

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 539

UD 007 931

By-Harrington, Charles; Adler, Norman M.

New York City's School Strike: Effects on Political Socialization of School-Age Boys.

Pub Date 10 Apr 69

Note-25p.; Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology (Mexico City, April 10, 1969).

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.35

Descriptors-*Beliefs, Childhood Attitudes, *Children, Fathers, Males, Mothers, Parent Attitudes, Political Influences, Political Issues, *Political Socialization, *Teacher Strikes, *Values

Identifiers-Albert Shanker, Mayor Lindsay, New York City, Ocean Hill Brownsville, Rhody McCoy, UFT, United Federation of Teachers

The New York City teachers' strike in 1968 over the issue of the removal of some teachers in Ocean Hill-Brownsville created an opportunity for a study of the effect of the strike on children's political values and beliefs. Drawing upon a sample of Jewish boys and their parents from an almost exclusively Jewish community, two hypotheses were tested: (1) the boys (aged eight to 12) would have more positive evaluations of Mayor Lindsay than of Albert Shanker, the union president; and (2) Lindsay would be judged right and Shanker wrong. The hypotheses are predicated on the assumption that children have positive attitudes toward elected, authoritative figures. However, the data disproved both hypotheses. During a crisis the traditional patterns of political socialization are apparently altered. In this instance there occurred a reversal of the usual way in which children apply learned symbols--there appeared to be a tendency (among the younger boys) to ascribe legitimacy to the illegitimate use of power. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

07931E ✓

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

New York City's School Strike: Effects on Political
Socialization of School-age Boys*

by Charles Harrington and Norman M. Adler

*Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the
Society for Applied Anthropology, Mexico City, April 10, 1969.

ED031539

UD 007 931

I. Background

In the fall of 1968 New York City's school system was paralyzed by three teachers' strikes. The third lasted five weeks. It threw the city into what Martin Mayer has called "...the worst disaster my native city has experienced in my life time--comparable in its economic impact to an earthquake that would destroy Manhattan below Chambers Street, much worse in its social effect than a major race riot" (1969:15). The precipitating factor of the series of strikes was the removal of a group of teachers from their jobs in a local school district (Ocean Hill-Brownsville in Brooklyn) by the district's governing board. Since the majority of the teachers were Jewish and the population of the school district is predominantly Black, the dispute quickly bifurcated along racial lines and feelings ran high. In addition, the strike took place in a setting in which the administration of the school system was moving toward decentralization (or local control), which was desired by Black leaders, while the union had reasons, primarily concerned with its ability to bargain collectively, for maintaining as much central control as it could win politically. (In this situation the union was probably giving greater priority to unionization and power than to educational goals.) The strike action was said to be against the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district board's firing of the teachers, but it was seen by many as a thinly veiled attempt to erode the political support which decentralization had gained since Ocean Hill-Brownsville was experimentally decentralized.

Opponents of the strike saw it as an attempt to alienate a majority of the lower-middle class Jews of the city (normally liberal in their support of social legislation) from the Blacks, and thereby to defeat decentralization as a Black proposal. Whether or not this was consciously the purpose of the union, that outcome has been largely achieved. Local control is now to a large extent associated in the public's mind with Blacks, lack of responsibility of local officials, lawlessness, and even as an attempt by criminals and hoodlums to take over the schools. Although in April, as this is written, tempers and the extreme statements they provoke have abated somewhat, it is unlikely that the state legislature will vote a strong decentralization bill, if any at all, in the current political climate.

The aim of decentralization is to make education more relevant and more sensitive to subcultural differences. Considering anthropologists' experiences with Roughrock School (Fuchs 1967), as well as what we know of the sad history of colonial schools in all parts of the world, decentralization and the objective of local control within the behemoth which is New York City are goals to which we, as applied anthropologists, would give wholehearted support. Our purpose in this paper is not to argue that case but rather to focus on the effect of the strike on children's political values and beliefs.

The Project in Political Socialization, Teachers College, Columbia University, which the authors direct, has been engaged for a year and a half in a long-term attempt to better understand how

children learn about political behavior. This paper is a progress report on research in progress rather than a final statement of our conclusions.

We have become dissatisfied with the present literature on political socialization because it is limited in two respects: 1) it defines "political" narrowly; and 2) it makes little use of recent methodological and theoretical advances in psychology and anthropology. In an era in which political scientists are defining politics as the process of allocating scarce resources, it is strange to find the field of political socialization largely limited to perceptions of elected officials and voting behavior. The second set of objections to the field will be discussed in our forthcoming book on political socialization. One of the limitations of the field that we deal with there is that it ignores crises and focuses on normal behavior. Roberta Sigel's outstanding study (1965; 1968) of children's reactions to the assassination of President Kennedy, and numerous other studies done at that time of national crisis, are of course exceptions to this trend.

It seems likely that in crises such as the school strike, instruction in "political" behavior occurs in the home. Especially with the schools closed, it is up to the parents to answer the child's questions and provide him with a cognitive map with which to understand the crisis. Normally political behavior is not openly discussed with children. Yet 91% of the 71 children whom we interviewed reported talking with a parent, usually both, about the strike. Thus crises like this one may be important in

socialization because at such times parents are almost forced to give instruction and guidance which they would not ordinarily provide.

This third teachers strike of 1968, then, afforded an opportunity to do a study which would begin to overcome the limitations which we have mentioned. First, elected as well as non-elected (and non-official) leaders were publicly maneuvering for political power in a crisis of major proportions. The Mayor (Lindsay), the elected school board, and the laws of New York State, which prohibit strikes by public employees, were pitted against a union (the United Federation of Teachers) and its president (Albert Shanker) in a dispute over the actions of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board and its appointed administrator, Rhody McCoy. Clearly, by our definitions the strike was political behavior, yet this kind of political behavior has not been studied in the political socialization literature. What do children learn from such a political battle, particularly when they and their parents are unwilling participants in the struggle in that decisions to send children to school or not, to support either Lindsay or Shanker, have effect on the outcome of the strike itself?

II. The Study

What is politicization? It is in part the learning of symbols; the learning of a shorthand by which to describe the exercise of authority, the reasons for the existence of authority in certain hands, the legitimacy of those who have power and exercise it, the means by which people participate in the distribution of premiums in the system. It is in part the application of this symbolic shorthand to real situations: seeing something occur and then describing it in terms of the symbols we learn. It is also seeing things for which we have no available symbols and the subsequent search for symbols that will fit the situation, or the creation of new symbols where there do not seem to be any. Finally, all this is cumulative. The children that we studied were supposed, according to political socialization lore, to bring with them certain symbols (often naively applied and often very positive toward authority and its exercise by legitimate authorities) that would be used to interpret the situation. The sources of such symbols are parents, teachers, mass media, peers, and others. Generally, these sources are homogeneous (not so for the Black youngsters, but they are not the subject of this study). In the school strike situation, these symbols--especially mayor, teachers, parents, and union--come into disagreement. That which has theoretically been labeled positively now becomes negatively appraised. What does the child do? How does he respond to being disillusioned with his earlier symbolic representations? That is the topic of this paper.

Following John Whiting, and other researchers, in distinguishing between values (simple judgments of good/bad) and beliefs (e.g., it is right or wrong for a mayor to act this way in the strike), we ask what effect the strike had on beliefs and values about these symbols.

In choosing an area of the city in which to work, we looked for an area of "maximal impact;" that is, where schools were all closed, where union feeling is strong, yet one in which support of liberal causes has traditionally been high.

The Pelham Parkway community is a middle class to lower middle class neighborhood of about 175,000 people in the Northeast Bronx. People reside in old apartment houses of six stories or more, most of which are rent controlled. Rent control has kept most of these people from fleeing to Queens, Staten Island, and the suburbs. There is a fringe of private housing, one middle-income housing project, and a few new high-rise buildings with rents of approximately fifty dollars per room. Almost all Jewish children in the area attend the public schools, as do some of the Italians. Some Negro children are bussed into the neighborhood schools, but the school population is overwhelmingly white. There are parents associations in each school which have large memberships but quite small attendance at meetings. Teachers are generally drawn from the neighborhood and adjoining neighborhoods, and it is not uncommon to be taught by someone whom you see on the streets during non-school hours. "Open School Week" is heavily attended; there is strong home-school communication; and, in general, the

upwardly mobile population has a sharp interest in education.

Pelham Parkway runs through the district and is a dividing line, generally between Jewish and non-Jewish residents; Jews predominate north of the Parkway, and few live south of it. Most of the Jews are first and second generation adults. Generally, the third generation goes to college and moves out of the neighborhood. The non-Jewish population is younger than the Jewish, and in recent years the schools have seen a sharp decline in Jewish pupils. P.S. 105, south of the Parkway, has taken to bussing in substantial numbers of non-white students due to the absence of school-age children from the surrounding Jewish blocks. The community is very union-minded. We would estimate that every household has at least one union member, and some have three or more. Garment workers abound among the older people, but there are many white collar and craft union members among the second and third generations. Most of the families include at least one teacher, and most children can say that they know either a close relative or family friend who teaches. The community has an overwhelming Democratic voting enrollment and a substantial number of Liberals. There are so few Republicans that a few years ago the local Republican club could claim, without being challenged, that every one of the area's Republicans was a member of the club; they did not have more than two hundred members. This is one of the districts of the city that at one time had an American Labor Party representative in Albany. Voter turnout is exceptionally high, and the corner of Lydig Avenue and White Plains Road is a sort of speakers' corner at election time, with sound trucks and speeches every evening and all day Saturday. There are seven Jewish

houses of worship in the area, all of them with large congregations, although attendance is not high except on Jewish holidays or for special events. There are a number of Jewish organizations in the community. The local Pelham Parkway Citizens Council contains on its roster: Jewish War Veterans, Hadassah, Bnai Brith, Bnai Brith Women, Zionist Organization of America, American Jewish Committee, and Youth Group of Young Israel. The Bronx House, operated by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies is the community center for the area.

There is a conscious policy of residential segregation, and, to our knowledge, the only nonwhite people residing in the area, with the exception of a few in the housing project, are superintendents and porters in buildings. There are a few nonwhite teachers in the schools.

Most of the Jewish children leave the city in the summer to go to camps (usually all Jewish) or bungalow colonies (rented summer cottages in colonies with day camps and an organized social life), which are always completely Jewish. One would say that if this is not a gilded ghetto, at least it is a laminated one.

We obtained a list of names of boys 8-12 years old with up-to-date address information from a local agency and interviewed 71 of the 226 boys on the list, which was roughly 67% of those for whom we received parental permission for an interview. The interviews were conducted during the final week of the strike. We then mailed questionnaires to all of the parents whose boys had been interviewed, asking them several of the same questions that had been used in the boys' interviews. We received questionnaires from 41 mothers, 33 fathers, giving us 42 children for whom we had a response from at

least one parent, which is 59% of the boys we were able to interview. The median age of the boys was 10; 14 were ten-year olds, 12 were younger than 10; and 16 were older than 10. While we do not claim that our boys are typical of New York City, we believe they are typical of the community we studied, in which one of us has been a participant observer for some time.

One of the instruments which was administered to both the child and his parent was a "semantic differential continua," which asked, for each of the major participants in the strike conflict, whether he (or it) was good/bad (values); wrong/right (beliefs). In this paper we deal only with that semantic differential material. We scored this material by measuring the distance from the left end of the line. Since the dimensions are

Good - - - - - Bad

Wrong - - - - - Right

and since the neutral point is about 6.3cm, anything higher than 6.3 is toward bad or right, respectively; anything less than 6.3 is in the direction of good or wrong.

III. Findings

Several studies of political socialization have shown that in the United States children have highly positive attitudes toward authoritative, elected officials, particularly toward the President and the Mayor (e.g., Hess and Easton 1960; Greenstein 1965). Therefore, we would expect our data to support the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Children have more positive evaluations of Lindsay than of Shanker, because Lindsay is an elected, authoritative figure and Shanker is not.

Hypothesis 2: For the same reasons, Lindsay should be judged right and Shanker judged wrong.

Table 1 reveals that both hypotheses fail. The mean semantic differential scores in Table 1 give us approximations of the respondents' values and beliefs about these participants in the crisis. These boys clearly have less positive views of the Mayor than of Mr. Shanker-- a finding which is inconsistent with our expectations based on the political socialization literature. From the failure of hypotheses 1 and 2, it is apparent that, as we expected, the crisis has had a profound effect upon the children.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Previous studies in political socialization have also shown that young children hold more positive views of publicly elected officials than older children (Hess & Easton 1960; Greenstein 1965). On the basis of the literature we would say:

Hypothesis 3: Young boys are more supportive of Lindsay than older boys.

This notion has not been supported in our study.

Insert Table 2 about here.

In Table 2 there are no significant differences between young boys and older boys in their evaluations of Lindsay or their beliefs as to his rightness or wrongness in the present crisis. In fact, in each case the younger boys have slightly more negative views of Lindsay than the older boys. The younger boys also perceived accurately and specifically what Shanker and Lindsay did during the strike, and then for Shanker they made up a status which reflects the power they see him wielding: thus, the boys tell us that Shanker is authoritative as a way of legitimizing the power they see him wielding. For example, they say "He is president of the schools," that "He owns the schools." One marvelous boy said that Shanker held veto power in the presidential election held last year in the United States.

It appears that these boys were unable to accept that Shanker's use of political power was not authoritative, and so they made up statuses for him. It is quite clear that they learned his individual behavior and then made up statuses that might explain it. Thus we see the crisis situation has altered the normal trends and relationships reported in the field of political socialization.

What impact, if any, did parents have on the child's values and beliefs about these figures? Table 3, showing correlations between the semantic differential continua scores of the children and those of the parents, offers some evidence on this question. (The reader will recall that the parent questionnaires were mailed to them, and that the boys were given personal interviews--a difference which has an unknown effect on these results.)

Insert Table 3 about here.

Table 3 shows a moderately high rate of agreement between boys and parents for Lindsay, Shanker, and the United Federation of Teachers, for both values and beliefs. On Ocean Hill-Brownsville there is agreement with only the mothers. Since this district was not mentioned in the news media as often as the public figures involved, perhaps the greater agreement with mothers is a reflection of the fact that the boys spend more time with them than with their fathers. The greater father-son agreement on attitude toward the U.F.T. may be an indication that the fathers are more likely to be union members

and to talk about unionization with the boys. Unionization is, after all, a part of the instrumental male role, and we would predict that boys' attitudes would show greater association with those of the father than with those of the mother. The complete lack of agreement for Rhody McCoy is an anomaly. Here the boys' harshness supports orthodox political socialization theory, and he is rarely ascribed an authoritative or elected role by the boys. Overall, the boys' attitudes toward McCoy were harsher than their parents' reported judgments. We think the boys accurately reported their attitudes, but that parents were less willing to label a Black "bad" or "wrong" in a questionnaire mailed to Columbia University. We think that the boys' judgments of McCoy more accurately reflect the parents' true attitudes than the parents' responses, and thus the correlation coefficient is diminished. Note, too, that when the race issue was depersonalized (in Ocean Hill-Brownsville), that the mothers apparently felt more free to condemn, and therefore the degree of association with the boys goes up. The fathers appear to be more reluctant than the mothers to condemn the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section, and this probably better explains those differences than the explanation posed above -- i.e., that the boys are more like their mothers because they spend more time with them.

We have said that our data suggest that in a crisis situation the boys first learn attitudes towards particularistic, individual behaviors and initially make up, then later learn, the formal statuses which the individuals hold. Further evidence for this point comes

from Table 4. There are two items which we believe are generalized statuses: Mayor Lindsay and Ocean Hill-Brownsville. There are two items which are particular individuals: Albert Shanker and Rhody McCoy. The United Federation of Teachers is so closely associated with Shanker that it is both particularistic and generalized.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Note that for the generalized items--the Mayor and Ocean Hill-Brownsville--there is no association between younger boys' values and their parents'. On the other hand, the older boys' values for those items are associated with the values expressed by their parents, particularly their mothers. Younger boys appear to react (if at all) to particular actions of the Mayor, older boys and parents to his status and general action in the strike.

The reverse is true for the particular individuals, Shanker and McCoy. For Shanker, there is a high degree of association between parental values and the values of the younger boys. Further, for the first time we find a significant correlation for McCoy, that between the youngest boys and their mothers. For the United Federation of Teachers (both general and particular) the boys' values are consistently highly correlated with those of their parents, regardless of age. Thus the boys appear to be socialized first into their parents' attitudes towards particular persons and institutions, then later form their own values

about individuals which may diverge from those of their parents, especially if they learn that Shanker's and McCoy's power is not legitimated. Thus you would expect that they would move away from their parents because of child's notions of rectitude and reliance on legitimated figures. At about 11 or 12 they become receptive to socialization into their parents' values toward statuses and groups, which knowledge they were not cognitively able to deal with earlier (in their younger years they make up their own values on the basis of unknown criteria, probably particularistic). Agreement on the U.F.T. initially would be expected because of the association with the individual Shanker, later with the general status of union ¹, as there was no conflict between the two.

We said earlier that the degree of association between parental beliefs and boys' beliefs should be lower than that for values. Beliefs are more complex cognitively, the questions subject to more interpretation; further, as compared with values, beliefs are thought to be more subject to non-family influences. From Table 4 it is clear that for Lindsay, Shanker, McCoy, and the U.F.T., the boys' beliefs about rightness and wrongness are less associated with parental beliefs than are values. The one exception is Ocean Hill-Brownsville, and here the reader will recall our interpretations given above for general lack of agreement with McCoy. Parents (particularly fathers) are reluctant

...

Hess and Torney (1967, pp. 66-67) found that when children are asked to rate the President, the "average person," policeman, newspapers, and various pressure groups (including labor unions) as to their influence on the lawmaking process, they rate the influence of unions at a higher level than other pressure groups (and as second only to that of the President).

to call a Negro "bad" or "wrong" in a written questionnaire from Columbia University. They also feel uneasy about calling a Negro district "bad." The civil rights movement has had some effect. But it is easier to call Ocean Hill-Brownsville "wrong" because the belief has the aura of specificity and intellectual disagreement which the value "bad" does not have. Thus, the parents are more severe in their beliefs about Ocean Hill-Brownsville than in their values (in fact the mothers' beliefs are more negative than the boys'), and the degree of agreement with children's beliefs about Ocean Hill-Brownsville is much higher than for the values expressed. Notice, too, that the older boys are slightly more temperate than the younger boys in their value judgments of Ocean Hill-Brownsville, presumably because they have been more socialized against saying bad things about Blacks.

IV. Conclusions

We have posed two main themes. Crises are different from the normal stream of behavior leading to political socialization. First, they are different in that they are more likely to provoke direct teaching by parents about political phenomena. This seems to account for the generally very high correlation between parents' attitudes and childrens'. Second, our data seem to suggest that in a crisis situation the particular is learned before the general. In addition, our data suggest that these children do not, as the political socialization literature suggests they will, more highly value legitimated use of power than non-legitimated use of power.

What we have in the school strike is what Ruth Benedict called "discontinuity." The things that children learn, to which they are socialized, are not identical in real life to the pictures painted in their minds. This is the normal chain of events and not terribly surprising. However, in a crisis situation (or at least in this crisis) events have a very direct impact on the child. The impact of not going to school, seeing parents and teachers (the principle sources of political information and values) emotionally involved and physically involved on occasion in the strike, is such that it creates not only the normal confusion attendant upon discontinuity but also a reappraisal of prior learning. What we have is not re-socialization, because most of the values and beliefs that the children now evince were present,

latently, before the crisis; they were placed further down on the priority scale of values. Cynicism begins to creep into the attitude and vocabulary of children at this age, anyway, but they are still inclined to be positive toward authoritative figures. Now, however, there is a convergence of political mentors: all of the principal agents of socialization (family, peers, teachers, mass media) come together to emphasize the child's loyalties to other things besides legitimate political authority. These other loyalties are to the Democratic party--Lindsay is, after all, a liberal Republican; to faith and race--the kids are Jewish and white; and to affiliation--dad is a union member and here is the Central Labor Council accusing Lindsay of union busting.

There is evidence that the crisis created a situation in which nascent doubts about the inherent rightness, goodness, and benevolence of legitimate authority figures were permitted to develop. Children who under other circumstances would probably have given the Mayor the benefit of the doubt in a conflict situation, and who would have had positive attitudes toward him, instead see him as "bad." On the other hand, a non-authoritative figure, namely Shanker, is seen as being very positive.

While the literature leads us to hypothesize that the older a child gets, the less positive are his perceptions and beliefs of authority figures, our findings do not support this contention. There appear to be no significant differences between the two age groups. The younger children, perhaps to justify their faith in Shanker, observed his exercise of power to close down schools, subdue heads of government agencies, frustrate the parents of numerous children, and

defy a governor and a mayor, and they concluded that this must be an authority figure and (perhaps because their parents approved the action) a legitimate authority figure to boot. If he is such, he must have a title. Titles were affixed to Mr. Shanker by a number of the younger respondents.

Crisis alter the patterns traditionally associated with the process of political socialization. Our data emphasize the importance of defining "political" in broad enough terms to include non-legitimated use of power and non-legitimated allocation of scarce resources. They suggest that there is some tendency for younger children to ascribe legitimacy to the illegitimate use of power. They suggest that in a crisis the order of learning is from particularistic behavior; and that this order is related to the child's stage of intellectual development. Our results support the oft reported finding that the age of 11 is a critical point in development; apparently at this age the child becomes able to grasp generalized status behavior in a crisis situation.

T a b l e 1

Mean Scores on Semantic Differential Continua

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Mothers</u>	<u>Fathers</u>
Mayor Lindsay			
good---bad	7.30	8.29	7.08
wrong---right	4.53	2.98	4.88
Albert Shanker			
good---bad	5.13	3.20	4.44
wrong---right	7.43	8.10	6.80
Rhody McCoy			
good---bad	10.10	8.30	7.56
wrong---right	2.21	2.68	4.22
Ocean Hill-Brownsville			
good---bad	8.66	8.31	8.45
wrong---right	3.02	2.57	3.12
United Federation of Teachers			
good---bad	2.98	3.19	4.58
wrong---right	8.29	8.26	7.16

T a b l e 2

Mean Scores on Semantic Differential Continua
for 10 youngest, 10 oldest boys and their parents

	Youngest boys			Oldest boys		
	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Father</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Father</u>
Mayor Lindsay						
good---bad	7.33	9.60	7.71	7.18	9.64	6.51
wrong---right	4.13	1.38	2.55	4.53	2.20	5.30
Albert Shanker						
good---bad	4.55	2.61	4.34	5.32	2.56	5.01
wrong---right	8.43	9.26	7.43	7.64	8.08	6.68
Rhody McCoy						
good---bad	9.79	9.10	7.88	9.55	8.26	7.58
wrong---right	2.75	1.74	2.85	2.47	3.30	5.26
Ocean Hill-Brownsville						
good---bad	10.21	9.19	9.17	9.75	9.80	8.53
wrong---right	3.16	2.29	2.98	1.67	1.96	4.13
United Federation of Teachers						
good---bad	2.27	2.59	4.94	3.80	2.06	5.07
wrong---right	9.12	8.98	8.48	8.92	9.04	6.80

T a b l e 3

Summary of Correlations (r)*

Semantic Differential Continua Scores of Boys and Parents

	<u>Boys/Mother</u>		<u>Boys/Father</u>	
	N	r	r	N
Mayor Lindsay				
good---bad	(38)	<u>.56</u>	<u>.54</u>	(33)
wrong---right	(40)	<u>.37</u>	<u>.50</u>	(31)
Albert Shanker				
good---bad	(41)	<u>.73</u>	<u>.71</u>	(33)
wrong---right	(37)	<u>.51</u>	<u>.44</u>	(31)
Rhody McCoy				
good---bad	(36)	.29	.03	(28)
wrong---right	(36)	.04	-.20	(28)
Ocean Hill-Brownsville				
good---bad	(36)	<u>.44</u>	.29	(30)
wrong---right	(38)	<u>.41</u>	.10	(29)
United Federation of Teachers				
good---bad	(35)	<u>.34</u>	<u>.67</u>	(28)
wrong---right	(36)	<u>.44</u>	<u>.45</u>	(28)
Decentralization				
good---bad	(22)	-.23	.11	(18)
wrong---right	(21)	-.19	.39	(18)

*One underlining = significant at 5% level.
Two underlinings = significant at 1% level.

T a b l e 4

Summary of Correlations (r) - Semantic Differential
 Continua Scores of Youngest and Oldest Boys With Parents*

	Youngest boys		Oldest boys	
	<u>Boys/Mother</u>	<u>Boys/Father</u>	<u>Boys/Mother</u>	<u>Boys/Father</u>
	r	r	r	r
Mayor Lindsay				
good---bad	.08	.26	<u>.89</u>	<u>.83</u>
wrong---right	-.07	.49	<u>.86</u>	<u>.63</u>
Albert Shanker				
good---bad	<u>.85</u>	<u>.94</u>	<u>.64</u>	.56
wrong---right.	<u>.62</u>	.59	.45	.46
Rhody McCoy				
good---bad	<u>.67</u>	.35	-.05	-.26
wrong---right	.46	-.16	-.18	-.15
Ocean Hill-Brownsville				
good---bad	.12	.14	<u>.80</u>	.58
wrong---right	<u>.69</u>	<u>.69</u>	<u>.93</u>	<u>.79</u>
United Federation of Teachers				
good---bad	<u>.74</u>	<u>.73</u>	<u>.72</u>	<u>.74</u>
wrong---right	.20	.45	.42	.58

*One underlining = significant at 5% level.
 Two underlinings = significant at 1% level.

REFERENCES

Fuchs, Estelle

- 1967 Innovation at Roughrock: Learning to be Navajo Americans. Saturday Review, Sept., 1967.

Greenstein, Fred I.

- 1965 Children and Politics. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Hess, Robert D., and David Easton

- 1960 The Child's Changing Image of the President. Public Opinion Quarterly 24: 632-644.

Hess, Robert D., and Judith V. Torney

- 1967 The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine.

Mayer, Martin P.

- 1969 The Teachers Strike: New York, 1968. New York: Harper & Row.

Sigel, Roberta

- 1965 An Exploration Into Some Aspects of Political Socialization: School Children's Reactions to the Death of a President. In Martha Wolfenstein and Gilbert Kliman (editors), Children and the Death of a President: Multi-disciplinary Studies. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Sigel, Roberta

- 1968 The Political Image of President John F. Kennedy as Seen by School Children. American Political Science Review 62: 216-226.