have implemented quite different desegregation plans.

Some have bussed minority youth throughout a system, some have bussed only small numbers of minority youth, some have bussed majority and minority youth; some

have reassigned students at all grade levels, others have begun this process only at the third or fifth grade levels; some have done it in one year, others have phased it in over several years; some have created many new educational programs, others have reassigned youngsters with few program innovations; some have done it with great community support, others have faced considerable resistance; some have done it only under court order, others have done it more or less voluntarily.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Focus of this Paper

Given widely varied interpretations, implementation efforts and reactions, it is not surprising that some groups push for desegregation and some against it, and that different groups may have very different reasons for advocating these school changes. As Clement, Eisenhart, and Wood note, "The contest which desegregation constitutes is one in which the rules change, the goals change, and even to some extent the composition of the 'sides' change over time" (1976, p. 1). Without conceptual clarity about this contest, it is difficult to understand the variety of issues involved in desegregation and hard to take advantage of the full range of practical options available for its implementation.

Our goal in this paper is to advance this understanding in two ways.

We plan to:

1. identify and contrast different central assumptions underlying current theory, research, and practice in school desegregation;
2. consider the usefulness of theory, research, and practice options which have not been pursued on a large scale, especially those that might help us move beyond mere physical desegregation to a state of quality inter-racial education.

---

<sup>2</sup>Several good summaries exist of the variety of techniques used to reassign pupils, and even to address some educational programs related to reassignment plans: Foster, 1973; School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas, 1977; Tomkins, 1976.

Social science theory and research potentially relevant to desegregation, and to other matters of public policy, often have failed to be effective because they have not explored fully their own assumptions, nor those assumptions supporting public policy options. The conceptual models and assumptions that guide research studies make important differences in topics selected, data gathered, and analyses and interpretations made, as well as policies and programs suggested. Likewise, the conceptual models and assumptions used by practitioners make a difference in their approach to knowledge, and to action tasks of planning and implementing change. The exploration of different conceptual frameworks used to order and explain phenomena, or to design and implement programs, is essential to identifying and clarifying the diverse and confusing alternatives available both to scholars and practitioners. Thus, in the next section we review contrasting paradigms of social thought, as they are represented both in social scientific research and in public practice. We expect to demonstrate important differences in two widely used and fundamentally different ways of thinking about the society, about local communities and organizations, and about schools and school desegregation in particular.

In later sections we review some recent research and journalistic reports of new educational practices that bear upon key issues in planning and carrying out desegregated schooling. This review will not be exhaustive but illustrative: illustrative of work stressing the importance of new community and organizational processes to support school change. In most educational research efforts, community and organizational processes either have been ignored or treated as residual categories. Thus, they have been seen as impotent or inconsequential, and as minimally impactful on student outcomes predetermined by home/community environs. In other studies, inter-school differences on these organizational variables have been assumed or demonstrated to be quite minimal. Their apparent uniformity fails to create

statistically significant descriptions or correlations to student outcomes in large-scale quantitative analyses. Thus a common argument is that social class and/or individual school/family effects are so powerful that they determine the outcomes of schooling more or less by themselves. The corollary argument is that organizational patterns are so uniform, rigid, or impotent that they are not liable to change, and that little can be done inside the school to alter these externally determined effects.

Unfortunately, much of this research has been limited to a narrow set of outcome measures, with an over-emphasis on student achievement on standardized tests of cognitive skills. Achievement on non-standard classroom tasks, relationships among students of various races, conceptions of current and future occupational and social careers, new forms of youth-adult activities, and students' broader interaction with the school and civic community are far less often studied. Moreover, much of this research has been guided by the traditional scientific focus on studying "what is." If current organizational practices are non-innovative, and thus do not lead to (correlate with, cause, etc.) new student processes or outcomes, it is not necessarily valid to conclude that new forms of these organizational practices are irrelevant or might not have a more positive impact. Studies of "what might be" may shed some light on the ways altered organizational practices could lead to altered outcomes, and thus tell us more about the relevance and power of the school organization.

Our view is that community and organizational processes are quite potent, do make a difference to students experiencing them, and can and do impact on pre-existing student characteristics. There is some scientific evidence supporting this view: Weinberg notes that "A number of empirical studies have suggested the inadequacy of [assumptions of] . . . social class determinism and school powerlessness" (1977, p. 7). Thus, he too concludes that new forms of school organization may be powerful enough to mediate or alter the impact of

students' social class characteristics. Although the hard evidence for this view is not as rich or massive as for the alternative, it deserves to be explored, especially since it has enormous implications for the implementation of desegregation as an educational/social change effort.

A central concern of this paper is: what can we do to help school desegregation be effective? After all, if desegregation does not positively alter student achievements, self-esteem, racial knowledge and attitudes, inter-racial behaviors and relationships, etc., then it is hardly worth promoting. Desegregation already is an economically and socially costly enterprise; if it does not or cannot have positive payoff, it is not worth the cost. For instance, a number of scholars and citizens, especially minority members, have argued that the quality of education for minority youth may be improved with greater ease in predominantly minority schools.<sup>3</sup> Desegregation efforts which erode minority influence in schools, which treat minority youth as guests or intruders, which separate minority youth from their peers, which discriminate further against minority youth, or which do little to deal with these youngsters' unique educational needs and interests, do not serve them well at all. Desegregation efforts which place the main burdens of transportation, dislocation, alienation, and adaptation on minority youth hardly represent an equitable response to educational inequality. If desegregation plans cannot overcome these barriers to equality and justice (in segregated or desegregated schools), it may not be a worthwhile public policy. Then perhaps we should pursue other options to gain racial equality and educational quality.

The appropriate answers to these questions, and to problems in the

---

<sup>3</sup>The research on whether and how minorities gain from attending racially mixed schools, while generally positive, is not so overwhelming as to completely rule out alternatives . . . nor to satisfy us with current plans and programs (St. John, 1975; Crain and Mehard, 1978). Of course, academic gain is not the only educational issue in desegregation, nor is it necessarily relevant for the adjudication of constitutional rights, but the same problems arise regarding other educational variables.

analysis of the success or failure of desegregation cannot rest solely on a review of "what is" or "what has been": such a focus is biased by the slipshod, resistant, and non-enlightened ways schools and communities have attempted to implement desegregation. For desegregation to be successful, we believe, various school practices must change: moving youngsters is only one part of a larger process of educational change. Moreover, for desegregation to be analyzed effectively, it cannot be treated as a single intervention in an otherwise stable input-output model of schooling. As we have indicated, many local definitions of desegregation exist, and each one gives rise to different school programs. Thus, desegregation must be considered as a multiple series of events, some overt and some covert, some of which may change life in the school system quite radically. Furthermore, it is not a series of events that occurs by itself; its components are planned and implemented by human actors. As such, they are planned and implemented in various ways, and the reality of what desegregation "is" varies considerably in different schools and communities. We are interested in exploring what desegregation "might be" if the best wisdom of social scientists, educators, and citizens were utilized to define and implement it at the local level.

In particular, we will focus in this paper on changes in community, organizational and individual processes, and educational programs that have worked or might work. Simply, we believe there can be no successful desegregation without educational change. If only bodies are moved, with no corollary changes in school structure and process, new youngsters merely are placed into old settings. The weight of social structure and tradition (including habit, ignorance, discrimination, etc.) can be expected to maintain prior outcomes. Thus, desegregation must be considered as a process of change itself, and as part of a broader process of change. To be implemented successfully, it requires other changes in the community context, organizational processes, and

individual actions of schools and school actors.

Many of the changes--policies and programs--we discuss here have not been subject to well designed social scientific research; that is, there often is little "hard evidence" regarding their payoff to students and to other members of the school community. Where there is such research, we hope to so indicate; however, occasionally we will speculate and draw implications for policy and program without benefit of empirical data and analysis. This is not a novel situation. Even the best technical research often leaves policy-makers or practitioners unclear as to its exact conclusions and programmatic implications. And many practitioners and consumers/clients (including educators, parents, and students) simply cannot wait for the complex process of scientific investigation to run its course before acting upon alternatives. As legislators and judges deal with educational remedies to segregation and racial isolation, they too need programmatic guidelines that make sense and that might work, whether or not they are supported by conventional forms of scientific analysis. The empirical and theoretical base we utilize here, in the absence of direct evaluative efforts, is rooted in scientific research on conflict and conflict resolution, in studies of organizational structures and changes, in studies of race relations, and in studies of schools and human learning. We also try to use other scholars' syntheses of the scientific literature, and their descriptions of desegregation programs various communities and schools have attempted. The result is an agenda for much needed research on potentially useful alternatives, as well as an outline for thoughtful local implementation.

This paper is a critical activity, aimed at asking ourselves and our readers to reconsider the intellectual bases of school planning and action--educational theory and research. Therefore we invite response--positive and negative--in the hope that others will join in making advances in our collective

praxis as scholars, practitioners, and caring citizens. Such critical activity is a necessary first step in assessing the real value of current research and the utility of proposed action programs. For theory affects research and practice, research affects practice and sometimes theory, and practice can affect theory and research. They each have impact upon our schools and the ways we can imagine or invent to design and implement desegregation. And that affects children and adults throughout the society.

## II. ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Throughout the development of the social sciences, two alternative models or paradigms of social systems and systemic functioning have been dominant. One model focuses on order and equilibrium as basic ingredients and virtues in the nature of societies, the other focuses upon the operations and necessity of conflict and change.<sup>4</sup>

Chambliss' (1973) review of several scholars' analyses of these two models provides us with the following descriptions. Essential assumptions underlying the consensus paradigm include:

1. Every social system is well integrated.
2. Every society exists on the consensus of its members.
3. Every society is relatively persisting.

<sup>4</sup>These models are ideal types and as such do not describe actual social situations; they refer to underlying assumptions about those realities. Moreover, they are not completely exclusive of one another, but may be considered to exist on a continuum, with potential overlapping principles; in some cases mixed models may even exist. However, all efforts to conceptualize, respond to, and conduct research on problems in social systems require us to make certain assumptions. The contrast between these ideal types or polar models is useful in illuminating contrasting approaches, and in forcing us to review our assumptions carefully. At critical choice points--in research and in public practice--they make a difference. It is essential that practitioners and scholars be able to select and evaluate assumptions purposively, in light of our own values and information, and in terms of their impact on the problems we seek to understand and the changes we elect to make. Part of our intellectual strategy in this paper is to discern and/or pose a provocative dialectic such as this, and to move back and forth between polar examples in order to increase our own clarity and to stretch the range of our thinking about theory, research, and practice.

4. The governing bodies of a society are value-neutral and act to promote the common good.
5. Social inequality exists as a result of levels of hard work, talent, and selection by others.

On the other hand, essential assumptions underlying the conflict paradigm include:

1. Every society exists with ubiquitous social conflict.
2. Every society exists with constraint of some members by others.
3. Every society is constantly changing.
4. The governing bodies of a society participate in the struggle on one side or another, and use organs of the state (law) as instruments of coercion for their own benefit.
5. Social inequality exists as a result of the use of coercion, fraud, and inheritance as the basis for obtaining resources.

Another illustration of the conflict and consensus paradigms has been presented by Buttell and Flinn (1975). Selected portions of their analysis are shown on the following page.<sup>5</sup>

As the comparisons indicate, persons using either the conflict or consensus paradigm understand the same phenomena differently, stress different system dynamics, and even would have us attend to different issues and data. The history of these divisions within social scientific thinking is long and tortuous, and full of debate and counterdebate about who assumes what.<sup>6</sup> Our purpose here

<sup>5</sup> Buttell and Flinn acknowledge their indebtedness to Horton (1966), Havens (1972), and Chambliss (1973) in articulating these comparisons. While Chambliss takes a general societal focus, Buttell and Flinn are especially concerned with the utility of this analysis for understanding environmental problems and issues. They are all part of an increasing body of scholars attempting to describe the assumptions and ideological roots of social scientific approaches to social issues and public policies. Later in this section we focus on schools and school desegregation, as they may be seen from these different analytic perspectives.

<sup>6</sup> Dahrendorf (1958) identifies the order-consensus-equilibrium model as rooted in, or perhaps reflected in, structural-functionalism, the dominant stream of modern American sociology. Marxian or neo-Marxian thought is seen by some as the root or reflection of the conflict school of sociology (R. Paulston, 1976). Lenski (1966) identifies the roots of these traditions, respectively, in conservative and/or radical theories. Numerous articles and books have attempted to analyze the differences between these models in detail, and to argue for the certitude, accuracy, or heuristic value of one over the other.

Assumptions in the Order (Consensus) and Conflict

Approaches to Social Structure, Social Change, and Natural Resources \*

Theoretical Issue	Approach	
	Order (Consensus)	Conflict
Society	System with "needs"	Stage for class struggle
Social relations	Advantageous	Exploitative
Social unity	Consensus	Coercion
Inequality	Social necessity	Promotes conflict and is unnecessary
State	Promotes common good	Instrument of oppression
Values, culture	First-order causal force	Second-order consequence of political power (hegemony) and class position
Power	Differentiated "multi-centered" origins, pluralistic	Results directly from economic power
Nature of advanced industrial societies	"Post-industrial," classlessness	Persistence of property as the basis of class structure, elaboration of contradictions and crises
Relationship of society and resource base	Adaptation to survival base as functional requisite of society	Capitalism degrades environment through irrationalities of productive system
Nature of environmental problems	Result from "externalities" and inappropriate values	Embodiment of irreconcilable contradictions
Resolution of resource problems	Adaptive cultural mechanisms	Recurrent cycles of crisis and re-equilibrium
Primary causal force underlying social change	Culture, values	Exploitation, alienation, class conflict, contradictions

\* Adapted from Buttell & Flinn (1975).

is not to further these academic debates, but to review and extend the contrasting paradigms in order to highlight issues and alternatives in school desegregation.

The conceptual distinctions arising from these two paradigms have been used to describe policy orientations and social programs as well as social systems in general. For example, Horton (1966) examines different approaches to the analysis of social problems and argues that the order or consensus model focuses on inadequacies in administrative arrangements as a prime source of problems. Applied to school desegregation, this model draws attention to inadequate planning, inappropriate administrative procedures, and the poor training or preparation of educators who must operate in multi-racial school settings. Another major source of problems, as seen from the consensus model, is the inadequate socialization or adjustment of minority or lower class youngsters and parents to schools.

Horton argues further that the conflict model of social problems focuses on the ways institutional structures and programs fail to meet the needs of particular interest groups, thereby reflecting societal injustice in rewards and resources. Applied to school desegregation, this model directs attention to the inappropriateness of current school structures and programs relative to the needs and potentials of minority students. It sees these structures and programs as racist and unjust, both in reflecting broader injustice and inequality in the society at large, and in recreating those patterns in future generations. Thus, school tension and student "failure" are products of fundamental conflicts between social service systems and the clients they purport to serve.

Just as these contrasting models have been utilized to describe social systems and the origins of social problems, they have also been and can be applied to studies of communities and organizations. For instance, adherents of the consensus paradigm generally assume that most parts of a community can

and do work together. Accordingly, overarching values bind different groups together, permit commonly trusted leaders to emerge, and promote cooperation . . . especially during crises that may accompany community change. Adherents of the conflict paradigm, however, assume that all parts of a community do not cooperate, and have had little experience working together. Accordingly, different groups have divergent values, different trusted leadership, and different ways of relating to key issues and institutions. During crises that may accompany change, all these differences are as likely to pull the community apart as they are to bring it together.

Organizational theorists operating from consensus or order assumptions certainly may agree that conflict occurs in organizations, but prefer to see it as ephemeral, accidental, or temporary deviation from the necessity of order and regularity in a complex social situation. Weber argued that rules and legitimate authority were key organizational factors, and that they were necessary in order to constrain people who were different, and who were performing different tasks, to cooperate with one another. Many theorists and practitioners following in Weber's footsteps often took that cooperation for granted, however, and sought to devise plans to encourage what they felt was the underlying reality and necessity of consensus and harmony in organizations . . . to the point of ignoring or denying basic conflicts and constraints.<sup>7</sup>

Conflict theorists of organizations stress the import of structural characteristics that underlie operational policies and procedures. For instance, Dahrendorf locates the primary root of conflict in the authority system present in all organizations:

---

<sup>7</sup>Perrow (1972) notes that the kind of harmony and cooperation stressed by early organizational sociologists, such as Mayo and Roethlisberger and Dixon, was to take place on management's terms. Moreover, no fundamental conflicts of interest were perceived between labor and management.



In every social organization some positions are entrusted with a right to exercise control over other positions and to ensure compliance with authority through coercion. . . . The persistence in time of authority structures gives rise to relations of dominance and subordination and thus provides the occasion for exploitation. (quoted in Oberschall, 1973, p. 33)

Gamson (1968) elaborates this view, distinguishing between two organizational parties -- authorities and partisans. Authorities generally occupy managerial roles and are responsible for making and implementing policies. Partisans generally occupy lower-status positions in organizations and are ruled by authoritative decisions. As such, partisans are structurally liable to challenge managerial authority. According to Gamson, this dialectic or strain is generic in organizational life . . . a view consistent with the conflict paradigm.

In even more detail, Walton and Dutton (1969) stress the conflicts involved in the following ubiquitous organizational conditions: mutual task dependence, organizational differentiation, unequal rewards, and asymmetrical interaction patterns. Other factors give rise to conflicts, such as communication obstacles, personal traits and skills, role dissatisfaction, and information ambiguities, but these are not structurally universal characteristics of organizations. Both sets of factors may lead to certain conflict behaviors, such as competition, distortion, rigidity, grievances, suspicion, etc.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>The variety of uses of the term "conflict" requires an important distinction between what is often called "realistic" or "objective" conflict, and "irrational" or "subjective" conflict. The former refers to incompatible goals, task differentiation or disproportionate shares of valued resources; the latter refers to experiential factors such as misperceptions and miscommunications, psychological feelings, etc. (Coser, 1956; Mack and Snyder, 1957; Boulding, 1962; Dahrendorf, 1958; Fink, 1968; Rapaport, 1960; and Williams, 1947). A second distinction can be made between conflict as an organizational "situation" or "condition" and conflict as a personal or group "behavior" or "reaction." The structural characteristics of communities or organizations may represent conflict situations that give rise to certain conflictual social reactions by individuals and groups (reactions such as tension-release, attack and defense, flight, etc.). For the most part, our

### "Mixed Models"

A number of social theorists and practitioners have found the dichotomy between the paradigms too stark. Some have tried to muddy the differences and others to create syntheses which mix elements of both models. For instance, to argue that a consensus exists does not imply that all people agree on all social goals, or on the institutional means to reach them. Obviously, minor differences can exist within a general consensus. As van den Berghe states, ". . . while societies do indeed show a tendency toward stability, equilibrium and consensus, they simultaneously generate within themselves the opposites of these" (1963, p. 696).<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the argument that conflict is ubiquitous does not mean that war is constant; surely moral agreement and common actions are evident on many issues, among many groups, and in many times and places. Thus, it is generally agreed by most who deal with these idea systems that both stability and change, both consensus and conflict, are essential and undeniable ingredients of society. As Coser notes in his updated attempt to state the issues clearly: "They (each) are partial theories sensitizing the student to one or another set of data relevant to a full theoretical explanation" (1970, p. 9).

While these two paradigms are not necessarily mutually exclusive interpretations of the world at large, they each do provide very different perspec-

---

discussion in this paper stresses the role of objective conflict, regardless of the levels of subjective experience or awareness individuals bring to these social situations. The early sections of this paper concentrate, moreover, on conflict as a social condition, and only in the later sections do we focus explicitly on behavioral strategies that do or do not use, raise, or lower, etc., the level and nature of conflict.

<sup>9</sup>Numerous scholars, of various persuasions, have also stressed the ways conflict may be strategically "functional" or useful for societal stability and improvement (Coser, 1956; Dodson, 1960; Himes, 1966). It may be necessary for surfacing differences, correcting injustice, tuning programs to the real needs of others, and providing a safety valve against future explosions.

tives for viewing social phenomena. When compared and contrasted with one another, they highlight choices theorists, researchers, and practitioners must make in their work. Most researchers and practitioners are not conscious of the paradigms underlying their work, or if they are, they are seldom explicit regarding the relations between these assumptions and their own information, findings, and applications. As we suggest later, schools try to actualize a social consensus, and to promote adherence to a general commitment to order and harmony. Thus, people graduating from, and adapting well to, our public educational system are oriented toward a consensus view. The process of academic socialization takes this trend further, and generally reinforces attitudes and behaviors most congruent with the consensus paradigm. If scholars do not bend over backwards to be alert to the influence of these traditions, they will continue to reinforce, in themselves and in the general public, a consensus ideology. Coser summarizes this tendency in his analysis of social scientists' roles and orientations:

. . . the majority of sociologists who dominate contemporary sociology, far from seeing themselves as reformers and addressing themselves to an audience of reformers, either have oriented themselves toward purely academic and professional audiences, or have attempted to find a hearing among decision makers in private or public bureaucracies.

They center attention predominantly upon problems of adjustment rather than upon conflict; upon social statics rather than upon dynamics. Of key problematic importance to them has been the maintenance of existing structures and the ways and means of insuring their smooth functioning (1956, p. 20).

#### Different "Payoffs" of the Consensus and Conflict Models

In a pluralistic society, each paradigm serves different groups' special interests. Who gains from the perception that consensus is the natural order and that conflict is unnatural and/or dysfunctional? By and large, institutional managers and other authorities.<sup>10</sup> Those in control of major social

<sup>10</sup> Gamson (1968) notes that authorities generally assume a consensus perspective for understanding social and political problems. In contrast, potential partisans generally assume a conflict perspective.

processes need to be able to maintain them against challenge and change. In so doing they also protect their own privileged positions. In a democratic society, where superior force is not a sufficient rationale for rule, control requires the establishment of an official ideology that defines and justifies ruling groups' decisions as "good." Thus, authorities require a societal model that suggests the current order is right and proper, that it is freely and consensually agreed on, and that conflict about it is illegitimate. Not only do system managers feel supported by such assumptions, but often subordinate and oppressed classes or "victims" embrace this view, and see themselves to blame for their poverty, slavery, low performance, etc.

Who gains from the perception that conflict is natural or functional? Oppressed groups and those who would benefit from changes in the distribution of societal resources must organize new resources to combat prevailing power structures. If the system is unresponsive to their needs, and appeals do not bring redress, their attempts to heighten conflict and generate threats to the prevailing order also require a supportive ideology. Thus, social movement organizers often argue that things need not be the way they are, that oppression is not inevitable, and that some people are benefitting unfairly from current arrangements. They require an ideology that assumes authorities or the "system" is to blame for various problems, and that escalated conflict and change are both justified and necessary.

Other issues besides a group's political interests frequently influence which paradigm is dominant in a specific situation, or in a specific research project. The goals of various parties, the nature of the issues facing them, the degree and depth of their differences, and their freedom of action when facing external pressures all make a difference. For instance, Warren and Hyman note that on issues of major controversy, such as fluoridation and civil rights, ". . . consensus models of change processes do not appear to

be applicable" (1966, p. 294). They argue that the key point is whether or not the rest of the social system is likely to be in fundamental agreement with the changes being advocated:

If the party attempting to bring about a change can reasonably expect that there will be no major opposition and that there is substantial agreement on the way the issue will be seen, he has much to gain by employing a collaborative strategy.

On the other hand, where there is opposition to the goal -- opposition that cannot be won over through alternative strategies -- one must "fight" for it or give up (p. 295-296).

"Fighting" for it does not mean fighting to the "end"; it may include vigorous negotiations that lead to compromise. And "substantial agreement" does not exclude differences that require consideration and adjustment within a broad consensus strategy. Contrasting strategies also may be used serially: (1) a conflict strategy may be initiated to threaten key managers, and to "soften them up" for multi-party collaboration; or (2) a consensus strategy may be initiated to discover the limits of administrative reform, thus identifying goals that can be attained only via the introduction of escalated conflict.

#### Alternative Models Applied to Schooling

Schools play crucial roles in the society's efforts to solve the dual problems of conflict and order inherent in societal differentiation and integration. By helping to shape consensus on core values and to route individuals and groups into economic, political, and social patterns, schools are the screening mechanisms and opportunity systems that stand between students' families of origin and their subsequent adult statuses as workers, citizens, and family members.

Adherents of the conflict paradigm start from assumptions of inequity and contest between interest groups in the society; they see the school as an arena for the maintenance of these societal inequities.<sup>11</sup> Struggles occurring in

<sup>11</sup>This general view is explicated by a group of revisionist historians and educational sociologists. See, for example, Bowles (1972), Carnoy (1972, 1974), Katz (1970), Spring (1976).

more fundamental social institutions, such as the polity and economy, dominate the life of the school and determine the nature and outcomes of school processes. Accordingly, schools are seen to channel students into economic, political, and social roles that maintain for some conditions of privilege, for others poverty, and for others vulnerable economic existences somewhere in between. Schools also teach obedience to vague and abstract views of the political system and passive conformity to rules and regulations established by legitimate authority. Different things happen to men and women, to black, brown, and white people, and to rich and poor youngsters in schools; and the educational system uses sexual, racial, and economic criteria carefully to sort and screen people into limited opportunities for mobility. Privileged groups of affluent white males exert monocultural control over the symbols, arenas, and norms of social interaction. Other cultural and social styles and preferences are given short shrift, and must contest with these monocultural values for visibility in the school.

Adherents of the consensus paradigm start with an assumption of a fundamental normative consensus as the necessary basis of societal order. Schools are seen as institutions that maintain such normative agreement and balance the incremental changes and minor differences that exist in the surrounding social context.<sup>12</sup> Since this paradigm views the American society as valuing open access to positions of leadership and privilege, schools are seen as helping to actualize this democratic and achievement-oriented ethic. Youngsters are aided to overcome the natural inequities of their origins and to acquire the basic attitudes and skills required to perform roles congruent with their talent and ability. The variety of pluralistic political beliefs and actions available in the society at large also are manifest in the school, and the school encourages

<sup>12</sup>This general view is called "meritocratic" by Rehberg and Rosenthal (1978). It is explicated by sociologists such as Goslin (1965), Parsons (1959), Hauser (1971).

(or at least does not prohibit) inter-status groupings among various races and classes. For the most part, universal standards and procedures guarantee that similar things happen to women and men, black, brown, and white youngsters, and rich and poor students in schools. When the outcomes of schooling deviate from these universal criteria and fail to respond to individual attributes, it is seen as due to inadequate administrative practice, maladjustments between the school and other institutions (such as families responsible for prior student preparation), or the talent, effort, or attitudes of students who are failing.

One example of the distinctions which flow from these two different models of schooling exists in the explanations given for the growth and expansion of public education in the United States. Squires notes that according to the consensus view, education "expanded in response to the rising technical skills' requirements of jobs and to create greater equality, or at least equality of opportunity" (1977, p. 437). According to the conflict view, education "expanded to meet the rising social control problems generated by industrialization and urbanization in the U.S. by imparting non-cognitive traits of obedience, discipline and respect for authority in students" (p. 437). In seeking to assess the validity of these two models of our society and our schools, Squires has identified the basic issue as whether education's value pays off according to technical competence/training, or according to non-job-related social and political skills and styles. Adherents of the consensus model hold that historic and pervasive links between family origin and educational attainment, and between educational attainment and occupational status, are the result of direct relevancies of prior family socialization, technical education training, talent or skill, and changing job requirements. Adherents of the conflict model argue the relevance of group struggles that have placed certain classes (white and affluent) in control of both occupational and educational

systems. They control the rules of the game -- the ways in which requirements are developed and implemented -- and can ensure preferred educational and occupational opportunity and outcomes (only partly related to actual talent or training) to children of elite groups (Collins, 1971).

Inside the school organization, adherents of the consensus model assume that authority is wielded as a public trust on behalf of all people. Others, not in power, generally trust the good will of those in managerial and governing roles, believe that authority is rooted in professional expertise and efficiency, and therefore feel that its exercise usually is both legitimate and wise. Consensus theorists and practitioners see no reason to interfere with this exercise of public trust, and dismiss citizen accountability in preference for intra-professional guardianship and systems of peer review and monitoring. This view is most consistent with both bureaucratic (Callahan, 1962; Katz, 1964) and collegial (Corwin, 1970; Miles, 1967) notions of the formal control structure of schools. While these views of schools do not ignore internal and external conflicts, they generally are seen as avoidable, unfortunate, caused largely by subjective reactions, and remediable by better managerial procedures.

Adherents of the conflict model assume that authority in the community and the school is wielded by ruling groups primarily in their own interests. These interests include maintaining the power of ruling groups, perhaps including some rewards that "buy off" challengers and partisan groups possessing lesser power. Inside the school, authority is wielded by professional educators in the primary interest of professional adult educators (who generally are white and relatively affluent). Others, not in power, often do not trust this authority to govern in ways that meet their needs. Therefore, conflict theorists see it as imperative that unrepresented or low-power groups find ways to hold educators publicly accountable for their acts. This view is most

consistent with clearly politicized notions of the formal control structure of schools (Carnoy, 1974; Fantini, 1969; Kimbrough, 1964; Lurie, 1970). These conflicts do not occur only between educators and clients; they also mark the structure of intra-professional relations as well. As a member of a professional system, the educator can anticipate autonomy to control his or her own work and collegial governance of the organization. As a subordinate employee in a bureaucracy, the educator can anticipate rules controlling his or her performance and governance via a hierarchy of superordinate officials. And as a member of a political agency, the educator can anticipate pressure from local clients and peers via public mechanisms of representation and informal pressure. Thus, educators themselves are caught in an objective and unavoidable conflict between varied role expectations and responsibilities (Becker, 1953; Bidwell, 1965; Getzels, 1963).

Running through all these organizational forms and role expectations is the reality of differential power and privilege accorded to principals and teachers, to department chairpersons and regular teachers, to professional staff members and para-professional aides, etc. When differential rewards are allocated on the basis of status, a natural and endemic conflict ensues between staff groups over: (1) the rules of the game; and (2) the power to rule the game. One key vehicle of power consolidation is teacher unions and associations, organizations established to protect and advance teachers' self-interests in rewards as well as their control over the workplace. The quest for such control has spawned an increase in the use of collective bargaining and its implicit base in a conflict set of assumptions. According to Kalish and Goldner (1971), teachers and other public employees adopted this approach as they experienced the failure of the consensus model, which assumed that professional managers of public employee systems would make decisions in their employees' welfare. Their loss of trust in benevolent paternalism raised the consciousness of professional employees regarding the natural

conflicts present in the public employee system. Since many middle-level administrators see themselves left out of the resource-allocation contest among communities, teachers, and boards, they also have organized to obtain a share of power and to press their own self-interests in the midst of multi-party conflict and negotiations.

Paulston (1976) has extended these analyses in his comparisons of consensus-oriented (equilibrium in his terms) and conflict-oriented theories of the relationship between educational and social change. His work, summarized in the chart on page 24, helps us make several essential points:

1. When the focus is upon educational change, each paradigm (theory) makes its own conclusions regarding the key pre-conditions, rationales, scope and processes, and outcomes of change.
2. While we have been contrasting consensus and conflict paradigms in general, there are many more discrete variants within each major paradigm. Despite these distinctions, our general descriptions of each paradigm agree with the more detailed lineup Paulston presents here.
3. These general descriptions need to be rescued from abstraction in order to interpret or guide effective analysis and action. In the balance of the paper, we turn our attention to the particular set of research, theory, and practice needs and opportunities present in school desegregation.

#### Alternative Models Applied to School Desegregation

Adherents of the consensus and conflict paradigms offer alternative views of the roots, nature, and future of school desegregation. As such, each suggests different problems that must be solved for desegregation to be effective. According to adherents of the consensus model, strains have arisen between the value of equal opportunity and the need for educational talent to operate a highly technical economy. Over time, minority subgroups have competed less effectively than whites for cherished economic roles and for positions of political leadership. These circumstances have their roots in a history of racial and class stratification, although this history is being altered by more egalitarian social arrangements. Currently, intergroup

RELATIONS BETWEEN THEORIES OF SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE/"REFORM"<sup>13</sup>

Social Change Illustrative Linked Assumptions Concerning Educational-Change Potentials and Processes

Paradigm	"Theories"	Re Preconditions for Educational Change	Re Rationales for Educational Change	Re Scope and Process of Educational Change	Re Major Outcomes Sought
Equilibrium	Evolutionary	State of evolutionary readiness	Pressure to move to a higher evolutionary stage	Incremental and adaptive; "natural history" approach	New stage of institutions; evolutionary adaptation
	Neo-Evolutionary	Satisfactory completion of earlier stages	Required to support "national modernization" efforts	"Institution building" using Western models and technical assistance	New "higher" state of education and social differentiation/specialization
	Structural-Functionalist	Altered functional and structural requisites	Social system need provoking an educational response; exogenous threats	Incremental adjustment of existing institutions, occasionally major	Continued "homeostasis" or "moving" equilibrium; "human capital" and national "development"
	Systems	Technical expertise in "systems management." "Rational decision making" and "needs assessment"	Need for greater efficiency in system's operation and goal achievement; i.e., response to a system "malfunction"	Innovative "problem solving" in existing systems; i.e., "Research and Development" approach	Improved "efficiency" re costs/benefits; adoption of innovations
Conflict	Marxian	Elite's awareness of need for change, or shift of power to socialist rulers and educational reformers	To adjust correspondence between social relations of production and social relations of schooling	Adjustive incremental following social mutations or radical restructuring with Marxist predominance	Formation of integrated workers, i.e., the new "Socialist Man"
	Neo-Marxian	Increased political power and political awareness of working class	Demands for social justice and social equality	Large-scale national reforms through "democratic" institutions and processes	Eliminate "educational privilege" and "elitism"; create a more equalitarian society
	Cultural Revitalization	Rise of a collective effort to revive or create "a new culture." Social tolerance for "deviant" normative movements and their educational programs	Rejection of conventional schooling as forced acculturation. Education needed to support advance toward movement goals	Creation of alternative schools or educational settings. If movement captures polity, radical change in national educational ideology and structure	Inculcate new normative system. Meet movement's recruitment, training, and solidarity needs
	Anarchistic Utopian	Creation of supportive settings; growth of critical consciousness; social pluralism	Free man from institutional and social constraints. Enhance creativity need for "life-long learning"	Isolated "freeing up" of existing programs and institutions, or create new learning modes and settings, i.e., a "learning society"	Self-renewal and participation. Local control of resources and community; elimination of exploitation and alienation

<sup>13</sup>Paulston, 1976, p. vi-vii.

relations' problems occur within a context of individual prejudice and occasional systematic deviations from American norms of racial and social equality. This is, indeed, "the American dilemma," seen by Chesler (1976) as treating racism as ephemeral in nature and as only minimally embedded in basic institutional structures and processes.

The pattern of unequal minority achievement is seen as unfortunate by consensus theorists, partly because of society's consequent loss of human resources and partly because it prevents the society from realizing its moral objectives of equal opportunity. Inadequate educational arrangements have rendered the society less efficient than it could have been had talented minority members been identified, utilized, and advanced. In a changing political system, these outcomes can lead and have led to serious disruptions of social order, as minorities respond to their frustrations and blocked aspirations.

Since schools are seen by consensus theorists as essential to the realization of equal opportunity and achievement, minorities must be provided with school experiences which will enable them to be competitive in the employment market, as well as in attempts to gain political leadership and social privilege. School desegregation promises that minority youngsters will have access to the same educational resources and experiences as do whites. It is a response to the minorities' feelings that their educational and economic aspirations may be forever blocked, and provides an arena in which talented minority members may advance themselves.

Adherents of the conflict model provide some different images of the roots and meaning of desegregation. In their view, the American society is experiencing another episode in its continuing struggle between powerful groups who rule the society and minorities who historically have been at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. This pattern is but one element of a

larger pattern of economic stratification and control which, in the wealthiest nation in the world, produces super-rich groups as well as groups for whom day-to-day survival is fragile. Racial oppression is seen to be systematic and coercive, with only minor or rhetorical progress being made toward true equality or justice. Inter-group relations' problems certainly are supported by patterns of individual prejudice, but much more importantly by institutional racism, a basic, historic, and heavily embedded feature of the American society (Chesler, 1976). Ruling groups not only rule minorities but poor and middle-class whites as well: one dynamic by which affluent groups maintain control is to exploit the divisions between poor whites and poor blacks, to keep them battling each other, thus distracting attention from actual rule by very affluent groups of whites.

According to conflict theorists, the condition of minorities and other moderate- to low-income groups deteriorates as their concentration increases, and as their low power roles in massive corporate conglomerates or governmental bureaucracies becomes more solidified. As corporate industry has increased in size and diversification, cities have become less and less important to our economy -- new factories, new worker populations, and new consumer wealth are concentrated increasingly in the suburbs. Industrial developers seek regions with tax benefits, non-unionized workers, low environmental controls, and "safe" working environs, all conditions of social harmony and order that take them away from northern, industrialized, polluted, and "crime-ridden" urban centers. At the same time, the concentration of minorities in urban centers increases.

Conflict theorists emphasize that in northern cities desegregation may satisfy constitutional provisions for equal educational opportunity while typically retaining separated housing and occupational patterns. The focus on school desegregation often diverts attention from the increasing economic

isolation and abandonment of the poor of all races, especially blacks and hispanics. At the same time, it gives the appearance that changes are being made and that the ruling white and affluent class is making alterations in the society . . . of course the alterations accompanying desegregation primarily affect the life styles and educational experiences of minorities and of whites who are urban and poor, not of affluent whites themselves. Struggles to redress these educational and social conditions often develop as poor peoples' movements or minority group movements attack ruling establishments. In turn, according to the basic principles of a political democracy, elites try to move these struggles off the streets and channel conflicts into the legal arena, into a rational and lengthy process for conflict resolution.

It is all too easy for local communities to ignore these patterns of racial separation and stratification, or to assume a consensus on race-related issues and to concentrate on the schools' problems. According to adherents of the conflict model, significant and sustained changes cannot be made in schools unless connections are made to problems of municipal finance, jobs, housing, social services, crime, transportation, political representation, federal agency actions, and all the other factors which determine the quality of life in a local community. If the entire politico-economic structure is involved in the maintenance of racism and inequality, then educational changes cannot effectively address those issues without attending to the role and actions of larger social structures. Thus, positive efforts at desegregation must also address broader educational issues, such as how schools are to be financed and controlled. Whether local school financing occurs via local property taxes, general state revenues, or federal block grants matters a great deal. It is relevant to community-wide questions of financial inequality and places school desegregation conflicts in the context of broader community economics. Similarly, it matters for desegregation how local schools are to

be controlled. Community elites who rule in the name of a local consensus establish very different governance patterns than do negotiators arranging collaborative bargaining among various conflicting groups.

One key aspect of any organization is the nature of its interface with the community or other external environment. Almost all observers agree that the local school system exists in a delicate balance, caught in the American political struggle between those advocating more control of education at the national level and those advocating more control of schools at the local level. As part of the exploration of this interface, Orfield (1969) has conceptualized conflict over southern school desegregation as rooted in basic tensions between the principle of equality and the principle of local control. Although both principles are fundamental to the American system, various groups have differing power to affect their destinies, either with regard to issues of equality or issues of local power and control of their communities. In the decades following 1950, minorities often were able to exert more influence at the national than the local level; the trans-local organization of minority interests had access to the federal judicial and legislative system (Coleman, 1970; Corwin, 1965). At the local level, powerful white groups ruled their communities and schools, especially in the southern states.

According to conflict theorists, the political structure governing local schools is most often dominated by the property-owning classes, including the social and business elite of the community. These local elites typically favor (and get) stability and the maintenance of their preferred interests in the operation of schools, through the instrument of professional practitioners. According to consensus theorists, such elites do not necessarily exert ruling control of local communities, and therefore not of their schools either. Many people of a given community, from various cross-cutting groups and roles, are seen to participate in electing a school board, voting on millage elections, gaining access to educational leaders, etc.

The educational goals of local school desegregation are also conceptualized differently, depending on whether the consensus or conflict paradigm is used. According to the consensus model, desegregation should increase the possibility of order and stability in the society, primarily by satisfying minorities' feelings of exclusion and injustice. Such goals may require increasing the ability of minority groups to compete with white groups, especially by raising their educational standards and performance to those of prevailing white norms. This is accomplished best through assimilative processes, subtle pressures, and opportunities whereby minorities accommodate to white norms, standards, etc. According to the conflict model, desegregation should increase the possibility of justice in the society by increasing the status and power of minorities in their attempt to negotiate for various resources with more powerful white groups. The maintenance of pluralistic goals for performance, and of distinct cultural heritages, is essential. A potentially dangerous byproduct of desegregation, in this view, is that it might dilute the concentrated power of numbers available to minority communities by spreading their children throughout the broader white community. The result might be a loss of the sense of cultural uniqueness and the power base from which minorities protect and advance their interests. Without substantial numbers of minority youth in a school, it is hard for minority parents to press for special programs, minority faculty, and school accountability to them and their concerns. According to the consensus model, this concern about the dilution of minority power is either irrelevant to educational goals or politically compatible with the notion of defusing and diffusing groups that might challenge current power arrangements.

In addition to discussions about the overall goals of desegregation, the different models can also illuminate alternative means-goals, organizational programs presumed to lead to broader goals of achievement, equality, equity, etc.



For instance, Paulston clarifies the distinction between conflict and consensus perspectives in her analysis of the differences between "Bilingual Education" and "English as a Second Language" approaches to educational equity and proficiency for hispanic youngsters:<sup>14</sup>

Bilingual education proponents typically claim that teachers should be members of the same cultural group as the students and tend to ignore the teachers' proficiency of English as an important qualification. Their position, whether theoretical or not, tends to be one of conflict orientation, frequently tending towards utopian ideology. ESL proponents, on the other hand, typically insist on discussing issues at the level of method and technique, a characteristic of the structural/functional approach. They see fluency in English and a thorough training in the techniques of ESL as the major requirement amongst the competencies of a teacher of limited English-speaking children (1977, p. 9).

ESL advocates evidently assume a consensus on goals, while Bilingual Education advocates see themselves in considerable conflict with dominant educational traditions and cultures. Questions of cultural and linguistic assimilation or pluralism (or the appropriate limits of pluralism) obviously are relevant here.

Adherents of the consensus paradigm suggest we all agree on the meaning and importance of educational values like individual achievement, academic excellence, citizenship training, etc. Such universal norms and values exist, are "good," and should guide our behavior. Adherents of the conflict paradigm, on the other hand, suggest that what appear to be universal norms are really only thin veils covering one group's control of the educational value system. Just as there is conflict over basic material resources and status, there is also conflict over moral norms. People from different backgrounds disagree about the nature of the good life, beauty, adolescent sexuality,

<sup>14</sup> Bilingual Education efforts suggest that youngsters' original language be maintained, and that instruction occur in this language. Thus, students can learn math, reading, and social studies in their original language. English as a Second Language approaches recognize youngsters' original language, but seek to supplant it, inside the school at least, with academic instruction in English. Thus, English proficiency sooner or later is a prerequisite for success in math, reading, and social studies.

citizenship, proper male student behavior, proper female student behavior, what a good white student is, what a good black student is, what a good hispanic student is, etc. Control of the definition of "good" is a part of the basic conflict and does not exist apart from it.

The organizational structures and processes of local schools potentially intervene between these general cultural, community, and family issues and students' eventual performance and the short- or long-term outcomes of schooling. They are also the major mechanisms for implementing desegregation at the local level. Adherents of the consensus model suggest that school organizations support cultural pluralism and that a well-functioning professional staff can serve the interests of most if not all students -- and certainly those who are motivated to pursue an education. Some minor alterations no doubt are necessary, but the basic school structure does not need major overhauling in order to accomplish desegregation. Adherents of the conflict model, on the other hand, suggest that schools act as conduits for the white culture, barely tolerating and attempting to assimilate aspects of black, hispanic, and other minority cultures. Professional selection and socialization patterns, organized by the prevailing white culture, systematically alienate educators from identification with minorities and poor people, and often make adults non-trusting of youth. Student motivation, and often performance as well, reflects this pattern, and minority students often reciprocate with alienation and distrust of the school itself. From this perspective, attempts to desegregate schools require a series of cultural and structural changes that cannot be effected within the professional bureaucracies of schooling as currently organized.

For instance, in the attempt to analyze and alter organizational structures and processes, scholars often collect various elements into a single organizational variable called "climate." All parties' access to trust and

influence, student and teacher satisfaction, mutual respect across racial, generational and other status lines, norms and expectations, and the quality of peer organization and support may be included in "climate." Weinberg makes the general case for the importance of altering this variable or variable cluster during desegregation, noting that most desegregation:<sup>15</sup>

. . . experiments are usually confined to changing the racial compositions of the classroom or the school. Teaching methods and school organization remain the same. Implicitly, this assumes that existing methods and structures are conducive to educational growth (1977, p. 169).

Orfield (1975) argues further that the key organizational targets of change in a desegregation program should include teaching methods, the principal role, the teaching staff, and the curriculum.

Another position somewhat consistent with the conflict model can be found in several scholars' classroom research. For instance, in a review of research on organizational factors relevant to school desegregation, Cohen argued that: ". . . the school, as presently structured, does not present many opportunities for interracial interaction" (1975, p. 290). And certainly not for interracial interaction that might support positive racial relations! Even within desegregated schools, student social groups are segregated, and academic groups often are tracked or informally separated in ways that permit and promote status inequality and cultural distance. For different interracial patterns to be promoted, alternative structures and procedures for grouping and teaching youngsters will have to be developed.

At the classroom level, these issues of "climate" and interracial inter-

<sup>15</sup>This observation is another example of the difference between reviewing the "what is" version versus the "what might be." According to Weinberg, most desegregation is implemented as if no major changes in the school organization are necessary, and the changes or "experiments" that are made are often limited to physical movement of youngsters. If this is the "what is," our evaluations of desegregation are based on a series of minimally changed situations. No wonder they show only minimal gains in climate, performance, and other variables!

action become much more visible and potent. The enormous power of the teacher is usually seen to be necessary, in what may be viewed as a site of multiple incipient conflicts, some of which are age/grade or role related (student-teacher), and some of which are latent and peer related (student-student). Because of the dominance of the consensus model of schooling, which accepts this power as an appropriate reflection of public trust in educational authority, relatively little critical analysis of alternative instructional dynamics during desegregation has been undertaken. Recent studies of the nature of teachers' power bases (reward, legitimate, coercive, referent, expert, and informational) have begun to relate this role variable to classroom conflict, student-teacher and student-student behaviors, and school outcomes (Jamieson and Thomas, 1974). The power of the teacher's role has major implications for many commonly studied situations in desegregated schools, such as teacher expectations, student initiative and satisfaction, interpersonal and racial relations in the classroom, differential student response to classroom content and instructional processes, and probably self-esteem, achievement, and other student outcomes as well (Willower, et al., 1973).

One particularly interesting issue is the nature and structure of student tasks and rewards. Important student outcomes generally are recognized in standardized grades, rewards delivered on an individual basis, presumably for individual work. Adherents of the consensus model generally argue that such rewards implement a normative agreement regarding expected student behaviors; when administered "fairly," everyone has an equal chance for good grades. No special procedures or innovations in this apparently universalistic system are required to deal with desegregation. Adherents of the conflict model generally do not assume rewards are distributed fairly for individual work; rather, grades are seen as a mechanism for ensuring dominant

groups' standards, styles, and status. Moreover, individual rewards generate a biased range of peer comparisons and competitions and promote student compliance to historic academic criteria and authority. These tendencies are especially dangerous in a newly desegregated setting, where dominance-submission, peer competition, and fearful compliance to authority may become highly charged racial issues.

The further we proceed in this discussion of the societal, community, and organizational contexts of desegregation, the more it becomes obvious that successful desegregation requires a variety of changes in traditional schooling processes. According to the model preferred, the changes may be minor or major, reformist or revolutionary, easy or hard. But changes they are! In fact, desegregation can be considered as part of a deliberate attempt to alter current patterns of school and community life. Thus, the conflict and consensus paradigms can now be applied to alternative strategies of planned or intended social change.<sup>16</sup> Several scholars explicitly or implicitly have used these comparisons to categorize and compare theories of social and educational change (Chin and Benne, 1969; Crowfoot and Chesler, 1974; Rothman, 1970), but the most recent comprehensive effort is Paulston's, as summarized in the chart on page 24.

Adherents of the consensus strategy of change make assumptions congruent with the broader consensus paradigm. As such, it is assumed that a relatively rational and collaborative problem-solving process will permit everyone to participate as they wish and to work together to solve organizational or

<sup>16</sup>As noted in the general discussion of the conflict and consensus models, elaboration of the ways these models lead to change strategies should not bind us to an either-or orientation. Conflict and consensus-based strategies can be mixed or used in a serial manner in any change effort such as desegregation. Conflicting and competing community or school groups can make a consensus or coalition on single issues, even while they continue to be in conflict on other issues. By the same token, groups in a consensus may experience tactical disagreements, internal contests for dominance, etc.

community problems. When and if the process of collaborative problem solving fails to work effectively, it is assumed this is accidental rather than deliberate or inevitable. Therefore, increased communications should provide better information and broader input to a basically open decision-making effort. Groups who feel their needs and interests are not being met should use tactics of appeal, wherein they communicate their concerns to authorities, whom they expect have good intentions to serve them. Implementation of change efforts undertaken from this strategy also proceed in a collaborative manner. Change-makers generally plan with the interests of aggrieved groups in mind; on occasion they will include these groups in their deliberations. It is expected that people will accept changes that help them attain the organization's goals, or that appear to benefit most organizational or community members.

Adherents of the conflict strategy of change make assumptions congruent with the broader conflict paradigm. As such, the basic process utilized to make changes involves advocacy of group interests and negotiations or collective bargaining. In this situation, low power groups must gain power, and when various groups have fairly equal power (or at least power sufficient to hurt one another), they will assess each others' strengths and on this basis make decisions that will protect and advance their respective goals and vulnerabilities, as well as protect the system's viability. When this basic process fails to work smoothly, it is assumed that one group has managed to gain so much power that it can ignore or disregard other groups' needs and interests. More communication may not help in this situation; it might even give away important secrets (about vulnerabilities, potential compromises, etc.) that could be used to increase the power imbalance. Increased efforts to mobilize one's own power, or to neutralize opponents' power, is the appropriate step. Action may take the form of gathering more potent resources -- money, people, organizing -- or of threatening the stability and ability of other groups to rule.<sup>17</sup> Implementation

of change efforts proceeds via organizing people who hold similar values/needs into tightly self-reliant groups. The development of a power base is essential, and confrontations with people of different statuses and values should be expected. People will accept changes that help them attain personal or subgroup goals, or that appear to help them move the organization or community in a desired direction.

Adherents of both paradigms own that the process of change is not easy. What or who are the key roadblocks? Why do some people and groups oppose it? The rationales for opposing desegregation can be every bit as varied as the reasons for supporting it. In practice, it seldom is clear whether minority or majority groups' resistance is rooted in opposition to racial mixing, per se, or to the particular programmatic mode in which desegregation is implemented. For instance, it is obvious that some white citizens' objections are rooted in opposition to lengthy transportation plans which take youngsters out of their home environs to "alien turf," to schools that are perceived to be physically unsafe or inferior. White groups may also express concerns about "lowered educational standards," and the poorer education they expect will accompany new groups of students. Other whites' objections are rooted in more general forms of racism, perhaps in what some have called "symbolic racism."<sup>18</sup>

Some minorities' objections are rooted in opposition to policy-makers' assumptions that minority youth can learn only when exposed to or located near white "models," thus derogating the possibility of quality education in any minority environment. Other minorities' objections are tied to the transportation burdens their young are asked to bear, or to their potential exposure to

<sup>17</sup> For low power groups who have few material and official resources, threats and illegitimate acts that disrupt orderly operations is a critical source of power.

<sup>18</sup> See our discussion of racism, attitudes and actions, in pages following.

rejection, isolation, discrimination, or violence in a new school. Minorities are as concerned with neighborhood schools as are whites, and desegregation may threaten their newly found ability to influence and control the local educational system. The challenge from local groups may lead to examination of the educational program of desegregated schools, and to minority focus on whether and how their special needs (regarding subject matter, instructional techniques, vocational efforts, bi-lingual or multi-cultural programs) are being met.

Opposition or roadblocks to desegregation do not come solely from community groups: educators often resist these changes as well. However this resistance is couched (e.g. in racial terms or in educational terminology and jargon), it is clear that educational leaders have helped delay and/or resist desegregation through a variety of legal appeals and administrative arrangements over the years . . . north and south, urban and rural.<sup>19</sup> In fact, Candoli has argued that it is a false myth to believe that educators are generally committed to desegregation (1978). Rooted in the same society as the rest of us, often required to make many immediate changes, teachers and other staff members can be expected to vary considerably in their support for desegregation. Since they have considerable power (at levels of policy-making and school/classroom implementation) to determine whether or not desegregation will work, educators' responses and reactions are quite important. The general focus on overt community opposition often has overshadowed the more subtle varieties of resistance and even sabotage generated from within the educational establishment.

Social scientists and policy-makers concerned with opposition or resistance to desegregation make different assumptions about the legitimacy and potency of each of these groups and factors, depending upon the dominant paradigm from

<sup>19</sup> Numerous books, articles, and court cases document the post-Brown history of "massive resistance," outright delay, and gradual implementation of desegregation orchestrated by professional educators and community school boards.

which they operate. Their commitments to either the consensus or conflict model of school and community life, and their general approach to desegregation as a public policy matter, also clarify the options they have for dealing with opposition. For instance, consensus strategists generally stress the role of failures in communication and trust as key pitfalls to any change process. On racial matters, they stress the negative heritage of ignorance and prejudice primarily evident in poor white groups who feel threatened by the intrusion of minority youngsters. Organizational inertia itself is seen to play a major role, as does some educators' resistance to innovation. Conflict strategists stress power imbalance, or the ability of ruling groups to successfully ignore or out-manuever low power groups as the key pitfall. When this occurs, vital official resources are denied to the desegregation effort, and advocates of change must create new community or organizational resources by themselves. The organizational (and sometimes socio-economic) self-interest of educational professionals, who wish to make educational decisions by themselves or with trusted community allies, also is seen to play a major role in excluding the concerns of minority groups.

In the chart on the following pages, we have summarized the relevance of the consensus and conflict paradigms for the process of desegregation. Several conclusions can be drawn from this summary and the preceeding discussions:

1. The contrasting paradigms offer basically different understandings of the societal origins and goals of desegregation.
2. The contrasting paradigms offer basically different analyses of the community and organizational contexts within which school desegregation takes place.
3. The contrasting paradigms begin to suggest basically different praxes for both established leaders and white and minority citizens as they try to implement desegregation effectively.
4. The contrasting paradigms call for basically different kinds of strategic information, research, and conceptual analyses to aid in understanding the history, progress, and future of local desegregation efforts.

In the balance of this paper we will examine selected practices which have been utilized to bring about effective desegregation in schools and communities. In order to advance our understanding of these practical options, we will continue to consider their assumptive bases in the consensus or conflict paradigms of analysis and action.

Alternative Models Applied to School Desegregation

<u>Desegregation Parameters</u>	<u>Consensus Model</u>	<u>Conflict Model</u>
<b>1. Generally</b>		
a. Societal context	Value strains between equal opportunity and individual achievement. Need for minority talent and better use of human resources.	Economic and political struggle between groups with privilege and those without. Need to maintain underclass and resist their struggle for liberation.
b. Goals of desegregation	Assimilation, adaptation of minorities to white styles. Improve academic performance of minorities, peaceful race relations, improved self-esteem of minorities. Reduce tension accompanying social change.	Empower minorities in struggle for social justice. Reduce white racism. Improve survival skills and career related academic performance of minorities.
c. Problems of race relations in school	Rooted in poor communication, inadequate socialization, and malcontents. Prejudice and ignorance on the part of some whites.	Rooted in differential socialization and status, exploitative white control, and rebellion by minorities. The schools' own racism.
<b>2. Community Structures</b>		
a. Power and control	Shared by entire community and exercised through democratic processes	Held by affluent white elites and exercised in relatively covert ways.
b. Elite-grassroots interaction	Elites are representative and trustworthy. Elites often act altruistically to serve the general welfare. All are part of the same community of interest.	Elites exploit others. Elites will resist changes that threaten their self-interest. Elites seldom are affected by mass education policies, such as desegregation. Elites have very different goals, interests, and styles.
c. Role of schools	Arena for individual mobility. Pluralistic reflection of all groups' values.	Arena for maintaining differential access to societal rewards. Built in the image of white and affluent groups.

<b>3. Organizational Features of Schools</b>		
a. Authority	Wielded as a public trust for the common good. Others not in power trust managers' good will and expertise. Authority is legitimate and wise. Stress professional (peer) accountability.	Wielded in the interest of ruling groups within and without the school. Others not in power do not trust its arbitrariness. Authority makes its working mysterious. Stress public accountability.
b. Norms	Natural outgrowth of shared values and goals like individual achievement. Universal norms exist that are good and should guide us. Communication resolves differences and increases consensus. Deviants are maladjusted or pathological.	Imposed result of power and its justification. Basic values are part of the contest. Differential norms reflect societal divisions. Communication often clarifies differences and increases conflict. Deviants are disagreeers who are labelled and controlled.
c. Professional/client/consumer relations	Professional expertise is valid. Parent-student involvement is good. Control should be in professionals' hands.	Professional expertise is a mask for elite standards and values. Parent-student involvement is good if translated into power to affect decisions.
<b>4. Changes Required</b>		
a. Change processes	Comes from collaboration and agreements among all parties. Supported by top managers. Process of rational problem-solving, scientific analysis of options, persuasion. Increase communication from educators to minorities.	Comes from strongly felt needs of excluded or oppressed groups. Often implemented without support from managers. Process of mobilization of low-power groups, coalitions with some elites, challenge to authorities with threats and bargaining.
b. Priority changes	Retrain educators. Better trained staff can serve better. Minor organizational changes in curriculum, personnel policy, and student relations . . . all within existing structure.	Train parents. Retrain educators in conjunction with parents. Better trained community can hold staff accountable for services.

2. Priority changes (continued)		Major organizational changes in programs, personnel, and structures to reflect plural cultures and increased minority power.
c. Relation between individual and organizational change	Individual changes are a good end. As individuals change, so will organizations.	Individual changes must be translated into organizational change. Organizational norms and structures control the limits of individual change.
5. Views of Conflict		
a. General	Maybe natural, but unnecessary. Nuisance to be avoided or suppressed or resolved quickly.	Natural and necessary. Key resource needed to alter system.
b. Major roadblocks to desegregation	Inevitable slowness of transitions in cultural values. Ignorance and prejudice of some educators and many parents. Irrational fears of educators. Natural inertia of organizations and the complexity of change.	Larger patterns of societal privilege and oppression are hard to alter. People in power try to retain control and fail to share resources. Manipulation of parents' fears. Racial mixing substituted for racial justice. Difficulties in low-power groups' ability to mobilize support.

III. DESEGREGATION PRACTICES  
IN RELATION TO THE CONSENSUS AND CONFLICT MODELS

We have indicated that the paradigm used to understand societies and schools affects the options social researchers or practitioners employ in their research or action efforts. In this section we examine selected innovative school practices employed by people trying to create positive forms of desegregation. Wherever possible, we will continue to make the connections between these programs and our earlier discussions of alternative theory, research, and action efforts. In the course of this review, it will become clear what the biases are of currently popular options, where possibilities exist for new practices, which current change efforts we ought to pursue more vigorously, and what new research is most critical.

The educational and social changes accompanying school desegregation require new programming at various levels of a school system's operations. We will examine, in turn, action alternatives that occur in the community or between the school and the community, in the internal organization of schooling, including the classroom, and in the ideas and behaviors of individuals who staff the teaching-learning system. The specific examples discussed here come from a variety of knowledge bases: some come from social scientific research and evaluation, some from informal observations and reports of school-community activities, and some from participants' and practitioners' plans and programs.<sup>20</sup> What they

<sup>20</sup> Several sources have been most helpful in the preparation of this section: (1) Weinberg's massive compilation of research studies and his thoughtful effort to extend research to its practical implications (Weinberg, 1977); (2) the Educational Testing Service's original research report on school conditions associated with effective desegregation (Forehand and Ragosta, 1976; and Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, 1976); (3) the recent series of research reports prepared by Coulson and his colleagues that document the Emergency School Assistance Program (Coulson, et al., 1976; and Coulson et al., 1977); (4) the descriptive case studies created by the regional offices and advisory groups of the United States Commission on Civil Rights . . . as summarized by the Commission (Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, 1976), and as presented separately.

all have in common is a concern to alter and improve the daily business of desegregated schooling.

The Community Context and Resources

The nature of the school system's interface with the local community is a critical issue for all those concerned with desegregation. All community contexts are not alike, of course, and school-community dynamics may differ in different regions, urban and rural areas, etc. Communities also differ in their degree of overt conflict between majority and minority groups, or between affluent and poor groups, and the institutional means available for resolving such conflicts. They also differ in their support for desegregation.

In the context of community variation, it is often difficult to assess the meaning of public opinion polls or surveys purporting to describe popular sentiment regarding school desegregation. Consider the trends reported in the following table:<sup>21</sup>

<u>White Support for Black and White Students</u>			
<u>Going to School Together</u>			
<u>Year</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>Whole Country</u>
1942	40%	2%	30%
1956	61%	14%	49%
1963	73%	34%	63%
1970	83%	46%	73%
1976	n/a	n/a	83%

rately in at least 29 individual case studies (USCCR, 1977a-q); (5) our own retrieval efforts, derived from contacts with scholars and practitioners in numerous schools, cities, and related agencies. These five major sources vary considerably in their investigative methods, in their concern either with research procedures or with practical programs, and in their focus on original knowledge or in the creation of integrative syntheses. We wish to thank Ms. Jan Wright for her thorough analysis and organization of many of the materials reported in this section.

<sup>21</sup>This table combines data from several articles reporting public sentiment towards school desegregation over time (in some cases the numbers represent our approximation from charts and graphs). The same question, asked at five different points in time, is reported in: Greeley and Sheatsley (1971); and Taylor, Sheatsley, and Greeley (1978).

Shall we conclude that there is growing public support for school desegregation? Or shall we conclude growing public sophistication about the "socially correct" answers one ought to give to public opinion surveys? Are these reported attitudes peoples' "real" and private views, or just those they are comfortable sharing publicly with a stranger conducting a poll or interview? Several scholars suggest that many whites still resist desegregation but have substituted more cautious or sophisticated arguments for outright expressions of prejudice or disfavor (Schuman, 1969; McConaghy and Hough, 1976).

There also may be quite a gap between "liberalized" sentiments such as those reported above and peoples' actual behavior in specific and local circumstances.<sup>22</sup> Some people hold these views firmly and support them with highly-articulated arguments and relevant actions; some people merely react verbally to a social situation. For some citizens the process of school desegregation is an immediate one affecting their day-to-day experiences and behaviors; for others it is an issue they care about but are not directly affected by; for still others it is merely an item of information encountered in the newspaper or the television newscast. National public surveys cannot possibly reflect the role of local events and community dynamics in mobilizing and directing public opinion, and in constraining or creating opportunities for certain behaviors and actions. For instance, media reports of school desegregation are replete with reports of local resistance and concern. While most organized resistance to mandatory desegregation, or at least to massive student transportation plans, has come from white groups, it is clear that some black, hispanic, and Asian-American parents and community groups also oppose these school changes.

<sup>22</sup>The attitude-behavior discrepancy is a long-standing issue in social-psychological research, and the issues are well documented in two excellent reviews, separated by over 25 years of work (Chein, Deutsch, Hyman, and Jahoda, 1949; and Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Arguments can be made about whether the explanation for the discrepancy lies in the psychological nature of individuals, poor measurement techniques, the ineluctable character of attitudes, or the power of changing social environments, etc.



Regardless of one's perceptions of local community support (or lack thereof) for school desegregation, it seems clear that school and community leaders' actions may have potent impact on community orientations and actions. For instance, according to the observations of the United States Civil Rights Commission:

Ordered by the Federal District Court to eliminate every form of racial segregation in the public schools of Boston, the Boston School Committee has pursued a deliberate policy of minimal compliance. The effect of the Boston School Committee's statements, policy and inaction was to foster within the community outright resistance to school desegregation (Desegregating the Boston Public Schools, 1975, p. viii).

And in Pontiac, Michigan, community leaders identified the manner in which they felt their school board and superintendent contributed to strife and eventual violence in that city's desegregation efforts:

The school board knew it was in the wrong, but refused to admit it, even after all court appeals had been exhausted; the board misled the public. The community would have been more cooperative if the superintendent had said, 'We are desegregating because it is the right thing to do for the children' (Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, 1976, p. 179-180).

The relevance of positive action by school system and community leaders also has been documented in a number of cases. For instance, the Community Relations Committee of Charlotte-Mecklenberg noted, in 1972:

. . . our first and firmest attention should be turned from discontent with courts . . . to our schools and the way in which they educate our children. The Committee believes that leadership from the Board of Education and from others — elected and private civic leaders alike — will cause this community's parents to reaffirm their belief in good education (FLSL, 1976, p. 179).

Obviously, no community or school leadership group acts independently of the support it perceives within the community. The general state of public opinion regarding desegregation and the existence of well organized movements of support or opposition must affect political and educational leaders, especially those who hold elected office. But at the same time, leadership does count, and a consistently positive approach by school and community leaders can

be very helpful in molding, activating, and directing community support that already exists or that can surface.

It seems clear that attention should focus on new mechanisms for generating or increasing positive public responses to school and community change during desegregation. How can this be done? Adherents of the consensus model of change usually stress the use of broad-based problem-solving mechanisms, procedures which include representatives from all portions of the community. When people from various racial and class groups are brought together, they may be asked to respond to court orders or to school problems, and to help develop local programs or policies for bussing, student orientation, safety, etc. The rational basis of such community or community-school planning rests on peoples' willingness and ability to get adequate information; to utilize the skills of professionals committed to all students' welfare; to work together and transcend minor differences; to focus on common problems; and to agree on mutually satisfactory solutions. Adherents of the consensus model generally deal with school-community issues within the boundaries of the school system and treat educational leaders with considerable respect. Attempts would be made, therefore, to separate school desegregation from other local "political issues," and to treat it as a technical educational problem. While broad community input and resources might be sought, they would be considered as advisory to the expertise of the school system staff and the legitimately governing role of the school board.

In the same context, adherents of the conflict model usually stress the need to organize members of particular interest groups who feel they are excluded or suffering as a result of current progress or lack of progress on desegregation plans and programs. These members would try to articulate their particular needs and to develop a coherent vision of desired changes. They would look towards allies and uncommitted groups to help generate the pressure that would permit them to be included in school decision-making (not just in

advisory planning). If such inclusion is not forthcoming, they may challenge the ability of school authorities to govern the system without them: threats or demonstrations, teacher and student strikes, and parent or service group boycotts are all examples of this strategy in action. Since adherents of the conflict paradigm stress the ways in which school problems are connected to broader community issues of racial and economic justice, mobilized groups would include a variety of movements for change in the local community. Thus, the resource base for bringing about desegregation is very broad. At the same time, adherents of the conflict paradigm anticipate the formation of other mobilized groups, some of whom are covertly or overtly committed to opposing desegregation, or at least to opposing a particular local version or plan.

Coalitions. One tactic that has been used to develop and mobilize community support for local desegregation is the multi-racial coalition. Burges (1978) makes a helpful distinction between two types of pro-desegregation coalitions: (1) the city-wide "blue-ribbon" coalition, which includes members of powerful local organizations representing labor, industry, banking, government, and social welfare agencies, etc.; and (2) the neighborhood or regional "grass-roots" coalition, representing parent groups, churches, and clubs from local areas impacted severely by desegregation plans and programs. The former comes closest to the assumptions underlying a consensus model; members of various elite groups form a consensus and pool their resources to help make and implement policy. The latter coalition more closely reflects the assumptions of a conflict model; people affected by others' decisions about school changes gather together to influence or challenge elites, and to pursue their own change goals.

In several cities, local civic leaders helped organize various groups' resources and developed blue-ribbon coalitions out of historic patterns of group conflict and non-communication (Desegregation Without Turmoil, 1976).

In these efforts, minor divisions among powerful groups were temporarily resolved as attention was focused on a special community problem. Examples of this approach to coalitions occurred in Detroit (PRO-Detroit and New Detroit, Inc.), Memphis (Involved Memphis Parents Assisting Children and Teachers), Dallas (Dallas Alliance), and St. Louis (Civic Progress). In these cities, leaders from various local agencies helped organize and accomplish events such as:

speakers bureaus sending informed people to local clubs, blocks, and schools to explain the desegregation plan and the need for peaceful cooperation;

neighborhood meetings to develop local coalitions;

community forums where representatives of various groups could present their views on elements of a good desegregation plan;

telephone "hotlines" or rumor clinics;

media coordination and the placement of positive stories about desegregation;

mobilization of influential community persons;

generation of resources for special school programs.

The involvement of local community leaders in a pro-desegregation coalition is seen by many as a key step in promoting effective and peaceful school change. The United States Commission on Civil Rights indicates that in cities where community leaders supported desegregation, there were fewer reports of disorder and violence; conversely, disorder and violence were more common where such leaders did not support desegregation (Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, 1976, p. 175).<sup>23</sup>

Of 411 districts where superintendents reported no serious disruptions on the issue of school desegregation, superintendents said:

<sup>23</sup> Most discussions of the actions of elite coalitions or community leaders assume that the general public follows their lead. The reverse is just as likely; leaders may be more likely to lead in those communities where public opinion already supports certain policy initiatives. Or some external factor (such as strong judicial intervention) may influence leadership groups and community members simultaneously.

Business leaders were supportive or neutral in 65%  
Political leaders were supportive or neutral in 67%  
Religious leaders were supportive or neutral in 87%

Of 95 districts which reported serious disruptions:

Business leaders were supportive or neutral in 27%  
Political leaders were supportive or neutral in 30%  
Religious leaders were supportive or neutral in 66%

Of course, a lack of disorder does not automatically guarantee positive changes in the quality of desegregation or interracial education, but the avoidance of violence and sustained disruption obviously is beneficial and desirable.

Grassroots or conflict-oriented coalitions developed in a number of cities as well -- most notably in Detroit (Coalition for Peaceful Integration), Cleveland (Greater Cleveland Project), and Boston (Freedom House Coalition and City-Wide Educational Coalition). More informal grassroots coalitions of white and black parents and community groups made input into administrative plans for desegregation in Tulsa and Greenville (USCCR, 1977e, 1977p).

According to Crain, et al. (1968), the issues that attract elite collaboration in blue-ribbon coalitions are fairly clear; they generally share the following concerns:

Peace . . . or social order and stability;

Prosperity . . . or the stabilization of the economic order required for profitable enterprise . . . including workers who can work and consumers who can and will buy;

Charity . . . or concern for the welfare of others;

Progressive reform . . . or concern for gradual change to improve the community and its image.

To the extent that a local desegregation controversy appears to threaten the progressive image or social harmony of the community, or perhaps even its business life, elites are likely to act to protect these four concerns.

Issues that attract grassroots coalition may not be so easily identified; they generally occur at a more local level and are bound by the hope of generating

more power together than any group can create on its own. Bonacich and Goodman (1972) report that some issues may be more effective than others in attracting grassroots coalitions of majority and minority parents: opposition to tracking, effective and fair discipline, and general upgrading of the educational program might have been effective rallying points in Inglewood, California. We suspect safety could be added to that list for most communities, although the issues will differ as the local setting varies.

Whether organized to exert the power of civic elites, or to challenge that power, coalitions represent a good bet for a broad attack on the many problems of community finance and control that undergird local desegregation controversies. They are usually the key to unlocking other community resources as well, such as the media, volunteer time, etc. All too often, however, elites' concerns for community peace fail to address root problems of racism, educational failure, and parental exclusion from school decisions. Some scholars and practitioners argue that peace may have to be threatened, and a conflict escalation strategy pursued, if meaningful school change is to occur.<sup>24</sup> Some grassroots coalitions, and many associations of minority parents, advocate this strategy as well.

Several recent reports, referred to herein, document the development, activities, and general utility of multi-racial coalitions in support of desegregation. However, there is little incisive data that helps the practitioner discover how to create a local coalition, and how to keep it together in the face of historic competition among agencies, racial and class discrimination and competition, tensions between blue-ribbon and grassroots efforts, etc. Moreover, there is little research evidence that indicates the particular and unique contribution of this tactic, especially as compared with other efforts to coordinate elite actions or mobilize community concerns. However, cities

<sup>24</sup> See, for instance, Gamson, 1975; Kirby, Harris, Crain, and Rossel, 1973; Lipsky, 1968; Lurie, 1970; Sprecht, 1969.

that have sustained effective multi-racial coalitions, of both the blue-ribbon and grassroots variety, obviously have a broader base of resources to call upon in support of desegregation.

Advisory Boards. A somewhat different mechanism for accomplishing similar purposes is the school (or school system) advisory board. Substantial efforts to create such boards were made in Memphis, Boston, Dade County, Florida, and in 17 of the 27 cities or counties studied by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (FLSL, 1976). Boards' structures varied considerably; in some systems one board was established, in others each geographical region or even local school had a board. In Little Rock, the school board and NAACP set it up; in Stamford, one was established by a small task force operating under the aegis of a Title IV grant; and in Ogden, Utah, portions of the local community who felt left out formed their board themselves (USCCR, 1977h, 1977k, 1977o).

In some circumstances these boards appeared as potent actors in school-community decision-making efforts; in other cases they operated merely as sounding boards and conveyors of complaints and information; and in still other cases they made recommendations that were ignored or resisted by top school officials. The ESAA evaluation, for instance, asked superintendents to choose their preference among three items describing parental and community roles in desegregation:

1. Parents and community should play a major role.
2. Opinions on educational issues should be sought from parents and community.
3. Parents and community should play a minor role (Coulson, et al., 1976, p. 16).

In their basic sample, 12.9 percent of the district superintendents indicated a preference for the first item, 87.1 percent for the second, and none for the third. The first item's "major role" probably is close to policy-setting or decision-making activity that may require sharing educational power and control. The second item's stress on "opinions sought" maintains power in

the hands of professional leaders and suggests an advisory or communicative role for the community. It should come as no surprise that current decision-makers would favor some community involvement, but an approach to this involvement that maintains their own power.

Almost all the advisory boards reported in the literature were multi-racial in membership, although many wrestled with problems of minority representation. The nature of constituency representation cuts to the core question of whether these boards were coalitions reflecting the meeting of groups in conflict, or the meeting of leaders of various groups who collaborated despite the real issues separating their constituencies. In Corpus Christi, for instance, the NAACP representatives (and some others) resigned from the Advisory Board, because they felt it was an attempt by the district to delay and " . . . to delude the court and people who might think that a real effort is being made . . ." (USCCR Report, 1977e, p. 63). The attempt to use advisory boards and leadership coalitions to create a false consensus may be similar to other actions of elites, wherein many " . . . cities have been reported to have a formally or informally organized top leadership group that irons out its differences in private, presenting a fairly united front to the community" (Warren and Hyman, 1966, p. 298). In contrast, some leadership groups fought their battles in public, inside and outside such advisory boards. Only persons committed to the potential benefits of a conflict strategy, and to the ability of communities to deal with conflicts productively, would encourage such public controversy.

Only two of the USCCR reports indicated that advisory boards included students as members -- Colorado Springs, and Racine (USCCR, 1977b, 1977m). Several communities experimented with student advisory boards, but the segregation of this age group generally marked their exclusion from meaningful influence and collaboration with adults, and thus their exclusion from a

consensus strategy. As we indicate later, other roles are available for students operating from a conflict strategy of change.

Information and Preparation for New Activities. One of the key roles noted in activities of interracial coalitions, advisory boards, and various school-community efforts was that of preparation and orientation (or information-sharing) for desegregation. All but three of the 27 case studies prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights indicated at least some community program of this order. In some cases, school officials conducted the preparation, but in other cities clergy played a major role, as did the media, the local Community Relations Commission in Tulsa, the NAACP in Williamsburg County, and local Mental Health Associations in Corpus Christi (USCCR, 1977c, 1977p, 1977q).

Informational meetings open to the public appeared to be the most common tactic. Organized clergy efforts to speak to their congregations and rumor-control hotlines were also quite common. In Santa Barbara, large displays promoting the value of integrated schooling were shown in several local banks and larger businesses: room for comments encouraged community members' responses (USCCR, 1977n). In Kirkwood, over 350 "coffees" were held where school administrators came and answered parents' questions, and in Minneapolis, it was estimated that more than 150 local meetings were held prior to desegregation (USCCR, 1977g, 1977i). When such activities are conducted within the consensus model, they usually involve educators transmitting information about new schedules, procedures, and educational options -- and parents and students are expected to comply with them.

School-community preparation did not go smoothly in all cases, especially when it appeared that certain community groups had special needs and concerns. For instance, in Corpus Christi, the school system evidently was reluctant to provide aid to community meetings for hispanic groups. Non-school agencies went ahead with their preparation conferences, even though the school system

argued that their efforts were premature (USCCR, 1977c). When community groups have an agenda of their own, preparation activities are more likely to proceed in a conflict framework, with community members and students taking the initiative in demanding the design and implementation of new educational objectives, decision-making structures, rules and regulations, and staffing procedures.

One of the ways some community groups got more adequate information about school actions was through monitoring programs. This tactic involved community volunteers, or on occasion paid staff, in keeping tabs on the school system's progress in desegregation. Sometimes community groups voluntarily took on this role, sometimes school systems invited community monitoring, and sometimes such activities were established by a court order. We do not yet have enough experience with this community option, nor with research on its operations, to know what institutional base, what internal format, or what sets of data gathering and reporting activities make the most sense.

We are, however, beginning to get reports of monitoring activities of different kinds being utilized in different communities. In several desegregation cases undergoing litigation, federal district court judges established monitoring commissions or panels (e.g., Boston, Buffalo, Dallas, Detroit, Milwaukee). These groups, charged with the responsibility of seeing whether and how judicial decisions were carried out, generally reported directly back to the court. In some cases, they operated as mediators of disputes that occurred between defense and plaintiff litigants, or among their community constituents (Cunningham and Carol, 1978).<sup>25</sup> In other communities, educators and/or parent groups themselves created relatively informal and grassroots monitoring efforts. For instance, reports from several cities, such as Santa Barbara, Kirkwood, Berkeley, and Providence (USCCR, 1977a, 1977e, 1977g, 1977n), indicated programs wherein parents rode buses and observed racial

<sup>25</sup> Cunningham and Carol report that these court-appointed monitoring "commissions to date have tended toward elitism rather than grass-roots membership" (1978, p. 83).

interactions on buses and in playgrounds. Elsewhere (e.g. Denver) parent monitors collected information about bus seating or lunchroom segregation, and identified potential trouble spots (School Monitor Information Packet, 1976). When monitoring guidelines are established by or with educators' supervision, they are often done within a consensus-collaborative context. Thus, guidelines caution against intervention, limit the arenas of inquiry, stress the locus of control in the school system, and require data to be turned over to the administration. These approaches to monitoring generally assume a sympathetic and helpful leadership of desegregation efforts by educators and public officials, and a supportive and trusting community response.

But what if educational and public officials are not providing adequate information to the community and fail to give positive leadership to the desegregation effort? Or what if they wish to do so without serious challenge or intrusion from parents and community members? Obviously, judges who established monitoring commissions were worried about official as well as general public response to their decisions. Community groups favoring a certain desegregation plan may also doubt the will or competence of educators to follow through on these efforts. In fact, Cunningham and Carol (1978) caution that monitoring groups must remain vigilant to co-optation by school officials. They argue that a monitoring "commission must work closely with schools but maintain its independent operation" (1978, p. 84). Working within a conflict framework, community monitoring groups may need to help "identify problems," and "raise issues" to a new level of public awareness. In some cases, even drawing public attention to issues has not been sufficient, and new forms of power have been used to turn a "condition" into a notable "problem," typically by demanding attention and threatening public action. The importance of this approach is reflected by Zeigler and Boss, who report that 50 percent of the superintendents and board members in their sample of interracial school dis-

tricts recognized no racial problems:

School governors apparently do not recognize such [racial] difficulties as being 'problems,' a fact that undoubtedly upsets the black citizen. Rather, school governors appear to recognize racial problems only where major issues or crises have evolved (1974, p. 322).

Monitoring activities that gather data on the school system's positive steps (or lack thereof) to counter racial and economic discrimination could be used as part of a broader campaign to hold these actors and institutions accountable to parents and community groups. Under these circumstances, well organized and mobilized community groups are critical to achieving peaceful and effective desegregation.

Negotiations and Bargaining. When a consensus is difficult to attain, and conflicts among various groups are intense, some school officials have turned to formal and informal negotiations as a way to proceed with community involvement in desegregation planning. In some cases, two parties meet with one another, and then another two meet, presenting an example of serial bilateral bargaining. In other cases, all parties gather simultaneously for a multi-party bargaining situation. These innovative efforts to include representatives of the public as parties to educational planning and implementation usually occur after the fact of a crisis; seldom have they been implemented ahead of time, or as part of a new institutional structure.

Formal negotiations or collective bargaining are problem-solving techniques that officially assume a conflict model of social systems and system change. They start from assumptions of important and lasting differences in interests and goals; moreover, they assume that groups must deal with one another and cannot ignore others' positions. Interdependence is based partly on groups' relative power, and partly on their necessary cooperation for basic tasks to be performed or for institutions to survive. The question addressed in negotiations generally is: what compromises and/or agreements must be made

so that this interdependence can be maintained? Formal negotiations generally will not occur if one party feels it has enough power (or the right!) to make decisions without others' input. The creation of a sense of mutual vulnerability, then, often is a precursor to the community's acceptance by public or school officials at the bargaining table. Vulnerability may be created by the deprivation of certain resources, such as funds (from the federal government or bond proposals) or personpower (via staff strikes or consumer boycotts), or by the threat of an exercise of superior power, such as judicial decisions or new board elections, etc.

Effective negotiations and/or bargaining require more than a recognition of this power "parity" or interdependence. They also require skill in exchanging information about needs, jostling for position, securing advantage, letting go of irreconcilable differences, making compromises that one's constituency will accept, and being able to bring heated negotiations to a close without continuing rancor and the threat of sabotage (Lohman and Wilson, 1975). Moreover, according to Deutsch (1969), conflicts underlying the bargaining process are likely to be destructive or non-productive if:

- a. misperceptions exist that minimize similarities or maximize differences between the groups involved and/or increase the hostility between groups.
- b. few cross-cutting social bonds and allegiances exist between the groups engaged in bargaining.
- c. views exist which expect solutions to be arrived at via force or fraud.
- d. unreliable communication exists and leads to stereotyping, lack of feedback on group initiatives, frustration, impasses, etc.

Under these conditions, the roadblocks to effective bargaining may be so high that the entire context of negotiations must be altered first. Conflict-escalating acts might help raise the issue of system survival to such potency that these subjective or psychological perceptions and communicative stereotypes

become less relevant. Or consensus-creating acts might help improve the accuracy of perceptions and communications so that "real" conflicts may be joined and "unreal" or "unrational" ones based on subjective distortions discarded. Despite whatever resources, goals, and commitments groups bring with them, the informal interactions and contexts of bargaining, per se, may be very potent. Group negotiations often have a dynamic of their own, and skills in the interpersonal politics of negotiations are often overlooked in the rush to clarify perceptions/communications or to mobilize power/vulnerability.<sup>26</sup>

Although the Community Relations Service (U.S. Department of Justice) and the American Arbitration Association have been active in community-school negotiations around desegregation, there is not much literature available on these public sector events. Two important exceptions are Chalmers and Cormick's (1971) case studies and analyses of racial conflict resolution, and recent reports by the Institute for Responsive Education (Collective Bargaining: bringing citizens to the round table, 1974). Chalmers and Cormick concluded that negotiations provide a route for only the temporary adjustment of racial conflict. Where there is basic ideological disagreement between parties, or where issues of social justice are at stake, collective bargaining is not an especially effective technique in the long run. It may temporarily restore order in a tense situation or create the collaborative conditions for reform and continuing operations, but it may do little to resolve underlying problems of social injustice or inequality or to create institutional change. Thus, collective bargaining may work best when parties accept a common base of assumptions and are prepared to confront and respond to one another to re-allocate systemic resources. When defining characteristics of either party

<sup>26</sup> An excellent portrayal of the internal psychology and power plays of bargaining situations can be found in Douglas (1957). Attempts to prepare community persons for such role dynamics include: Preparing for Negotiations, (n.d.); Negotiations: A Tool for Change, (n.d.); McShurely, 1967.

are challenged, or when major structural changes (or the steadfast refusal of changes) are one group's goal, this mechanism has quite limited utility.

Developing Other Resources. Another popular community change effort relevant for desegregation is the development of new resources for schools. Many additional resources beyond money are important, including the volunteer labor of parents and community groups to help teach new classes, monitor buses, playgrounds, and lunchrooms, staff innovative field trips, expose students to various previously-hidden segments of the community, etc. As parents and community members utilize their resources in school affairs, segments of the community which seldom have encountered each other may discover their misconceptions, fears, differing styles, and/or conflicting expectations about dominant and subordinate behavior. The results can often be problematic, as difficulties are compounded or underlying conflicts escalated. One attempt to deal with these problems occurred in Dade County, Florida, where special training programs helped community members examine their relation to potential allies and opponents as they worked in local schools.<sup>27</sup> Efforts were made to sharpen parents' skills in running meetings, engaging in collaborative problem solving, gathering data, and understanding school issues. School-led training programs for community volunteers have been reported in many other cities undergoing desegregation.

Relevance of the Alternative Models for Community Change in Desegregation.

What assumptions do these various programs make about the community context within which desegregation takes place? Adherents of the consensus strategy generally view desegregation as occurring within a more or less pluralistic environment, one with progressively more egalitarian adjustments to counter historic racial and class stratification. Educational leaders and community

<sup>27</sup> Dr. L. Pugh, Department of School-Community Participation, Dade County Public Schools (personal correspondence).

groups are seen to be supportive of school change, especially if their fears and anxieties can be reduced. Thus, access to schools should be easy for most parents, and their efforts should be accepted and supported by school officials. Asking questions, gathering local data, assisting in implementing administrative decisions, and surfacing grievances to legitimate leaders all appear to be favored approaches. Community-wide meetings, open houses, and local advisory boards are seen as useful adjuncts to professional decision making, and various groups can expect that there will be a rapid response to concerns.

People operating on assumptions consistent with the conflict model of communities are not so sanguine about community-school cooperation. Access to school is expected to be reserved for the powerful and influential, and not easy for lower-class or minority parents. Throughout, adherents of the conflict strategy seem to stress tactics that focus on community initiative in making decisions, organizing parallel decision-making bodies, publicizing data that may hold educators accountable for their decisions, and the like. Advisory boards often are seen as a sham, as a way of masking fundamental conflicts between professional control of the schools and community members' attempts to advance their own interests and needs. Such boards substitute "participation" for "power," and they often distract community members from the need to exert influence on school officials. Failing to get rapid and forthright response by educators, community groups adopting a conflict strategy must mobilize to exert influence, perhaps even to generate problems or crises for educators. That this strategy is indeed used is borne out by many reports: for instance, superintendents of the ESAA basic school sample reported protests, demonstrations and sit-ins (29 percent), legal suits filed against school leaders (39 percent), boycotts (10 percent), destruction of school property (16 percent), or closing of schools due to intergroup tension (19 percent) (Coulson, et al., 1976).

Should community reaction and resistance be expected? And where might it



come from? Adherents of the consensus model of desegregation and school change generally downplay the relevance of professional resistance to desegregation, or see it as a problem of miscommunication . . . correctable by open discussion and problem-solving activities. Anti-desegregation community groups usually are seen as uninformed or mistaken, perhaps acting out of prejudice. Adherents of the conflict model of desegregation anticipate that the clash of community values and interests ought to generate resistance to racial and educational change. Some of that resistance might well come from educators seeking to maintain their own positions of power and their own traditions of professional behavior. Some of it might come from anti-desegregation community groups (elites or grassroots citizen groups), from other parents and students (white or minority) who cherish values and interests threatened by or not met by a desegregation agenda. The social scientific and educational literature on desegregation has not yet provided us with good data on the interest group bases of such community conflicts, on the ways social movement analysis may help us understand these mobilization processes, and on the ways by which pro-desegregation forces can out-mobilize, withstand, or create compromises and coalitions with resistant groups.

#### Organizational Structures and Processes of Schools

Can desegregation be accomplished effectively within the current structures of school organizations? Many educators and community members believe they can. Others disagree. Many educators and community leaders feel that most school organizations support a variety of cultural styles, promote intellectual growth and diversity, and operate in a relatively fair manner. Thus, not only can students achieve positive educational outcomes, but students of all races and classes can do so. This is especially true for those students, majority or minority, with the talent or interest to gain an education. Adherents of this consensus model generally agree that minor alterations are necessary but that

the basic structure and culture of schools do not need major reform to accomplish desegregation.

Others, viewing the school from the vantage point of the conflict model, believe our schools do not reflect or respect minority cultures, traditions, and norms. Not only do minority youngsters not achieve well in school activities, school patterns often doom them through unfair treatment. Unless they conform to white standards and come from relatively affluent or economically stable backgrounds, the school tends to overlook or disrespect their unique talents and interests. Thus, efforts to desegregate schools, to introduce representatives of alternative cultures, and to create new outcome patterns cannot be successful without major reform in the structures and operations of school systems, schools, and classrooms.

While there may be disagreement about the nature and extent of change needed, most scholars and practitioners support alterations in the school organization that might increase the likelihood of positive results from desegregation. But what particular aspects of the organization require attention? Forehand and Ragosta (1976) indicate, in a research-based manual prepared for educators, that the key organizational characteristics of effective desegregated schools include:

- multi-ethnic teaching methods
- home and school communication, cooperation, and confrontation when necessary
- equitable rules and regulations for students
- principal leadership
- human relations activities in the student curriculum
- staff retraining
- interracial achievement grouping
- fairness and equity throughout the school

This list suggests changes in the organizational "climate" of schools that are attractive both to consensus adherents (home-school cooperation, human relations, staff retraining) and to conflict adherents (confrontation when necessary,

equitable rules, fairness and equity).

Another general list of organizational changes relevant for effective desegregation may be gleaned from the work of Coulson, et al. (1976). The intergroup relations and cultural enrichment programs they found in ESAA-funded schools are presented below (adapted from p. vi-20):

Intergroup Relations and Cultural Enrichment Programs

Program Objectives:

Decreasing intergroup conflict  
Appreciating different cultures  
Reducing desegregation problems  
Raising minorities' self-image  
Increasing knowledge of different cultures  
Increasing achievement of minorities

Program Activities:

Cultural programs  
Multi-ethnic materials  
Ethnic studies units  
Student exchange programs  
Academic instruction  
Group discussions  
Staff inservice workshops  
Social activities  
Parent meetings  
Interaction events  
Student tutoring  
Serving ethnic food  
School integration  
Group counseling

This list is not a series of suggestions based on research, as is the Forehand and Ragosta set. Rather, these are programs actually implemented in schools provided with extra funds to facilitate desegregation. Almost all of these objectives and activities appear to be "add-ons"; they treat the current school structure and operations as satisfactory and, rather than alter them, merely add on some extra items. Moreover, goals of "decreasing conflict" and "reducing problems" without a corollary concern for justice, power equalization, or the quality of services provided, clearly sets this list within a consensus framework. Many of the same programs could be tied to other objectives, and

could then be consistent with a conflict approach to organizational change. The following discussion should illustrate both of these possibilities.

Role of the School Principal. Many observers agree on the importance of the principal's role for the success of desegregation and education in a school building. This role may not be reducible to a set of personal characteristics or background factors, but they probably can be expressed as skills, role relations, and leadership acts. For instance, when St. John (1975) stresses the need for "affirmative administrative leadership" in desegregation, she means a principal's unequivocal commitment to positive changes, active selection and training of a school staff competent in interracial instruction, and vigorous efforts to structure a positive interracial climate within the school.

As the senior educator in a building, a principal can facilitate desegregation in several different ways (Chealer, et al., 1970). She or he can: (1) help organize staff resources in ways that build an instructional team devoid of competition and racial bickering, and replete with efforts to share competencies, support new ideas, and promote positive interaction; (2) act as a professional leader to help provide feedback to teachers, consult on the development of new pedagogy, reward innovative classroom efforts, and invite/require staff participation in school leadership functions; (3) be a direct and an indirect teacher of students, both as instructor and as a model of concerned and fair-minded educational authority; (4) assist the school staff in establishing effective communication and accountability links with parents and other community members; (5) help organize the local community in support of desegregation and in support of new student, staff, and parent programs to increase the effectiveness of desegregation; and (6) act as a change agent in the larger community and in the upper reaches of the school system, protecting local innovations and promoting changes throughout the system. This last role is often overlooked and appears especially important: Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock (1976)

stress the ways in which a principal's influence in the larger administrative or community arena may help gain added resources for the local school.

Although these and similar priorities make good sense, we do not have very good research on just how a principal can go about accomplishing these role behaviors. Research that correlates principal attitudes, or even reported practices, to certain staff or student outcomes still fails to inform how to implement such suggestions. It would be useful to have a series of studies of the ways in which successful (and not so successful) principals operate in desegregated settings. Probably ethnographic studies would be most helpful in filling the gaps in our knowledge.

As desegregation both creates and highlights new community-school relations and different groups' leadership expectations, principals may experience quite contradictory role demands and increased pressures from various groups. These issues are exacerbated when the principal herself/himself is a member of a racial minority. Buxton and Prichard (1977) provide a sensitive and detailed narrative of the ways in which community groups, administrative peers and superiors, and local staff subordinates tried to subvert the authority of black principals. Their study of 30 current and former minority principals (equal to 75 percent of the total population) in a southern state indicated two major lines of attack: (1) erosion of the principal's authority, and (2) erosion of the minority community's unity (including the potential unity between the minority principal and the minority community). Examples of the erosion of authority pattern included:

- making black principals assistants to white principals
- promoting black principals to do-nothing roles (with salary increases)
- placing pressure on black principals to resign
- hiring others to do part of the principal's task
- permitting/encouraging white staff to resist principal's leadership

Examples of the erosion of unity pattern included:

- creating competition among black educators
- promoting compliant blacks
- permitting/encouraging black parents or staff to appeal to higher level whites

Without higher-level administrative support, minority administrators experienced sabotage and disrespect and were unable to exercise positive authority at the local school level.

Naturally enough, most administrators anticipate support from their supervisors and peers within the school administration. But innovative educators, and in this case minority administrators whose racial characteristics make them an "innovation" regardless of their actions, may not be able to depend on that educational consensus. Under attack, or faced with subtle non-support and sabotage, these educators may have to generate support from sources outside the school system itself. In an approach consistent with the conflict paradigm, they may have to build strong constituencies of reform-minded or minority parents and students who desire affirmative leadership and who will stand behind administrators engaged in a struggle with other school authorities or with resistant community groups.

More optimistic reports from Dorchester county and Nashville-Davidson indicated some success in their efforts to create majority-minority teams for the administration of desegregated schools (USCCR, 1977d, 1977j). If inter-racial leadership teams can be developed, they may stand as models for staff and student organization, and may begin to publicize new visions of racial equity and shared power in organizations. But this is no easy task, and we know little about how to make this idea work. At the very least, it requires a great deal of higher administrative support, and perhaps complementary encouragement from community coalitions and fellow staff members. It also requires administrators to learn new skills and commitments and to risk their old patterns in pioneering a difficult innovation.

Staff Roles. Change in the nature and operation of the educational staff appears to be another appropriate tactic for facilitating successful school desegregation. Almost all of the case studies conducted for the USCCR indicated some local changes had been made in staffing practices (Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, 1976; and USCCR, 1977a-q). At least six of these case studies indicated that new and specialized staff roles had been created to assist in the desegregation process. The following titles of new roles seemed most popular: human relations officer, community liaison officer, student advocate, ombudsperson, teacher aide, bus monitor, multicultural expert, and counselor. Obviously these additional staff members buttressed the school system's resources to deal with a variety of the community and organizational changes discussed herein. However, there is little sound evidence indicating they were helpful in and of themselves, or which new roles were most useful. In fact, the titles (and the USCCR studies) alone reveal very little about what they actually did, or how they generated support from the school and the community to do it.

If these new roles were created in the image of the consensus paradigm, we would expect a focus on dealing with "problem students," and on attempts to increase communication with parents and community agencies. If the conflict paradigm were dominant in the creation of these roles, we would expect to see time spent in developing sound and potent student and community organizations and attempts to hold the school accountable to the community for its plans and action. We cannot conclude from these descriptive titles just what functions are being played, and in what manner these roles are enacted. On this basis it is hard to evaluate (empirically or speculatively) whether these staffing innovations will really help. The best we can conclude is that these innovations may be useful -- either in broadening school-community communication or in increasing community pressure and presence in the school. If they

do not receive support from other staff members (such as the principal, superintendent, and teacher leaders) and from standard organizational procedures (such as meetings where innovators participate, or committees where newly identified grievances are adjudicated), these new roles and their functions will not be institutionalized and will stick out as token reforms that can be scapegoated and discarded easily at some later date.

Many of these new staff members, especially those in non-traditional roles, require careful preparation for their jobs. In Denver, for example, school bus drivers were given special training in responding to desegregation incidents, and parents were given explicit instructions in how to prepare their youngsters for the busing experience (Handbook Supplement for Bus Assistants, 1976). Often, however, schools have hired and utilized ancillary staff without paying close attention to their special training needs or unique contributions to desegregation. Bus drivers, custodians, and clerical workers all have substantial interaction with students and local parents and often do or can play critical roles in creating positive school-community relations. If they are not treated as important staff members, or not prepared well, and if their relevance to overall policy and program is not acknowledged, much of their special utility may be wasted.

Nine of the case studies produced by the USCCR indicated that the local percentage of minority professional staff members had increased since the advent of desegregation efforts; three indicated that minority percentage had decreased; and at least fifteen of these studies mentioned successful efforts to move staff members to different schools in order to establish greater staff racial balance. In several communities, moreover, courts have ordered greater racial equity in hiring, in replacement hiring, or in placement.

It seems essential that each local school and school system develop and pursue an affirmative action plan for the recruitment, selection, placement, and maintenance of minority staff members, including administrators. The reason

for such a priority may not necessarily be that minority teachers are more caring or effective instructors of minority: research data on that proposition are by no means clear. On some matters, such as language and culture, minority staff members may have special and irreplaceable expertise; in other matters they may be no different in their relation to youngsters than majority staff members. But racial equity in professional teaching ranks is an important indicator of a concern for equity throughout the community and the school system. And an interracial staff that can surmount traditional stereotypes may be able to present a good model of interracial harmony and cooperation to students and community members alike. It is not easy to accomplish such staff patterns; racism within the staff is just as stubborn as elsewhere, but it is an important issue for the desegregated school.

Affirmative action programs that are instituted cannot end with new hiring practices, even if they are successful. If organizational racism is maintained subsequent to hiring, and if power structures fail to support new personnel, sabotage and rejection can be expected. Our earlier discussion of the Buxton and Prichard study of reactions to minority principals stresses the difficult and complex nature of affirmative action efforts within schools. In many cases new minority staff are not supported actively, are not guaranteed access to rewards and promotional systems on an equal basis, and their needs are not advocated. As a result, these minorities leave the system (voluntarily or via dismissal), or lose the ability to make their unique inputs and act just as the prior majority; in either case the affirmative action program fails. In this context, the research reported by Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock (1976) indicates the importance of friendly and warm/open interpersonal relations among teachers as a characteristic of effectively desegregated schools. Moreover, they note that the principal plays a major role in setting the tone for positive relations among the staff: "High schools that have good race relations tend to have principals that are highly evaluated by teachers" (1976, p. v).

Another organizational variable that has important impact on staff performance is the nature of rewards and the ways these rewards are allocated. Increased salary, public recognition, or new tasks and roles may be very meaningful motivators for sustained staff change. So may organizational policies or norms that support and promote innovative classroom behavior. Negative sanctions or punishments also could be applied for non-changed behavior, or for racist actions or policies. Administrative authorities could withhold raises, promotions, and privileges, or seek transfers or dismissals for personnel who do not alter their professional behavior, or for supervisors who do not alter racist patterns within their work groups, departments, or agency subsections.

It is also possible to reorganize the procedures by which rewards are allocated. As one example, the USCCR report from Kalamazoo indicated that teachers and parents were involved in rating the performance of school principals and in insuring that salary increases were linked to performance on previously agreed-upon goals. Further, principals and professional peers were involved in implementing a similar system for the allocation of rewards to teachers. Although the first example from Kalamazoo invites public participation in an accountability system and the second maintains accountability within the professional apparatus, both represent a broadening of the evaluation and reward allocation process beyond the lone acts of a key administrative authority (USCCR, 1977f).

Administrative and community leadership in pursuit of positive staff action has taken many forms: the USCCR case study of Berkeley dramatically reports that when desegregation began in 1967, the superintendent asked any staff member who opposed desegregation to leave the district (USCCR, 1977a). In numerous schools and communities, moreover, parents and students have protested the degrading and deleterious aspects of staff racism and minority staffing procedures. Our review of new reward systems and of peer relations

within the professional staff should suggest other new directions for desegregated staffs. The entire network of organizational variables undoubtedly has impact on individual staff members' values and attitudes, thus permeating classroom relations and events as well as organizational features themselves.<sup>28</sup>

One of the most critical staff persons during desegregation is the school counselor. Most school counselors perform a variety of functions or roles, including some of the "innovative" roles noted on page 68. As a result, counselors often fill some of the most important gaps or conflicts in school life. Inevitably, however, they are caught between various aspects of their roles: as agents of the bureaucratic control apparatus of the school administration; as aides to the academic staff and the learning processes; and as helpers and direct agents of students with particular needs. Thus, counseling often is a residual program, designed to pick up where other professional operations miss students or fail to implement programs. The Coulson, et al., report of ESAA-funded projects indicates various objectives and activities of counseling/guidance programs in desegregated schools (adapted from 1976, p. vi-19):

<sup>28</sup>The importance of staff attitudes for students undergoing desegregation has been documented in many studies. In some cases, teachers' attitudes impact directly on students, as in acts of caring, favoritism, rejection, or discrimination. In other cases, the impact is more indirect, as when teachers are able/unable to translate their attitudes into new and more effective ways of teaching in the multi-racial classroom or school. Data and prior research relevant to these issues are reviewed at several time periods in: Bloom, Davis, and Hess, 1965; Forehand and Ragosta, 1976; Gerard and Miller, 1975; Noar, 1966; Rosenthal and Jacobsen, 1968; St. John, 1975; Weinberg, 1977. In a later section of this paper we review training efforts aimed at changing individual staff members' attitudes and skills.

Percentages of Basic Treatment Schools Having Guidance/Counseling Programs with Specified Characteristics

<u>Program Characteristics</u>	<u>Basic Elementary</u>	<u>Basic Secondary</u>
Percentage of schools having guidance/counseling programs	26.0	23.0
Program objectives:		
Improving self-image	23.5	9.5
Helping students with career plans	5.9	14.3
Helping with personal problems	14.7	19.0
Planning academic programs	0.0	9.5
Furthering academic growth	5.9	0.0
Raising students' GPA	0.0	4.8
Reducing drop-out rate	0.0	9.5
Reducing truancy	0.0	9.5
Reducing disciplinary problems	2.9	9.5
Program activities:		
Staff training	14.7	4.8
Increase counseling staff	2.9	0.0
Group counseling	11.8	9.5
Individual counseling	20.6	14.3

The first three objectives in this table focus most directly on counselors as agents of individual student problems and concerns: they are reported in 44 percent of the elementary schools and 43 percent of the secondary schools. The next three objectives concern counselors as aides or backup to the academic staff, roles reported in 6 percent of the elementary schools and 14 percent of the secondary schools. The last three objectives focus on counselors as disciplinarians and extensions of the school's bureaucratic control apparatus, reported in 3 percent of the elementary and 29 percent of the secondary schools. There are very few indications of the ways counselors can be part of a conflict strategy for change, as advocates or confidants or trainers of youth taking collective action to meet their needs in school. Informal helpers in the community usually provide this sort of assistance to youth, although some of these actions could be integrated with certain aspects of a counselor's functions.

Student Roles. Attempts to alter traditional patterns of social interaction among students, and between students and staff members, occurred in at least 10 of the 27 cities studied by the USCCR. Some cities established training programs for students and/or bi-racial student problem-solving committees (Boston, Denver, Tampa, Providence, Nashville-Davidson) (Parents United, 1976; Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, 1976). In Kalamazoo and Providence, bi-racial student committees met with their local principals and teachers to plan greater minority student access to school activities (USCCR, 1977f, 1977i).

Although there are many reports of new programs aimed at altering student attitudes, norms, and patterns of behavior, relatively few appear to involve youth in significant ways in designing and implementing these programs. This approach is quite consistent with the traditional view of students' roles, and with traditional patterns of school organization that generally do not share programmatic authority or control with youth.<sup>29</sup> But during desegregation, at times when the youth community itself is undergoing rapid change, it may be even more important to generate new roles for youth in schools.

Weinberg has reviewed recent literature on desegregation and reports several studies in which "the importance of student involvement and responsibility for the school's program was found to be vital" in producing positive racial interactions (1977, p. 212). And Coulson, et al., (1977, p. vii-15) report that secondary students' "views of their control over their environment, as measured by the 'locus of control' scale, was positively associated with reading and math outcomes." These authors suggest that students be given more control over aspects of the school curriculum and instructional materials.

<sup>29</sup> A number of scholars have argued that discrimination against youth, per se, is an important aspect of American society, and that this tendency is exacerbated in school via procedures such as: non-representation in decision-making, forced compliance with adult rules, escalation of academic competition, and perhaps even the mandatory aspect of schooling itself.

Obviously, the implications for new student roles are far wider than that and could affect an entire series of organizational factors that currently exclude youth from having legitimate and meaningful impact on major school decisions and policies. The assumptions that only educators can and should plan for youth, and that they can act with youth's interests at heart, are consistent with the consensus model of schooling. Within this framework, a mutuality of interests is assumed between educators and youth (of whatever race, class, or age); therefore, youth need little protection against the potentially arbitrary or self-interested actions of educators. Adherents of the consensus model consider youth involvement in desegregation planning a bonus, a sufficient contribution to increased communication about various groups' needs and concerns. Adherents of the conflict model assume that youth and educators (of different races and classes, especially) have some very different needs and interests. Within this framework, one can assume neither mutuality of interests nor professionals' abilities or commitment to act on behalf of others. Youth's interests must be protected and advanced by youth, and therefore involvement in desegregation planning is only the initial step in potent student representation at various stages of actual decision-making and implementation.

Although the need for new forms of youth involvement in and control of school activities may be apparent, the heightened fears and anxieties so often associated with desegregation may make this a difficult time for educators to innovate in their roles vis-a-vis youth. Alternatives do exist, nonetheless. Some of the nation's pioneers in youth involvement programs argue quite emphatically that youth have the talent, responsibility, and right to be involved in creating new curricula, teaching others in peer tutoring programs, generating special programs that speak to their needs, participating in staff selection and review, etc.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> See, for instance: Davies, 1976; National Commission on Resources for Youth, 1974; Kohler, 1976.

In desegregation situations in particular, notably in Tulsa and Kalamazoo, students have participated in citizens committees to draft desegregation plans and have served on student-faculty committees to establish and administer rules pertaining to student life (USCCR, 1977f, 1977p). The critical question is whether programs for youth involvement encourage student participation in crucial school decisions that affect desegregation. This is the cutting edge of new policy and an arena where more substantial research could help guide new policies and programs. It would also be useful to explore the barriers that exist within the professional structure and personnel of schools, especially secondary schools, that so severely limit innovations in this direction. And at what age or grade levels are such programs most likely to be effective? The traditional distinction between elementary and secondary school students makes good intuitive sense, except that the later the introduction of responsible roles, the more patterns of non-responsibility students have to unlearn. In a recent paper (Chesler, et. al., 1979) we argued that students can make some meaningful contribution at almost any age. What should vary by age level is the depth, breadth, and power of student participation (the kinds of issues they explore, the amount of time devoted to student planning, and the range of issues students decide on rather than advise on), and not the question of participation, per se. In this context, some educators'/adults' concerns about students' age may be a "cop-out," a way of avoiding important innovations, as opposed to a serious question to guide positive planning. It also may represent a subtle suggestion that most students are not competent to participate in such decision-making at any age level. It would be helpful to know what self-governing talents students have and can exercise at various grade levels; it would also be helpful to know how different groups of administrators feel about these questions.

The character of student rules and regulations (and resultant discipline

codes and procedures) is one arena wherein issues of school authority and plural norms may come together -- for better or worse. Thus, it is a key target for change in the desegregation process. Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock indicate that student "achievement is significantly related to perception of school fairness" (1976, p. 39). They argue that students' feelings about equity or fairness are so critical that they should be a major focus of desegregation programs, even superseding other goals. Four key pieces of the fairness problem in school rules seem to be: (1) the excessive number of rules, and thus heavy reliance on control of youth; (2) rules which may discriminate (perhaps even out of ignorance) against minority cultural traditions in language, play, work, style, dress, etc. ; (3) the exclusion of students, or of broadly-based student representatives, in the construction and implementation of rules; and (4) the unfair administration of rules, wherein majority and minority youngsters may be caught and/or punished in different degree.

When trusting relationships between students and educators begin to fail, power becomes the dominant factor in educators' ability to maintain their vision of order in school. At the same time, Kvaraceus (1965) argues that a reliance upon this kind of power, or external control, tends to lessen trust further and to deepen resentments between youth and adults. It is typical for youth to perceive school rules as stricter and more constraining than do adults. At the same time, in desegregated schools it is common for minority students to feel that school rules are stricter than do white students. They also more often feel that school rules are unfair to them, and are administered unfairly as well (Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, 1976). One result of all these factors is that data from a large number of desegregated school systems indicate that minority youth are more often suspended or expelled from schools than are whites. For example, the Council of Interracial Books for Children (Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism, 1978) reports the following data from a 1975 U.S. Office of Civil Rights study:



<u>City</u>	<u>Minority Enrollment</u>	<u>Minority Suspensions</u>
New York	64.4%	85.9%
Houston	56.4%	71.0%
Cleveland	59.9%	70.8%
Memphis	58.8%	70.2%
Dallas	49.4%	68.5%

Much more extensive data are reported in a recent publication by the Children's Defense Fund: their analysis indicates that in some instances, "at the secondary school level, black students . . . were suspended more than three times as often as white students" (Children Out of School in America, 1974, p. 6).

Of course, there may be substantial disagreement about the meaning of these data and therefore about what might be done to improve the situation.<sup>31</sup> Adherents of the consensus model of schooling generally would argue that some educators may not be administering rules fairly but that minority students themselves may be more troublesome in school -- either because of their cultural and economic background or because of the difficulties they encounter in adapting to a new situation. The appropriate treatment would be to clarify and tighten rules, including more standardized procedures for their administration. Moreover, communication with minority youngsters and their parents, as well as counseling sessions that might help students behave better, would be in order. Adherents of the conflict model of schooling would be more likely to argue that these data are one more reflection of institutional racial bias in schools, a bias made more pronounced by the schools' unilateral creation and implementation of rules for a minority student underclass. The schools' unfamiliarity with minority youth, and indeed the fear or ignorance some white educators and students might have, make the school an oppressive experience for many minority youth. The appropriate treatment might include minority students' participation in and control of new rules and regulations, as well as a student-parent procedure to monitor the acts

<sup>31</sup>In an interesting and provocative article, Duke (1978) explores a range of explanations for student "misbehavior," including some of the victim blame and some of the system blame varieties.

of administrators. The possibility that educators may be operating unfairly, or that by their passivity may permit unfairness to flourish, is considered quite seriously from this viewpoint. In reviewing their own empirical data on these matters, Forehand and Ragosta (1976) urge educators to confront traditions, attitudes, and rules that are barriers to equity. In practice, however, this is a difficult agenda on which to make progress, mostly because it cuts to the heart of educators' power to run the school without collaboration or interference from students.

Curriculum Content and Organization. The content of schooling, as reflected in curriculum and instructional techniques, can also undergo changes during desegregation. As new groups of students, with varying values and needs (as well as manifold individual differences), come together in a single environment, revised educational content may be necessary. New reading and mathematics programs, multicultural curriculum offerings, bilingual programs, classes devoted to the study and improvement of intergroup processes, and new textbooks that reflect a multicultural approach are all relevant. The United States Commission on Civil Rights reports that 23 of the 29 case studies prepared for them indicated curriculum changes, including: addition of multicultural or bilingual programs, addition of vocational and career counseling curricula, and new compensatory curriculum materials (Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law, p. 126).

Many school districts have experienced substantial controversy over bilingual programs and the need to recognize vast cultural differences between whites and minorities, and among minority groups. If minority cultural integrity is to be cherished, and not merely temporarily tolerated and eventually assimilated, bilingual and bicultural programs are essential for any school with a sizeable number of Hispanic (and Asian and Native American) students. When massive transportation plans so redistribute linguistically different

children that they cannot have access to such programs, something has to give. Thus, the priority on racial mixing may conflict with the priority on opportunities for maintaining and advancing cultural integrity.<sup>32</sup>

It does not seem reasonable to so widely disperse minority students that they lack friends and comrades of their own group. Some critical mass of minority students must exist in each desegregated setting; otherwise there is little protection against the marginality and alienation of being alone in others' worlds. Moreover, wide dispersion lessens the possibility of a critical mass of minority parents who can exert influence in the school and classroom. This is an especially important principle when special programs for minorities require numbers of them to be in one place to be served adequately. Research data pertinent to the choices of what programs should be offered to Hispanic students are not yet conclusive; but the expressed needs and concerns of many scholars and community members are clear. Special programs that teach English as a second language are important ingredients in assimilating and adapting linguistically different youngsters to the mainstream of American schooling and society. At the same time, if these programs are managed in ways that deprecate or assign to a less significance the students' own language and culture, it is obviously detrimental to those persons and to our plural society. Bilingual programs that maintain instruction in students' native language probably are important in and of themselves, as aides to (non-English standardized) academic performance and to cultural and linguistic integrity. Thus, instruction in the native language can be justified as more than a temporary aid to youngsters making the transition to English. If we really are committed to pluralism, and to appreciating and cherishing alternative cultures, maintaining

<sup>32</sup> All minorities have expressed this concern regarding current desegregation programs. However, the focus on black/white populations and issues often has obscured the special concerns confronted by Hispanic parents and students. See especially: Desegregation and Educational Concerns of the Hispanic Community, 1977; Research Review of Equal Education, 1977 (#2 and #3).

the Spanish language in school helps support the dual identity common to minority people in a majority institution.<sup>33</sup> Of course, it may also broaden the horizons of majority youngsters and help educate them to life in a linguistically and culturally plural society! They may not only appreciate others more positively, but a stress on plural traditions may also aid majority youngsters to discover and revere their own ethnic roots and distinctive traditions . . . thus creating or publicizing a broader and more inclusive mosaic of American life.<sup>34</sup>

Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock (1976) also report the importance of classroom study projects that focus on minorities and of explicit discussions of race-related matters in class. Numerous school systems have developed classes focusing on human relations or intergroup relations, and a vast array of relevant curriculum materials is now available for these ventures. However, not all of these materials, and the pedagogical techniques with which they may be utilized, have been tested or even thoughtfully developed. For instance, in reviewing such efforts it seems important to stress the differences between two complementary foci: (1) the study of and appreciation of minority cultures; and (2) the examination of, and perhaps improvement of, patterns of inter-racial relations. Both are relevant classroom activities, both are relevant academic content, and both can focus on the history of whites and current white behaviors as well as on minorities. However, a sole focus on history tends to isolate everyone from contemporary realities; and a sole focus on minorities

<sup>33</sup> The differences between these "transitional" and "maintenance" approaches are explored in theoretical and programmatic detail in: A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education, 1975; Paulston, 1977.

<sup>34</sup> The possibility that such inquiry and articulation may inappropriately emphasize differences and lead to increased ethnic and racial conflict has led many educators to be wary of such efforts. While this may be a reasonable concern in some circumstances, in general it reflects a consensus-assimilative approach to managing multicultural issues, traditions, and problems.

neglects the study and analysis of majority oppression, responsibility and guilt, change potentials, etc. It also is apparent that not all teachers are qualified or interested in dealing overtly with race relations in class. The staff's own legacy of racism, and of traditional educational content and techniques, makes a retraining program almost mandatory for such new curricula.

Another focus of attention by researchers and practitioners has been classroom or school grouping procedures. The evidence seems clear that students of higher status backgrounds are disproportionately located in college preparatory tracks, thus ensuring them a better chance at college admission (or superior non-college job placement). Considerable argument has ensued regarding whether these placements are primarily a function of student merit (performance and ability, according to the consensus view), or of the school's preferred treatment of certain ascribed groups (by economic class, race, and sex, according to the conflict view). Since each interpretation has its roots partly in one of the basic paradigms we have been exploring, each contains different implications for how to conduct research and what policy should be derived or developed. Alexander, Cook, and McDill (1978) conclude that neither explanation works simply and that considerable slippage exists in the assignment of high school students to tracks (slippage in the sense that neither merit alone nor ascribed status alone accounts for all track placement). Even when students are placed in tracks primarily on the basis of prior performance, this criterion necessarily includes the past effects of race and class background and prior school treatment of these students. Regardless of this problem of origin, the research does indicate that a central dynamic appears:

Differential tracking in secondary schools thus introduces academic inequalities where none existed previously, and in so doing contributes independently to educational and socio-economic inequalities (1978, p. 65).

And where the economic class and race are strong differentiating elements in track placement, these are the inequalities that are "introduced," "contributed

to," or "maintained" and "advanced" by school tracking.

Two distinct programmatic trends with regard to tracking seem to be evident: first, several cities studied in the USCCR reports indicate they dropped tracking, noting that tracking often leads to resegregation within the school (Stamford at the elementary level, Little Rock, and others; USCCR, 1977h, 1977o). However, Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock (1976) report that ability grouping within a classroom may not create distinct racial groups and often appears to be educationally effective. The difference in these reports is that heterogeneous and shifting ability grouping may permit students to compare and contrast themselves with close and relevant peers while also permitting mobility as appropriate. It also permits teachers to develop new forms of instruction, ones that emphasize the educational potential of small student workgroups and that decentralize classroom control patterns. School-wide tracking systems have proven to be notoriously immobile and often "cool out" students into early stratification patterns that also stereotype and isolate race and class groups. We return to a discussion of some productive variants of intra-classroom grouping in the next section.

Relevance of the alternative models for organizational change in desegregation. In the attempt to create organizational changes relevant for desegregation, adherents of the consensus model generally suggest that changes be begun by top managerial personnel. Their support is seen as so essential that few meaningful options are taken without their approval. Other staff members and community groups may then be included as collaborators. Communication and problem-solving are seen as key resources for change.

Adherents of the conflict model stress the need to include often excluded groups, such as parents and students, in decision making and implementing desegregation. Although top leadership support is seen as useful, other sources of power and legitimacy would be sought should top management not act positively.

In fact, the reliance on a principal's authority is seen as evidence that other groups are not sufficiently involved and that scholars and practitioners both lack new models of shared authority and decision making. Communication and involvement are not seen as especially useful unless they lead directly to new programs. Power, and the mobilization of new sources of power by people who care about what is happening at school, are the key resources for change.

Adherents of both models acknowledge the potent role of professional educators. People sharing the consensus view see these staff groups as highly respected public servants and feel experts should control most local educational decisions. Such professionals are seen as politically disinterested and therefore advocates of merit and equal education for all. People sharing the conflict view see these professionals as agents of prevailing elites and as potent actors in the mystification of the educational process. They often feel that students and members of minority or poor communities must assert their power to monitor and correct professionals' actions. How should students exert their power? Adherents of the consensus view, who see students as less than full participants in educational decision making, usually assign them little role if any. When students demand influence, they are usually denied, being relegated to "having their say," at best. Adherents of the conflict view generally interpret and respond to students' demands in other ways, ceding legitimacy and experimenting with student inclusion in decision making. In a number of communities, students' responses to what they perceive as inadequate school conditions, oppressive controls, as well as exclusion from legitimate influence channels, have taken the form of vigorous protests and public demonstrations.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See documentation as well as different consensus-based or conflict-based interpretations of these events in: DeCecco and Richards, 1974; Halleck, 1968; Rhea, 1968; Strategies for Coping with Student Disruption, 1969; Wasserman and Reinman, 1969. In general, adherents of the conflict model view protest and disruption as having positive consequences for change: old patterns are confronted, new visions demanded, and new resources for change mobilized and applied. Adherents of the consensus model generally view such events as examples of unnecessary, irrational, or expressive behavior: as polarized antagonistic acts which draw energy away from positive change efforts.

For consensus strategists, even-handed school rules and discipline policies can be established by adults who care about the young entrusted to them. For conflict strategists, students of various groups must be involved in the generation of such rules and in their implementation, if the rules are to be fair and if youth are to feel bound by them. But it is quite rare to see students involved in exercising authority over the formal rules and regulations for their behavior in school. One of the tactics used by practitioners operating from a consensus view has been to formulate codes of student responsibility, and several courts have required them as part of the desegregation plan. People operating from a conflict view see these attempts at "fairness" as shallow, as reflecting only adults' views of proper student behavior.

The curriculum, too, can be analyzed in terms of its congruence with the consensus or conflict models of school operations. We have already discussed the different ways bilingual programs may be seen from these two vantage points, and the same general applications would hold for any current treatment of multicultural or racial relations' issues in school. But even further, the entire curriculum can be examined to discover what it informs students about our society. To what extent do English and social studies texts and coursework reflect a consensus interpretation of the American experience? To what extent do they reflect a conflict interpretation? What are the various images regarding cultural assimilation, adaptation, separation, and pluralism that prevail in these materials? What overt or covert messages are present in school procedures and programs, and in norms about fashion, language, art, and music? If students are presented a single image of the appropriate school culture, they are forced into a consensus, and it becomes difficult to sustain different or conflicting traditions. Moreover, if most coursework presents them,

with a single paradigm with which to interpret their world (usually a consensus approach), they will be prone to use only that perspective, and to deny or ignore other visions and explanations of reality. Whether this is appropriate or not depends, of course, on the model of schooling and school organization we each adopt.

Finally, adherents of the conflict and consensus models generally see the problem of organizational resistance to change quite differently. According to consensus theorists, much resistance to change lies in the natural organizational inertia of highly bureaucratic systems. Thus, in terms of desegregation, entrenched patterns of staffing and teaching would be stressed as problems. Since it is assumed that decisions are based on rational evaluations of sound evidence, some resistance can be explained in terms of the non-supported or ill-founded hunches and guesses that underlie some desegregation options. Moreover, personal lack of vision, fear, and anxiety associated with a new procedure may be used to explain individual resistance to organizational change. According to conflict theorists, such fear and anxiety certainly are important, although these reactions would be linked to their contexts in status interests and organizational roles. For instance, adherents of the conflict model would stress various groups' desires to protect their own ideology or value system and their own role and its selective organizational advantages. Teachers or administrators would be likely to resist changes not consistent with their ideology and their sense of control over their role and role environment. Thus, most principals are seen as not likely to share decision-making with students or teachers if they perceive this innovation as altering their ability to control the school; teachers are not likely to support new disciplinary regulations if they perceive them as lessening their ability to control students and the classroom. Innovations in the direction of new curricula or norms are unlikely to be tried if they are seen to

challenge the prevailing ideology or power of adult white professionals who control the classroom. This analysis begins to bring us full circle, in terms of different strategies of organizational change. Adherents of a consensus strategy, attempting to overcome inertia, psychological fears, and a lack of information, adopt various forms of persuasion, communication, and fear reduction. Adherents of the conflict model, attempting to overcome resistance based upon superior power, self-interest, and alternative values, are more likely to stress power mobilization tactics, threats, reorganization of resources and rewards (linked to self-interest), and the like.

#### The Structure of Classroom Activities and Instructional Techniques

What kinds of programmatic options relevant to desegregation can take place within the classroom? The focus on community and organizational conditions associated with effective desegregation should not distract us from the ultimate social locus of teaching and learning -- the classroom. As Weinberg indicates:

Unsuccessful desegregation can be guaranteed by action of school boards and central administration; under such conditions little constructive can occur in the classroom. Given a strong and positive policy position, however, the classroom teacher becomes the central element (1977, p. 235).

By themselves, classroom events probably are not powerful enough to make a difference in the face of community inaction and malaise or organizational inertia and resistance. But if community and organizational forces are supportive, in word and deed, good things that happen in the classroom can make a difference in the education of the young.

If what goes on in the classroom might make a difference in achieving effective desegregation, what are the key variables we must deal with at this level? The teacher certainly: research indicates the relevance of teacher demography, training, on-the-job socialization, attitudes and skills, etc.

Students certainly: research indicates the relevance of the racial, economic class and "ability" mix of students, as well as their attitudes and interactions with one another. The content of the curriculum or the classroom task certainly: we discussed aspects of this variable in the prior section. Often overlooked, however, are the pedagogical or instructional techniques and modalities by which classroom social relations and academic tasks connect all these (and other) variables. Recently, there has begun to be serious and competent attention paid to the unique shape of these variables in the desegregated classroom.

In this section we depart from the procedures utilized in earlier sections to discuss changes in the community or in the school organization. Because there is such a wealth of literature on classroom dynamics, and on race relations in the classroom, it is impossible to review this field in a reasonable space. Rather, we will examine some exciting recent developments in research and practice that highlight a particular subset of issues in the classroom: pedagogical techniques focusing on racial interaction patterns. One of the hopes of desegregation is that it will create, in the long run, new patterns of racial interaction among students, and new racial patterns among adults in the society at large. Another hope is that new forms of racial interaction among students will lead to an improved school and community climate and to improved outcomes of schooling for all students. Thus, both as a goal and as a means or mechanism for attaining other goals, racial interaction in the classroom is a key issue.

Students who are not accustomed to working/playing in multi-racial groups have quite "natural" ignorance, stereotypes, and often fears of members of other races. The apparent differences in talent or skill that exist within any classroom can be interpreted and/or organized in ways that reinforce stereotypes and increase racial distance, or that challenge old views and create new

interaction patterns. The teacher's role, as organizer and conductor of academic and social tasks in the classroom, is critical in this regard. The organizing techniques by which she/he carries out classroom tasks also is crucial. The general problem is to reduce the (race or class-based) status inequalities created by the external or prior school environment: new classroom structures and procedures can help. As students work with one another, alternative means of organizing the classroom task, peer arrangements, authority patterns, and rewards must all be considered.

Patchen, et al., point out in their study of desegregation in Indianapolis schools, that "among black students, participation in interracial classroom subgroups made small positive contributions to more friendly interactions with whites" (a non-significant but similar trend occurred among white students) (1977, p. 70). The authors note that the impact of this variable was not large, probably because there was not much emphasis or reward for participation in such classroom group activities. Recent work by several other teams of scholars has begun to explore and document some of the intricate issues and tactics relevant for positive interactions in the multiracial classroom -- such as new forms of task organization and peer-group participation in learning activities and new ways of distributing rewards.

Both Cohen and her colleagues (1973; 1976) and Aronson and his colleagues (Aronson, et al., 1975; Blaney, et al., 1977; Lucker, et al., 1976) have generated a series of articles from a sequence of laboratory and/or field experiments on the general topic of positive interpersonal relations and cooperation in the interracial classroom. Both series of studies are based upon experimental rather than survey methodology; both have been translated into the field rather than being "stuck" in the laboratory; and both reflect their authors' concerns to do more than study these variables -- but to try to create new educational environments for teachers and students. They both

proceed from erudite and careful extensions of the "contact hypothesis" in race relations, inquiring into and planning the social conditions that might support equal status and anxiety-free, mutually interdependent, and task-productive contact between people of different races.<sup>36</sup>

Lucker, et al., are concerned primarily with placing students in a classroom situation where interdependent learning groups require/permit students to teach each other, and where students derive mutual benefit from their interactions. The educational task they must deal with is a "jigsaw" design, where each student has learned one part of a total package of information in social studies and must teach her/his part to others in the group. The authors expect student performance to be improved because of the interdependent task and because students work together within a "cooperative reward structure." The reward structure is cooperative, presumably, because the group is working together and because no one person's grade affects any others'; however, students take an individual test and receive personal grades.

The site for this study was several fifth and sixth grade classrooms in Texas. Approximately 80 percent of the 300 students were Anglo. There were no significant score differences between black and Mexican-American youngsters, so they were combined into a single "minority" category for analysis and reporting purposes. The students in the interdependent classroom were pre-tested for general reading skills and social studies knowledge, worked in these jigsaw-designed groups for two weeks (45 minutes a day in four- to six-person groups),

<sup>36</sup>The "contact hypothesis" has a long and distinguished history in race relations. Basically, it assumes prejudice is in part created (or maintained and exacerbated) by a lack of fruitful contact between members of different races, or by a form of contact that reinforces white dominance and minority subordination. Interventions based on this "hypothesis" seek to create equal-status contacts between majorities and minorities, contacts that are sustained, intimate, cooperative, marked by task and skill equality, pleasant and positive, and supported or rewarded by the surrounding institution (Amir, 1976).

and then took a content-oriented post-test. The teachers of the interdependent classrooms were given special training in how to facilitate cooperative student learning.

The results demonstrate to the authors' satisfaction that students, especially and primarily minority students, performed better on the social studies post-test in the interdependent classrooms than in the traditional (control) classes. Anglos' performance did not suffer, but their performance was not particularly facilitated via this grouping program. Other studies by this group indicate that Anglos also may improve their cross-ethnic perceptions, and that minorities do gain in self-confidence under these conditions (Blaney, et al., 1977).

Cohen, et al., are primarily concerned with placing students in situations where they can produce and maintain interracial status equality, a situation wherein whites do not dominate the interracial social interaction system. Their prior research indicates that such situations require: a collective task, minorities perceived as competent, and minorities contributing instrumentally to task success. In order to create this situation, they have developed a program of "expectancy training," whereby they provide special training to minority members who then teach skills to whites (the hope is that the training and its classroom aftermath will alter the success/failure-related expectancies both white and minorities have). The authors created a special summer school program where students could study together, a Learning Center. Subsequent to special training, both experimental (expectancy training) and control (Learning Center) students entered a classroom phase in which they engaged in a variety of collaborative learning tasks. The authors expected students to create and maintain new patterns of social relations because they engineered the situation "to prevent the development of a status order based on perceived academic ability, a status order which would be closely related to the racial status

order" (Cohen, et al., 1976, p. 50). Students worked in four-person groups on a task that was simulated and that was fully cooperative. The collective product of the group, rather than individual performance, was stressed in allocating rewards.

The site for this study was a specially created summer school in a west coast city. Some 145 10-13 year olds volunteered to participate in the Learning Center or expectancy conditions. Approximately 55 percent of the students were black. A post-test of the group task was administered after the expectancy training and Learning Center conditions, and again after the four-week classroom phase of the summer school. Videotapes of group interactions were scored to assess which students dominated group interaction; self-report instruments were administered to students; and teachers rated student interaction patterns.

The results demonstrate to the authors' satisfaction that equal status interaction patterns had been created as a result of expectancy training . . . that is, whites did not dominate group interactions. But not only were white-dominant patterns reduced, in some circumstances the expectancy training condition showed black-dominant patterns. The effects of these treatments were maintained through the classroom phase of the summer school.

To a certain extent these two sets of studies are quite comparable and complementary, and several interesting themes spring from considering them together. First, both teams of authors make it quite clear, in their reviews of prior work, in their own prior work, and in these studies, that new classroom options must be developed if we are to make progress in desegregated schooling. Collective and interdependent learning tasks, more nearly equal status systems, and fewer or non-competitive reward structures are among the key elements noted in tandem. Of course, other classroom restructuring may be needed (as in curriculum, teacher authority, and elsewhere), but these three

are clearly demonstrated. Under these circumstances, each student may have a unique contribution to make to group learning and performance; thus more plural forms of peer evaluation and respect can be generated. If many different dimensions of achievement are rewarded in class, individual and group differences may be seen in less monolithic and more truly plural terms, especially when different students become "experts" in information needed by all. Eventually, such pluralistic norms may be expanded to include divergent social and affective styles and relations, as well as academic skills and roles. If task expertise is one form of power, and most social scientists do treat it as such, these innovations can create new status and power relationships among students.<sup>37</sup>

In most classrooms, student tasks and outcomes are mediated by grading systems (rewards) that are individuated; that is, intermediate rewards are delivered on an individual basis, presumably for individual work. For some observers, these traditional ways of organizing academic tasks and rewards appear to implement a general consensus on the nature of individual achievement and peer-related behaviors; when administered "fairly," everyone has an equal chance for meritorious reward. Others view these work patterns as creating conformity to a narrow range of academic and social values and skills, promoting student obedience to the teacher as rewarder, and engendering peer competition and conflict over gains of critical rewards.<sup>38</sup>

Michaels, especially, indicates in his review of the relation between classroom reward structures and achievement:

<sup>37</sup> The notion that task expertise is one base of interpersonal power was developed by French and Raven (1959) and has been extended empirically to the classroom by Jamieson and Thomas (1974).

<sup>38</sup> As Ashmore (1970) notes, the contact hypothesis (refined by him to a concept of "shared coping") indicates "that contact in situations that involve competition does not cause a reduction in prejudice" (p. 319). To the contrary, it may raise the threat level so as to increase hostile or negative racial stereotyping and interactions.



An obvious shortcoming of individual reward structures (individual reward structures as well as competition) . . . is their relative ineffectiveness in strengthening such group process variables as collaboration and coordination, interpersonal attraction, and positive attitudes toward achievement (1977, p. 96).

When the classroom is as hierarchical as the school, with one teacher working with 25 to 30 individual learners, the student role is relatively passive, and there are minimal opportunities for peer learning interactions. Both the potentials for conflict as well as positive growth involved in such transactions are muted. The studies reported here provide concrete evidence and illustrations of some "whys" and "hows" of altering these teacher-student and student-student interactions.

Second, the line of argument and evidence developed here is related to significant prior and contemporary research on the organizational structure of classroom tasks, and especially to the relevance of these structures to race relations. Similar efforts by Weigel, et al., (1975); Johnson and Johnson (1974; 1975); and Slavin and his colleagues (DeVries and Edwards, 1974; Slavin, 1977; Slavin, 1978) all support this general thrust. The Slavin team, in particular, has experimented with an easily adoptable/adaptable series of classroom "games," including Teams-Games-Tournaments and Student Teams-Achievement Division, in order to group youngsters and generate tasks that reduce historic forms of academic competition and stereotyping. Although most of the reported research concentrates on elementary and middle (or junior high) schools, there is no reason to expect that these techniques and structural rearrangements would not also be successful at the senior high level. Of course, positive results are not guaranteed, and the creation of equal status relations out of prior inequality is no easy task; but it does appear that it can be done.

Third, both authors demonstrate that it is possible to move from the laboratory to the field setting, and some ways of engineering the move are illustrated. This is a welcome addition to the spate of research studies that

utilize a single method of inquiry and that overemphasize correlative analyses of large sets of survey data. These gross quantitative emphases often present a static analysis of organizational inputs and outcomes and seldom focus upon a unique intervention, or on the micro-processes that distinguish one educational practice from another. Moreover, the use of a field-based inquiry method has required these researchers to create interventions that really do fit some of the realities of everyday schooling, and not simply the experimental psychologist's image of interesting laboratory variations.

Fourth, both studies raise the question of just how far one can go in restructuring the peer racial interaction system without restructuring the entire classroom, and just how far restructuring the classroom can go without altering the organizational structure of the school. For instance, the schools Lucker and his colleagues worked in tolerated the individuated but non-competitive reward structure; would they have accepted a truly collective reward structure such as Cohen used? In our view, hers is far more appropriately titled non-competitive than his. But would the school have bought it? What else would have to be arranged for teachers to adopt such norms of collaborative achievement? Would it have been used in "hard" courses other than the "soft" social studies? What organizational supports are required for equal status relations and reorganized power relations among students to be sustained outside the innovative classroom? Would other students not involved in this experiment accept or sabotage these forms of peer interactions? Would educators and other adults be able to adapt to these new patterns in interracial relations? It is not likely that these new classroom structures can be isolated or encapsulated in one classroom or in one corner of the school. If they are successful, the results will penetrate classroom barriers and must impact on the rest of the school. And they are not likely to be successful without support from other aspects of the school organization . . . from the patterns of staffing,

authority, curricula, rules and regulations, etc., discussed in the prior section. As we indicated in Weinberg's introductory quote to this section (p. 87), classroom changes are not likely to be constructive in and of themselves without corollary changes throughout the school organization. In general, the attempt to alter status and power relations (and especially the latter) is a major alternative to the reliance on increased interracial communication, "contact" and collaborative tasks alone. As such, it appears most consistent with the conflict model of changes needed during the desegregation and re-raises many of the strategic and programmatic choices discussed earlier in this paper.

Fifth, what kinds of systematic retraining of teachers, and pairing of majority-minority teachers and administrators, must be implemented for these interracial gains to be maintained over time within the embracing structure of the school? Not all teachers and/or administrators possess the attitudes and skills required to promote these instructional strategies. For instance, Gerard and Miller (1975) note the relationship between low teacher prejudice and positive interracial relations in class; they also indicate that teachers who were lower in prejudice were more likely to be associated with the use of teaching techniques emphasizing interracial "contact" in class. In his review of organizational changes required for effective integration, Orfield (1975) constantly stresses the need for teachers to teach in new ways, and the need for in-service training programs to help this occur. This stress is still most appropriate!

These two studies (and the related efforts of other authors noted here) are exciting precisely because they break new ground in identifying complex and intricate patterns of classroom interaction that must be altered and have been shown to be alterable. They also point to unresolved issues in the basic structure and process of the classroom and school building, and in the kinds of organizational changes that must be explored. As Cohen notes:

Non-competitive social structure with emphasis on group rather than individual accountability is shown as a feasible classroom arrangement . . . production of equal status conditions is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the improvement of black achievement in the desegregated . . . The revision of the classroom social structure . . . has implication for the eventual re-design of classrooms in a total academic program of an integrated school (1976, p. 57).

In our prior discussion of the relationship between efforts to alter the organizational structure of schools and the surrounding community context, we stressed ways in which the community was either a limiting or liberating factor. The difference lies in one's conception of the appropriate or feasible relationship between the organization and the community: and these conceptions differ according to the paradigm employed. Adherents of the consensus paradigm stress independence and professional autonomy within the classroom as well as professional direction to the entire school's and community's educational activities. Adherents of the conflict paradigm stress the school's dependence on the community and the need for previously unempowered school and community groups to help direct the course of professionals' activities. Although Cohen notes, and we agree, that classroom change has implications for the entire school structure, it is not easy to translate these implications into new practices. Why? According to some, especially adherents of the consensus model, other staff members would have to be carefully convinced; and problems of inertia as well as lack of skill would no doubt intervene to impede rapid dissemination. According to adherents of the conflict model, other staff members with contrary values (and perhaps students as well) would resist and perhaps even sabotage these innovative efforts. Moreover, teachers' interests in maintaining their strong control over the internal environment of the classroom would move some to resist all departures from a highly controlling pedagogy of transmission of information and socialization norms. A variety of tactics of organizational and individual change will have to be considered in attempting to implement new classroom procedures on a large scale.

### Attitudes and Actions of Individuals

Is everyone prepared for desegregation? Are educators, students, parents, and the general citizenry ready to help implement desegregation in ways that are likely to be effective? What kinds of changes in the attitudes and actions of individuals involved in desegregated schooling are possible or productive? Further, what kinds of procedures have been or can be developed to help individuals alter their values and behaviors in desegregated school and community settings? The new programs and changes we have discussed throughout this paper -- changes in communities, organizational structure of schools, and classrooms -- require corollary changes in the ways individuals within the school system go about their daily jobs. Major organizational changes will not persevere long unless the personnel administering such changes find and practice new ways of thinking, feeling, and acting.

The degree of personal change required for desegregation is a matter of debate, based partly on what attitudes and skills we think people currently hold, and what personal attributes and actions we think appropriate or necessary for desegregation to be successful. For instance, reconsider the discussion of public opinion data presented on page 44. Do these data indicate general community support? They may at the level of verbal responses to questions, but that does not necessarily guarantee that individuals can or will act on those reported attitudes in ways that create positive schooling procedures and outcomes (or even that they know how to act in ways congruent with their values). Individuals may hold conflicting or competing attitudes and values and may act on different ones in different situations. Moreover, how much attitudinal support for desegregation must someone have in order to work effectively in a desegregated setting? What behaviors are relevant? Must a teacher value minority students positively in order to teach them? Do we care about parents' and students' attitudes regarding desegregation so long as they send their young (or go themselves) to

desegregated schools? Although there are many unanswered questions in this regard, we all probably can agree that desegregation is most likely to be successful if people feel, think, and behave in ways congruent with and supportive of this agenda.

One way of identifying targets of individual change more specifically is in terms of those aspects of persons (attitudes and actions) that can be altered, and that thereby might affect the course of successful desegregation. A useful list could include:

1. new information and ideas . . . about society, the community, and the school; about one's own self-interest in the long run; about race and sex and class relations; about the process of desegregation and education; about the possible directions and strategies of change.
2. new values and attitudes . . . about people of other races, sexes, or social classes; about new educational designs; about one's own role in making changes.
3. new feelings . . . about oneself; about one's relation to friends, families, and peers; about fear, anger, and risk.
4. new skills or behaviors . . . in teaching, managing, and learning; in making changes in organizations and communities; in working with other people, especially people of other races, sexes, and social classes; in performing new roles, or old roles in new ways; in coping with conflict (Chesler, 1971).

Of course, none of these items is likely to stand alone; they are highly inter-related: new information may be required in order for people to generate alternative behaviors, altered values may flow from successful experiences with new roles, new behaviors and values may generate different feelings, etc.

If we agree that changes should occur in the attitudes and actions of individuals involved in desegregation, what are the mechanisms by which such change can be brought about? For instance, if we think change can be brought about in a voluntary and self-directing manner, we will proceed in certain ways. According to adherents of the consensus model of change, individuals generally can recognize their own value inconsistencies or skill gaps and willingly enter retraining programs that can help them adapt better to and perform more effec-

tively in a new situation. Thus, voluntary retraining programs or educational efforts make the best sense. According to adherents of the conflict model of change, however, this willingness is not reliable. Persons whose attitudes or behavior must change for desegregated schooling to succeed may not know that; or may not agree with this diagnosis. Thus, voluntary programs that acknowledge resistance, or even involuntary training programs, may be the answer. In addition, organizational mechanisms (norms, standards of performance, criteria for rewards) which require persons to behave in certain ways may be instituted. Then the individual can decide whether he or she wishes to abide by such directives, wants to change, wants help (education/training) in changing, wants to leave the organization, etc.

Kelman (1961) has distinguished among several different kinds or processes of personal/attitudinal change, and his discussion is relevant to the issues raised here. One process of change is called compliance; it occurs when a person adopts an altered public attitude or behavior pattern because he or she is forced to. Private attitudes may not change in this process, and behaviors may revert to former modes when constraining authority is out of sight, but when someone with power is checking, change occurs. Another process is called identification, wherein a person alters attitudes and actions willingly because of allegiance to important peers or authorities -- allegiance or identification with others, not coercion, is the key mechanism. A third process is called internalization; it occurs when a person fully intergates an altered attitude or behavior pattern into her or his personal value system and adopts it completely as congruent with other personal values and behaviors. Our preferences for various processes of change (or hunches about what is possible) probably are related to our assumptions regarding consensus and conflict and the general role of constraint in human interactions. If willing and voluntary internalization or identification does not appear possible, compliance may still be

effective; but compliance obviously requires the use of organizational requirements or standards for behavior and appropriate constraints.

The attempt to utilize any of these processes can benefit from the large body of research available on attitudes and attitude change, especially that research focussing on change in racial attitudes.<sup>39</sup> Several authors argue convincingly that change efforts must begin with an understanding of the personal psychological functions of racial attitudes (Katz, 1960), or of their acquisition and maintenance (Ashmore and Del Boca, 1976). For instance, if we analyze racial views as an expression of ego-needs, or a symptom of personality balance/imbalance, semi-therapeutic approaches to change probably are most relevant. If we analyze them as a function of misinformation or ignorance, information and education campaigns seem most relevant. If we analyze them as a response to learned patterns of compliance to peer cultures, to values supported by families, friends, and neighbors, alterations in one's stance toward peers' expectations, or even transformations of the entire peer culture, may make good sense. In this view, we could not very effectively abstract any person from the rest of the social and community environment within which her or his values and attitudes are embedded, reinforced, etc. If we analyze racial views (or behaviors) as a function of a lack of knowledge and experience in a multi-racial situation, learning new interpersonal or work-related skills and the successful experience of interacting differently with minority members seems quite relevant. Constant feedback to people on the ways their behaviors affect others (how teachers' acts impact on student performance, how administrative policies impact on teachers' options or feelings, etc.) may be a powerful tool for self-corrective insight and

<sup>39</sup>It is beyond our purpose to examine these fascinating issues of attitudinal analysis and change tactics in much detail here; they obviously are deserving of more adequate research in large-scale organizational change and personnel training programs. Laboratory experiments on attitude change and speculations drawn from analyses of survey data have been useful beginnings, but need to be extended into actual change programs.

action. To the extent that whites' attitudes toward minorities are a result of perceptions of threat to their instrumental interests (jobs, traditional ways of teaching, safety), information or experiences that reduce or reinterpret these perceived threats may be most useful.<sup>40</sup>

Any discussion of white attitudes and actions must consider the possibility that these individual attributes are determined strongly by the nature of organizational realities -- norms, status systems, rewards, authorities' expectations, etc. To the extent that the school organization rewards and reinforces discriminatory behavior, or passively accepts or overlooks it, no individual change effort will succeed unless the organization changes -- and changes first! This analysis would place priority on the issues and options developed in prior sections of this paper. It in no way obviates the need for personal change efforts but does stress the importance of organizational and societal factors in producing and maintaining individual behavior patterns. A comprehensive analysis could well integrate all these analytic principles into an understanding of the individual, organizational, and societal conditions that create a vast web of institutional racism, a web only partly attackable via approaches that concentrate on individuals' attitudes and actions.

Since individuals obviously are embedded in organizational structures and procedures, it is not reasonable to expect people to alter their behaviors unless there is support and reward for altered behavior in the social networks, organizational structures, and institutional ethos that surround them.

<sup>40</sup> McConaghy and Hough (1976) argue that over and above such instrumental views, many whites harbor "symbolic racism," negative attitudes of a general character that are not tied to psychic disorder, threat, etc. Such views are part of the normative order of our society and constitute a residue of racial belief that probably only can change over a long period of time and as a result of major changes in our culture and symbol systems. Chesler (1976) identifies several other scholarly themes which see racist attitudes and actions as "normal" and deeply embedded in the American culture and social structure.

Unfortunately, the literature (and practice) on individual change does not provide much good evidence on how organizations can induce or constrain members to behave in new ways during school desegregation. All social organizations do induce or constrain member behaviors; without it industrial production, social services, and other essential outcomes would falter. But this wisdom in generating organizational compliance seldom has been applied to racial processes . . . generally we prefer to see changes in racial attitudes and behaviors as voluntary and unconstrained activities, as opposed to the constraints assumed necessary in other aspects of American life. Obviously there is a well developed technology of securing staff cooperation on any organizational agenda, and it can be extended to apply to school desegregation efforts. For instance, it certainly is possible to build an organizational consensus in support of change: it is every bit as possible for organizations to control and constrain members' actions. Organizational authorities can monitor individuals' racial behavior in much the same way they monitor narrower aspects of task performance. Moreover, community members could develop, or could be included in the development of, school monitoring programs (see our discussion on p. 55) that hold the teaching and administrative staff accountable for their actions in promoting effective desegregation. Organizational norms and rewards systems may be altered in ways that constrain and/or promulgate certain attitudes and actions, and peer group standards and pressures can be reorganized so as to support positive racial and educational practices.

Although these are important priorities, and these approaches could supplement any training program, they are almost neglected in scholarship and practical suggestions for change. There is substantially greater evidence available on training programs that focus primarily on altering individual attitudes and actions, generally separated from attempts to alter the organizational context or support system.

Training/Educational Programs for School Members. Just what is the extent and impact of in-service training programs for educators, or for related programs directed toward students and community members? It sometimes seems that every major school system, aided by most universities and all General Assistance Centers, constantly are conducting desegregation training programs. In several court cases involving desegregation, federal judges have included mandatory staff training as part of their remedy. The United States Commission on Civil Rights indicates that at least 23 of the 79 case studies prepared for their report demonstrate some kind of staff training program (PLSL, 1976, p. 131). The Southern Schools Report (1973) indicated teacher in-service programs in 84 percent of the districts receiving Emergency School Assistance Program funds. Coulson, et al., (1977) indicate that over 50 percent of the elementary and secondary staff included in their survey of ESAA-funded districts experienced in-service training focused on the teaching of reading and math: approximately one third of the staffs received training focused on cultural enrichment or intergroup relations issues. However, most of these programs reported in Coulson, et al., were of short duration, with 10 hours of training or less. What can be done in 10 hours? What kinds of assumptions about individual change targets or processes would expect 10 hours to make a difference?

Orfield (1975) has suggested that in-service programs should focus especially on altering ideas and skills. And Coulson, et al., (1976) reports that in the ESAA schools, in-service training programs focusing on instructional techniques or skills in teaching math and reading were far more popular than programs focusing on teachers' awareness of intergroup relations. Consider, for instance, the following table which indicates the objectives of various staff development programs (adapted from Coulson, 1976, p. vi-21):

Characteristics of Staff Development Programs

Program Objectives:

- Increase teacher awareness of cultural differences
- Improve teaching of remedial reading or math
- Improve intergroup relations between teachers and students
- Encourage innovative techniques
- Improve teaching of students with different racial/ethnic backgrounds

Program Activities:

- Group discussions
- Inservice workshops
- Seminars, lectures

It is unclear from the wording of the first item whether increasing "awareness" emphasizes ideas or feelings, but all the other items focus on skills. Such foci can be expected to meet the least resistance and to be translated most directly into changes in classroom events. Our own experience, however, is that developing new skills is not a useful long-term change strategy unless ideas and attitudes and feelings also are explored. Then there is a greater possibility of internalization of change, as compared with solely compliance (Kelman, 1958). Of course, the reverse is true as well; there is little payoff for new staff ideas and attitudes unless they can be translated into practical skills in interpersonal and pedagogical behaviors.

And who are the relevant individuals whose attitudes and actions must change during desegregation? Essentially all parties involved -- administrators, teachers, counselors and ancillary school personnel, students, parents, other citizens and community members, policy makers in the community, etc. Everyone socialized in systems of racial separation and everyone conditioned to historic patterns of domination-subordination, must be considered as a potential target of change. Anyone considering an active role in the community, organizational and classroom settings, or programs discussed heretofore probably will need to

learn new skills and behaviors. It may be most important, however, for changes to occur in high power figures, such as administrators, civic leaders, influential parents, and public officials. As people with power change, they may be able to alter the organizations they direct and guide.

Unfortunately, it appears that most training programs that focus on individuals involved in desegregation have dealt with teachers as the target of change. As front-line workers, as staff members with the primary responsibility for interacting with youth, they certainly are an appropriate target: just as certainly they are not the only appropriate target. Although the reports prepared for the USCCR indicate that most school systems studied had some kind of staff retraining program, only seven included administrators; four included parents or local business leaders; and only four included counselors and other school staff members. Several of these school systems established programs that included teachers, administrators, parents, and students together (Tulsa, Wichita, Ogden), and some included bus drivers and custodial personnel as well (Nashville-Davidson, Waterloo).

Who runs or directs these training programs? What resources are critical? The search for expert consultants and/or instructors for race relations training programs has led to several alternative resource bases. Some systems have utilized external consultants, especially from federally sponsored General Assistance Centers. Others have sought help from local universities and schools of education, notwithstanding the evidence that these same institutions provided initial teacher training and helped create generations of teachers poorly prepared to deal with interracial classrooms and schools. Local agencies, such as Urban Coalitions, Civil Rights Commissions, and community groups of various sorts also often provide experts who help in school change programs. And some school systems have utilized a two-step model, wherein staff members who have received some sort of external training create an instructional cadre to pass on these new

ideas and skills to others within the system (USCCR, 1977f). In this case, it is critical that staff members involved in peer instruction be provided with substantial organizational support. Otherwise, other staff members may resist their efforts as a power play, unrelated to system-wide priorities and concerns.

General Assistance Centers often are able to provide such resources to school systems without costs; their federal mandate and funds usually include available services. Other agencies may cost the school system money, and then decisions must be made about funding priorities. Proposals to federal or state agencies, or in some cases to local business interests, may provide external funds. On occasion, a school system will fund such programs out of internal disbursements. Costs include not only the services of instructional experts or "trainers," but also released time for staff members attending such events, payment for time of parents and students, materials and facilities, etc.

Although training programs appear to be legion, we have relatively few well-documented descriptions or evaluations of these efforts. As a result, we know little about whether retraining produces positive changes in program recipients, and even less about whether these changes result in new outcomes for students and communities. The lack of detailed program description means that even when we do have evidence of change, we often do not know how and why it came about -- what retraining tactics and/or targets worked?

There are a few large-scale studies available of the general impact of teacher retraining. For instance, the Southern Schools Report (1973) indicates that approximately 50 percent of the elementary and secondary teachers involved in training events felt that they were valuable. Specifically, at least half of the participants felt:

- it changed their teaching techniques
- they learned about discipline
- they learned about intergroup relations
- they learned to be less afraid of other ethnic groups
- they learned about handling heterogeneous classes
- they learned about minority history (30 percent)
- they learned about teaching reading (only 20 percent at the secondary level)

This general finding is repeated in many reports of local training events. Of course, it is inadequate to rely solely on participants' self-reports as evaluations of change programs, but it is helpful and hopeful to know that well over half of the participants did not feel openly resistant or negative about their experience. As noted, there is little sound evidence of the ways such training programs may "pay off" in terms of student outcomes -- or of what training specifics led to what outcomes.<sup>41</sup>

It would be useful to have a national assessment of the kinds and extent of in-service training programs conducted as a part of desegregation efforts. Then maybe we could discover which foci, with which mix of resources, make a difference in the life of the school. Good evaluations of in-service programs are extremely hard to come by; most evaluative efforts are poorly funded, quickly done, with locally derived post measures (sometimes even pre-post) of attitudes toward students, race relations, or even the training program itself. Little long-term evaluation of the impact of training on teachers' classroom activities is available, let alone evaluation of the impact on community and organizational innovations.<sup>42</sup> The overwhelming assumption seems to be that individual changes in ideas, feelings, or skills can be translated into new practices and outcomes, without altering the interpersonal context or organizational structure within which educators operate. But the same organization that

<sup>41</sup>Not no evidence, but little concrete detailed evidence. Some indications exist in both the Southern Schools Report (1973) and the Coulson, et al., (1977) study that teacher training programs were associated with more racially tolerant teacher attitudes and/or improved student racial attitudes. At this point, however, we cannot be sure whether those effects are really the outcomes of successful training, of the self-selection process whereby only certain teachers or schools participated in training, or other organizational conditions unrelated to training.

<sup>42</sup>Arguing that training programs in general are good is a bit like arguing that desegregation in general is good . . . both positions ignore the reality that many things are done in the name of training or of desegregation, and that such change efforts are good only under certain conditions, for certain outcomes. Under other conditions, with other components, for other outcomes, they may be irrelevant; or worse, they may have negative impact.

supported non-innovative teaching may well frustrate attempts to teach in innovative ways. Of course, it is easier to retrain teachers, or to create and operate programs designed for this purpose, than to change the organization of schooling. Funds can be allocated, experts hired, meetings held, and a training program accomplished. A history of research suggests, however, that retrained individuals re-entering a stable organization will rather quickly revert to established practices: that is, unless new organizational procedures and structures are employed to reinforce and encourage new behaviors.

Relevance of the Alternative Models for Individual Change in Desegregation.

Scholars and practitioners adhering to the consensus strategy of individual change in desegregation usually stress retraining programs involving attitude change and skill development, some of which focus on educational and racial relationships, others on interpersonal styles and anxieties, and others on teachers' needs for information. Attempts to increase problem-solving skills, including diagnostic and data feedback efforts, and new teaching technologies, are also congruent with this approach. In addition to retraining programs, authorities' and peers' use of persuasion, reflective conversation, feedback, and modelling processes are common tactics. Generally, the assumption is made that people of good will wish to make their own and others' lives better if they know what has to be done and how to do it.

Those adhering to the conflict strategy of individual change also utilize retraining programs, but usually stress that educators' participation should be held accountable to or monitored by consumer groups. New ideas and information are important, especially if they raise consciousness and challenge consensus assumptions about school and society. The development of new ways of teaching is important, but so are improvements in community members' skills in organizing others, running campaigns, generating power bases, and managing negotiations. Other skills needed by students and parents, as well as educators, include:



changing target individuals or organizations via embarrassment and harassment, via evidence of racism or incompetence, or via mobilization of threat and power. In addition to retraining programs, organizational pressures such as coercive rules and regulations, accountability procedures, and the allocation of rewards for new behaviors are preferred tactics for creating individual change.

#### IV. CONCEPTUAL MODELS AND IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS: CONCLUSIONS

This review of school desegregation research and action programs indicates the popularity of a pattern of assumptions generally consistent with the consensus model of schools and school change. Those practices most likely to have been suggested and implemented seem to assume a general readiness for change in the school and community and a reservoir of professional and citizen good will. Moreover, practices and programs that fit either model seem to have been implemented rather consistently in ways that assume the workings of a general consensus supporting desegregation. Thus, it seems clear that the conflict paradigm has been under-utilized in responding to a range of issues, problems, and opportunities encountered during desegregation. This is by no means startling, considering how much of the planning and implementation of desegregation has rested in the hands of professional educators -- largely white educators as well.

In a similar vein, Collins and Noblit conclude their summary of the recent literature on desegregation as follows:

. . . it appears that generally only those researchers that are critical of the institution are significantly concerned with community conflict, factionalism, decision-making, and the role of elites in interracial school processes. Those who are not critical of the institution simply do not seem to ask questions about the community, expect in terms of deficiencies of its inhabitants and/or the technical problems they create for the school (1976, p. 99-100).

These observations take us back to earlier comments about the ideological commitments of educational practitioners and some social scientists and how these commitments shape research, theory, and action alternatives.

We need not make a case here for the "better fit" of the conflict model, except to say that desegregation is indeed a major community and organizational conflict and that it sparks and surfaces secondary conflicts within and between communities, organizations, and individuals. With that reality in mind, either the consensus or conflict model (or a mix thereof), undertaken self-consciously, could help direct inventive scientists and practitioners to useful new ideas and programs. The problem of the "accuracy" of a model is probably not as important as the "function" it serves for the user, because either model may "fit," depending on the issue, the situation, and actors' roles, resources, and ideologies. But the current skew in thinking and planning about desegregation is dangerous, and it has major disadvantages for the breadth and clarity of thought and program.

We need more scientific analyses that stem from and that explore the full meaning of the conflict model applied to desegregation and social change. And we need more detailed thinking and planning about educational and community programs that are consistent with the conflict approach. Then we all will have a better set of choices to make, ones which may fit more people's underlying assumptions and preferences regarding the future of schools and race relations . . . ones which also may fit better with current realities. Without some greater degree of public clarity, we all may get lost in rapidly shifting conceptions of reality, political alignments, and local options. And without more conscious attention to alternative models, we (scholars, practitioners, policy-makers) may become victims of a limited set of assumptions made by ourselves or others.

Work on school desegregation initially focussed on how to implement court

orders to move youngsters physically from one educational setting to another. The second generation problem of what to do with these interracial groups of students to insure a high-quality interracial learning environment, integration, soon followed. Ahead of us lie five major new tasks. First, given the major difficulties encountered in moving toward high-quality interracial learning environments, we need to learn how to implement our best guesses, hunches, research findings, or praxis lessons about what it is important to do with youngsters in a desegregated school. Second, we need to think and plan more clearly about how to bring about change in adults -- parents, teachers, administrators, and others -- who make decisions about the community and organizational context within which desegregation occurs. The continuing focus on how to change youngsters is a basic extension of the function of education, but youngsters will not change unless these other social systems are altered as well. Third, we need to focus more attention on changing the organizational structures and procedures that provide the context for schooling of all sorts, and for desegregated schooling in particular. This focus includes attention to classroom operations as well as to support systems between the school and the community. Fourth, current urban realities point to the need to manage desegregation within new constraints and limits not realized in the early 1950s. Such constraints include limits on desegregation plans imposed by economic class factors in schooling, by demographic transitions and housing segregation in urban centers, and by progressively shrinking urban resources in the public as well as private sector. Fifth, we need to think and plan more clearly how to tie desegregation into other agendas for community and social system change. We may not yet be able to plan the kinds of grand political and economic changes that might alter the course of racial injustice and inequality in America, nor may we yet be able to alter the fundamental character of our schools. But we must find ways of relating to this larger agenda, and of utilizing the human

resources liberated by these other social movements. Unless we do this, desegregation will continue to be carried out in a manner insulated from other and larger issues in social change.

It remains to be seen how changes such as those discussed here (and elsewhere) come about -- how are they introduced and adopted? Obviously, some of the most important, provocative, and/or promising programs have not been implemented on a broad scale. Why? Is their non-use due to a problem of a lack of knowledge, in which case reviews of social scientific knowledge may be useful? Is their non-implementation due to a lack of good will, in which case creative problem-solving activities, increased interracial interactions, and appeals to democratic values might be useful? Is their non-implementation a problem of lack of skill on the part of leadership groups (and perhaps minority or community groups), in which case workshops, skill training events, or the intervention of expert social and educational planners might be useful? Is their non-implementation a problem of value confusion or dissensus, in which case clarification, tolerance of differences, or the development of overarching norms among school staffs and student/community groups might be useful? Is their non-implementation due to a lack of power and resources, in which case litigation, the organization of establishment resources, and the mobilization of alternative (or counterestablishment) power bases might be useful?

In a recent article, Dentler also has lamented the state of implementation of desegregation plans, and addressed the academic community's involvement, or lack thereof, as follows:

The educational policy literature on urban school desegregation tends to neglect the factors of planning and implementation . . . factors that account for four-fifths of the variance in policy success or failure, account for less than one-fifteenth of our professional attention (1978, p. 72).

He explains this trend in terms of the lack of rewards available to scientists who do get involved in action efforts, and to the academic tendency to armchair

theorizing and/or distant modes of evaluation and research. From our own point of view, part of the reason also lies in the scholarly commitment to studying the "what is;" and "what is" is often dismal, unproductive, and non-visionary forms of urban race relations and education. Positive images of the future will not spring from this turf. Rather than jettisoning this approach completely, however, we need to exert more energy studying "what might be," and on understanding how to design and implement these alternative futures. Then we could provide more adequate information regarding the school and community mechanisms by which effective desegregation and positive outcomes for students, staffs, and communities may be produced.

In all probability, each reader's own answer(s) to the question of implementation (multiple answers are permissible, to be sure) may reflect her or his current stance on the conflict and consensus models of schools and school change. They also may reflect her or his stance on the nature and roots of educators' and community members' resistance to certain school changes accompanying desegregation. Our own view is that we always need new ideas, especially new ideas that can be or have been tested in practice. But we also need to find the courage and energy and support to implement the best of our current ideas. Undoubtedly there are many arguments about micro-tactics and programs; but there are also many agreements on the general thrust of needed changes in desegregation. We could be moving a lot faster in finding thoughtful and potent ways to implement them.

REFERENCES

- A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual Bicultural Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975.
- Alexander, K., Cook, M., and McDill, E. Curriculum tracking and educational stratification: some further evidence. American Sociological Review 43, 47-66, 1978.
- Amir, Y. The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. Katz (Ed.), Toward the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Sikes, J., Stephan, C., and Snapp, M. Busing and racial tension: the jigsaw route to learning and liking. Psychology Today 43-50, February 1975.
- Ashmore, R. Prejudice: causes and cures. In B. Collins (Ed.), Social Psychology, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Ashmore, R., and Del Boca, F. Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. Katz (Ed.), Towards the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.
- Becker, H. The teacher in the authority system of the public school. Journal of Educational Psychology 27, 129-141, 1953.
- Bidwell, C. The school as a formal organization. In J. March (Ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965.
- Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Rosenfield, D., Aronson, E., and Sikes, J. Interdependence in the classroom: a field study. Journal of Educational Psychology 69, 121-128, 1977.
- Bloom, B., Davis, A., and Hess, R. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Bonacich, E., and Goodman, R. Deadlock in School Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Boulding, K. Conflict and Defense: A General Theory. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
- Bowles, S. Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor. In M. Carnoy (Ed.), Schooling in a Corporate Society, New York: McKay, 1972.
- Burges, W. Good Things Can Happen: Your Community Organization and School Desegregation? Cleveland: Federation for Community Planning, 1978.
- Buttall, F., and Flinn, W. Methodological issues in the sociology of natural resources. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 3 (1), 62-72, 1975.
- Buxton, T., and Prichard, K. The power erosion syndrome of the black principal. IntegratEducation 15, 9-14, May-June 1977.

- Callahan, R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Candoli, I. An urban superintendent looks at school desegregation. Theory into Practice 17, 17-22, 1978.
- Carnoy, M. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: McKay, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Schooling in a Corporate Society. New York: McKay, 1972.
- Chalmers, E., and Cormick, G. (Ed.). Racial Conflict and Negotiations. Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1971.
- Chambliss, W. (Ed.). Sociological Readings in the Conflict Perspective. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1973.
- Chen, I., Deutsch, M., Hymans, H., and Jahoda, M. Consistency and inconsistency in intergroup relations. Journal of Social Issues 5, 1-63, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Contemporary sociological theories of racism. In P. Katz (Ed.), Toward the Elimination of Racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teacher training designs for improving instruction in interracial classrooms. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 7, 612-641, 1971.
- Chesler, M., Crowfoot, J., and Bryant, B. Student participation in school desegregation: programs and problems. Integrate Education (in press) 1979.
- Chesler, M., Jorgensen, C., and Erenberg, P. Planning Educational Change: Integrating the Desegregated School. Washington, D.C.: USDHEW, 1970.
- Children Out of School in America. Cambridge, Mass.: Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Project, 1974.
- Chin, R., and Benne, K. General strategies for effecting change in human systems. In W. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (Eds.), The Planning of Change, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Clement, D., Eisenhart, M., and Wood, J. School desegregation and educational inequality: trends in the literature, 1960-1975. The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1976.
- Cohen, E. The effects of desegregation on race relations. Law and Contemporary Problems 39 (2), 271-300, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Modifying the effects of social structure. American Behavioral Scientist July-August 1973.
- Cohen, E., Lockheed, M., and Lohman, M. The center for interracial cooperation: a field experiment. Sociology of Education 49, 47-58, 1976.
- Coleman, M. The struggle for control of education. In C. Bowers and J. Dyke (Eds.), Education and Social Policy: Local Control of Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

- Collective Bargaining: Bringing Citizens to the Round Table. Citizen Action in Education 2 (1), 1-5, 1974.
- Collins, R. Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification. American Sociological Review 36, 1003-1018, 1971.
- Collins, T., and Noblit, G. The process of interracial schooling: an assessment of conceptual frameworks and methodological orientations. The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1976.
- Corwin, R. Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Coser, L. Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Coulson, J., et al. The Second Year of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation. Santa Monica: Systems Development Corporation, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The Third Year of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation. Santa Monica: Systems Development Corporation, 1977.
- Crain, R. The Politics of School Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.
- Crain, R., and Mehard, R. Desegregation and black achievement. Working paper, Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs, Duke University, 1978.
- Crowfoot, J., and Chesler, M. Contemporary perspectives on planned social change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences 10, 278-304, 1974.
- Cunningham, L., and Carol, L. Court ordered monitoring of school desegregation. Theory into Practice XVII (1), 81-85, 1978.
- Dahrendorf, R. Toward a theory of social conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution 2, 170-183, 1958.
- Davies, D. Youth and citizens: allies and collaborators. Citizen Action in Education, 1976.
- DeCecco, J., and Richards, A. Growing Pains: Uses of School Conflict. New York: Aberdeen Press and Federal Legal Publication, 1974.
- Dentler, R. Desegregation planning and implementation in Boston. Theory into Practice 17 (1), 72-77, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Desegregating the Boston Public Schools: A Crisis in Civic Responsibility. Washington, D.C.: USCCR, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Desegregation and Educational Concerns of the Hispanic Community. Washington, D.C.: NIE, USDHEW, 1977.

Desegregation without turmoil: the role of the multi-racial community coalition in preparing for smooth transition. New York: Community Relations Service and National Center for Quality Integrated Education, 1976.

Deutsch, M. Conflicts: productive and destructive. Journal of Social Issues 25, 7-41, 1969.

DeVries, D., and Edwards, K. Student teams and learning games: their effects on cross-race and cross-sex interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology 66, 741-749, 1974.

Dodson, D. The creative role of conflict re-examined. Journal of Intergroup Relations 1, 5-12, 1960.

Douglas, A. The peaceful settlement of industrial and intergroup disputes. Journal of Conflict Resolution 1, 69-81, 1957.

Duke, D. The etiology of student misbehavior and the depersonalization of blame. Review of Educational Research 48, 415-437, 1978.

Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1978.

Fantini, M. Participation, decentralization, community control and quality education. Teachers College Record 71, 93-107, 1969.

Fink, C. Some conceptual difficulties in the theory of social conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution 12, 412-460, 1968.

Forehand, G., and Ragosta, M. A Handbook for Integrated Schooling. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1976.

Forehand, G., Ragosta, M., and Rock, D. Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Foster, G. Desegregating urban schools: a review of techniques. Harvard Educational Review 43 (1), 5-36, 1973.

French, J., and Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law. Washington, D.C.: USCCR, 1976.

Gamson, W. The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1975.

Power and Discontent. Homewood: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Gerard, R., and Miller, N. School Desegregation: A Long-Range Study. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.

Getzels, J. Conflict and role behavior in the educational setting. In W. Charters and N. Gage (Eds.), Readings in the Social Psychology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.

Goslin, D. The School in Contemporary Society. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1965.

Greeley, A., and Sheatsley, P. Attitudes toward racial integration. Scientific American 225 (6), 13-19, 1971.

Halleck, S. Hypotheses of student unrest. Phi Delta Kappan 50 (Sept.), 2-10, 1968.

Handbook Supplement for Bus Assistants. Denver Public Schools, 1976.

Hauser, R. Socioeconomic Background and Educational Performance. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1971.

Havens, E. Methodological issues in the study of development. Sociologica Ruralis 12 (3/4), 252-272, 1972.

Himes, J. The function of racial conflict. Social Forces 45, 1-10, 1966.

Horton, J. Order and conflict theories of social problems as competing ideologies. American Journal of Sociology 61, 701-713, 1966.

Jamieson, D., and Thomas, K. Power and conflict in the student-teacher relationship. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 10, 321-327, 1974.

Johnson, D., and Johnson, R. Instructional goal structure: cooperative, competitive and individualistic. Review of Educational Research 44, 213-240, 1974.

Learning Together and Alone: Cooperation, Competition and Individualization. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Kalish, M., and Goldner, N. The demise of the management team approach and the rise of collective bargaining for middle management educational professionals. Michigan Journal of Secondary Education 12 (2), 1971.

Katz, F. The school as a complex social organization. Harvard Educational Review 34, 428-455, 1964.

Katz, M. The Irony of Early School Reform. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Kelman, H. Processes of opinion change. Public Opinion Quarterly 25, 57-78, 1961.

Kimbrough, R. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1964.

Kirby, D., Harris, T., and Crain, R. Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

Kohler, M. Citizen concern: key to youth participation. Resources for Youth Newsletter 3, 12, 1976.

Kvaraceus, W. Negro Self-Concept. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Lenski, G. Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Lipsky, M. Protest as a political weapon. American Political Science Review 62, 1144-1159, 1968.

- Lohman, M., and Wilson, G. Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1975.
- Lucker, G., Rosenfield, D., Sikes, J., and Aronson, E. Performance in the interdependent classroom: a field study. American Educational Research Journal 13, 115-123, 1976.
- Lurie, E. How to Change the Schools. New York: Vintage, 1970.
- Mack, R., and Snyder, R. The analysis of social conflict -- toward an overview and synthesis. Journal of Conflict Resolution 1, 212-248, 1957.
- Michaels, J. Classroom reward structures and academic performance. Review of Educational Research 47, 87-98, 1977.
- McConaghy, J., and Hough, J. Symbolic racism. Journal of Social Issues 32, 23-46, 1976.
- McShurely, A. How to Negotiate. Louisville: Southern Conference Educational Fund, 1967.
- Miles, M. Some properties of schools as social systems. In G. Watson, (Ed.), Change in School Systems. Washington, D.C. NTL-IABS, 1967.
- National Commission on Resources for Youth. New Roles for Youth in the School and Community. New York: Citation Press, 1974.
- Negotiations: A Tool for Change. New York: SEDFRE, n.d.
- Noar, G. The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.
- Oberschall, A. Social Conflict and Social Movements. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Orfield, G. How to make desegregation work: the adaptation of schools to their newly-integrated student bodies. Law and Contemporary Problems 39 (2), 314-341, 1975.
- The Reconstruction of Southern Education: The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- Parents United (New student government to be formed). Boston City-Wide Parents Advisory Council, 1976.
- Parsons, T. The school class as a social system. Harvard Educational Review 29, 297-318, 1959.
- Patchen, M., Davidson, J., Hoffman, G., and Brown, W. Determinants of students' interracial behavior and opinion change. Sociology of Education 50, 55-75, 1977.
- Paulston, C. Theoretical perspectives on bilingual education program. Paper presented at Conference on the Dimensions of Bilingual Education, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1977.

- Paulston, R. Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change: A Typological Review. Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, 1976.
- Perrow, C. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, Ill.: Scott-Foresman, 1972.
- Preparing for Negotiations: A Manual for Community Groups. St. Louis: Community Crisis Intervention Project, Washington University, n.d.
- Rapaport, A. Fights, Games and Debates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.
- Rehberg, R., and Rosenthal, E. Class and Merit in the American High School. New York: Longmans, 1978.
- Research Review of Equal Education 1 (2-3), Northwestern University, Center for Equal Education, 1977.
- Rhea, B. Institutional paternalism in high schools. The Urban Review 3-4, 13-15, 1968.
- Rosenthal, R., and Jacobsen, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Rothman, J. Three models of community organization practice. In F. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman, and J. Tropman (Eds.), Strategies of Community Organization. Itaska, Ill.: Peacock Publishers, 1970.
- School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas: Choices and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: NIE, DHEW, 1977.
- School Monitor Information Packet. Denver: Community Education Council, 1976.
- Schuman, H. Sociological racism. Trans-Action 7, 44-48, 1969.
- Schuman, H., and Johnson, M. Attitudes and behavior. Annual Review of Sociology. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1976.
- Slavin, R. How student learning teams can integrate the desegregated classroom. Integrated Education 15 (6), 56-58, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Student teams and comparison among equals: effects on academic performance and student attitudes. Journal of Educational Psychology 70, 532-538, 1978.
- Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation. University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center, 1973.
- Sprecht, H. Disruptive tactics. Social Work 14, 5-15, 1969.
- Spring, J. The Sorting Machine. New York, McKay, 1976.
- Squires, G. Education, jobs and inequality: functional and conflict models of social stratification in the U.S. Social Problems 24, 436-450, 1977.

St. John, N. School Desegregation Outcomes for Children. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Strategies for coping with student disruptions. School Management 13, 46-63, 1969.

Taylor, G., Sheatsley, P., and Greeley, A. Attitudes toward racial integration. Scientific American 238 (6), 42-49, 1978.

Tompkins, R. Techniques of desegregation. Citizens Guide to Desegregation. Cleveland: Citizens Council for Ohio Schools, 1976.

United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1977 a - q.\*

School Desegregation in Berkeley, California, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977a.

School Desegregation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977b.

School Desegregation in Corpus Christi, Texas, Texas Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977c.

School Desegregation in Dorchester County, Maryland, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977d.

School Desegregation in Greenville, Mississippi, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977e.

School Desegregation in Kalamazoo, Michigan, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977f.

School Desegregation in Kirkwood, Missouri, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977g.

School Desegregation in Little Rock, Arkansas, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977h.

School Desegregation in Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977i.

School Desegregation in Nashville-Davidson, Tennessee, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977j.

School Desegregation in Ogden, Utah, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977k.

School Desegregation in Providence, Rhode Island, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977l.

School Desegregation in Racine, Wisconsin, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1977m.

School Desegregation in Santa Barbara, California, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977n.

School Desegregation in Stamford, Connecticut; Connecticut Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977o.

School Desegregation in Tulsa, Oklahoma, Oklahoma Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977p.

School Desegregation in Williamsburg County, South Carolina, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977q.

\*There are several other case studies in this series, but we have not had access to all of them, and not all of them have been referred to specifically herein. We note here only those we have noted by name or program. For the sake of convenience, we have listed all these publications under the heading of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. However, the reader is advised to note that several publications have not been authorized by the Commission but have been printed under the auspices of the relevant State Advisory Committee. In some cases that is due to disagreements between the state group and the federal

commission with regard to the content of the report; in other cases not enough time has elapsed for the state group's report to have been re-issued under the Commission's auspices. Thus, the authorization or imprint noted here may change over time.

van den Berghe, P. Dialectic and functionalism: toward a theoretical synthesis. American Sociological Review 28, 695-705, 1963.

Walton, R., and Dutton, J. The management of interdepartmental conflict: a model and review. Administrative Science Quarterly 14, 73-91, 1969.

Warren, R., and Hyman, H. Purposive community change in consensus and dissensus situations. Community Mental Health Journal 2, 293-300, 1966.

Wasserman, M., and Reinmann, J. Student rebels and school defenders. The Urban Review 4, 9-17, 1969.

Weigel, R., Wiser, P., and Cook, S. The impact of cooperative learning on cross-ethnic relations and attitudes. Journal of Social Issues 31, 219-244, 1975.

Weinberg, M. Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1977.

Williams, R. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.

Willower, D., Eidell, L., and Hoy, W. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. State College: Penn State University Studies, no. 4, 1967.

Zeigler, H., and Boss, M. Racial problems and policy in the American public schools. Sociology of Education 47, 319-336, 1974.

WORKING PAPERS OF THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

The Center for Research on Social Organization is a facility of the Department of Sociology, University of Michigan. Its primary mission is to support the research of faculty and students in the department's Social Organization graduate program. CRSO Working Papers report current research and reflection by affiliates of the Center; many of them are published later elsewhere after revision. Working Papers which are still in print are available from the Center for a fee of 50 cents plus the number of pages in the paper (87 cents for a 37-page paper, etc.). The Center will photocopy other Working Papers at cost (approximately five cents per page). Recent Working Papers include:

- 189 "Did the Cake of Custom Break?" by Charles Tilly, December 1978, 47 pages.
- 190 "Women and Collective Action in Industrializing France, 1870-1914," by Louise A. Tilly, January 1979, 32 pages.
- 191 "The Rise and Fall of the Bourgeois Family, as Told by Lawrence Stone and Christopher Lasch," by Charles Tilly and Louise A. Tilly, January 1979, 11 pages.
- 192 "The Family Wage Economy of a French Textile City, Roubaix, 1872-1906," by Louise A. Tilly, January 1979, 23 pages.
- 193 "Sociology, Meet History," by Charles Tilly, February 1979, 97 pages.
- 194 "Administrative Regulation and Industry: A Sociological Perspective," by James B. Lowenthal, Michael A. Berger, and Mayer N. Zald, March 1979, 157 pages.
- 195 "Sinews of War," by Charles Tilly, March 1979, 25 pages.
- 196 "Trends in Policy Making and Implementation in the Welfare State: A Preliminary Statement," by Mayer N. Zald, May 1979, 20 pages.
- 197 "Social Movements and National Politics," by Charles Tilly, May 1979, 30 pages.
- 198 "The Effect of Roles and Deeds on Responsibility Judgments: The Normative Structure of Wrongdoing," by V. Lee Hamilton and Joseph Sanders, July 1979, 71 pages.

Request copies of these papers, the complete list of Working Papers, lists of other Center reprints, or further information about Center activities from:

Center for Research on Social Organization  
University of Michigan  
330 Packard Street  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109