DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 724 UD 022 077

AUTHOR	Broh, C. Anthony; Trent, William T.
TITLE	Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume VI: A Review of Qualitative Literature and Expert Opinion on School Desegregation.
INSTITUTION	Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. Center for Education and Human Development Policy.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.; Office of Civil Rights (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 81
CONTRACT	NIE-R-79-0034
NOTE	185p.; For other volumes of this Assessment Project see UD 021 862 and UD 022 073-080.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Measures; Community Involvement; *Desegregation Effects; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Integration Readiness; *Public Opinion; Racial Relations; School Community Relationship; School Resegregation; Teacher Attitudes; Urban to Suburban Migration; *Voluntary Desegregation

ABSTRACT

This volume presents a review of the qualitative literature pertaining to desegregation strategies and outcomes, and school characteristics. The review was based on the following objectives of desegregation policy: elimination of racial isolation; improvement of racial relations and academic achievement; promotion of positive community attitudes; and reduction of white flight and resegregation within schools. Public opinions regarding various voluntary and mandatory student reassignment plans and transfer policies are discussed. Also included is a review of the consensus literature which summarizes the perspectives of desegregation experts, an outline of strategies for promoting community involvement and techniques for improving home-school cooperation, and a summary of interview findings based on local and national surveys. The literature suggests that most opinions call for magnet schools in combination with mandatory assignment metropolitan plans, and plans that include the early elementary grades. Also reported are generally positive attitudes toward pre-implementation, inservice training programs and post-implementation community involvement, with the greatest expressed concern being white flight in the absence of a metropolitan plan, and resegregation within schools. The majority of consensus reports focus on the avoidance of resegregation, enhancing racial relations, and academic achievement. Sample interview questionnaire forms for local and national experts are appended. (JCD)

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STRATEGIES

VOLUME VI

A REVIEW OF QUALITATIVE LITERATURE AND EXPERT OPINION ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

C. Anthony Broh

William T. Trent

Center for Education and Human Development Policy

Institute of Public Policy Studies

Vanderbilt University

April 1981

Preface

This volume is one of nine resulting from the Assessment of Effective Desegregation Strategies Project (hereafter referred to as the Project). The Project was financed with funds provided by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education and administered by the National Institute of Education (NIE).*

The primary purpose of the Project has been to identify what is known about strategies that are effective in desegregating school systems. A secondary objective of the Project is to facilitate further research on this topic. The Project will be successful if policy makers and practitioners use its [illegible]ngs, and the subsequent knowledge from research to which the proje[illegible]ributes, to more effectively racially desegregate the nation's schools.

There are several potential goals of desegregation and these may be the terms in which effectiveness is measured. This Project defined an effective strategy in one of four general ways:

1. The acceptance and support of desegregation by parents and the community.
2. The reduction of racial isolation and the avoidance of segregation among public schools (white flight and nonentry) and within schools (unnecessary ability grouping, push-outs, etc.).
3. The development of better race relations among students.
4. The improvement, or at least the continuance, of academic achievement.

---

* This report was prepared under Contract No. NIE-R-79-0034.

The Project involved several different but interrelated activities:

1. A comprehensive review of the empirical research (see Volume V).
2. A review of the qualitative literature on school desegregation, including studies surveying the opinions of practitioners and policy makers.
3. An analysis of ten key court decisions (see Volume VII).
4. Interviews with local and national experts on school desegregation.
5. A synthesis of the information gathered in activities 1-4 (see Volume I).
6. A review of actions by state governments and interviews with state officials (see Volume VIII).
7. An agenda for future research to determine the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (see Volume II).
8. The design of a multicommunity study to determine the factors that account for the effectiveness of school desegregation (see Volume III).
9. A guide to resources that those charged with implementing desegregation might find helpful (see Volume IV).
10. A comprehensive bibliography of books, articles, papers, documents and reports that deal with desegregation strategies related to the four general goals outlined above (see Volume IX).

These several activities were conducted by a team of researchers from several universities and organizations. The Project, which was managed by Willis D. Hawley with the assistance of William Trent and Marilyn Zlotnik, was initially based at Duke University's Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs. Midway during its 19 month life, the Project was moved

to Vanderbilt University's Institute for Public Policy Studies. The members of the Project team were:*

Carol Andersen	Education Commission of the States
C. Anthony Broh	Duke University
Robert L. Crain	Johns Hopkins University, The Rand Corporation
Ricardo Fernandez	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Willis D. Hawley	Vanderbilt University
Rita E. Mahard	University of Michigan, The Rand Corporation
John B. McConahay	Duke University
Christine H. Rossell	Boston University
William Sampson	Northwestern University
Janet W. Schofield	University of Pittsburgh
Mark A. Smylie	Vanderbilt University
Rachel Tompkins	Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools
William Trent	Vanderbilt University
Charles B. Vergon	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Meyer Weinberg	University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ben Williams	Education Commission of the States

The conclusions reached in the several volumes are those of the named authors. Neither the NIE or OCR necessarily supports the findings of this Project.

* Affiliations are for the period during which these persons participated in the study.

A REVIEW OF QUALITATIVE LITERATURE AND

EXPERT OPINION ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Table of Contents

Page

CHAPTER I

ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE LITERATURE ABOUT THE OUTCOMES OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STRATEGIES

C. Anthony Broh

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to analyze a body of elite opinion often ignored in the discussion of school desegregation strategies and outcomes--the qualitative literature. This literature contains judgments of school officials, politicians, informed citizens, scholars and others who often have first-hand experience with school desegregation. The materials reviewed here range from case studies to interpretive reviews of empirical studies.

The term "qualitative literature" refers to books, articles, reviews, and commentaries that embody judgments, interpretations, perceptions or opinions that are not directly linked to statistical data. Where empirical findings are included, they are used descriptively rather than analytically. This section does not examine articles and reviews that rely on research findings involving quantification and comparison. The terms "qualitative" and "quantitative" are not evaluative; they refer to the data base of two types of literature.

We approach the qualitative literature from several directions to understand the context in which authors make judgments, the background of the authors, the systematic nature of their analyses, and the difference between predictions about what will happen and assessments of what did happen, both in specific and in general. Such understanding assists us in determining the instructive quality and reliability of this literature. It should be noted that we erred on the side of including specific materials for purposes of making generalizations as broad as possible. Our primary objective is to introduce the reader to this literature and to raise issues that might be

examined in the expert interview and integrative stages of this project.

Indentifying the Qualitative Literature

Our first task was to define the literature. We narrowed the search to materials written by knowledgeable sources that are based on experience or expertise--but not original quantitative research--and that 1) discuss some form of outcome, and 2) relate such outcomes to general or specific strategies. This definition encompasses several different types of written material including book reviews in scholarly journals, articles in scholarly and professional journals, letters to editors, government reports, written testimonies, experimental research reports, and unpublished papers. We excluded those articles and reviews that report original research findings from structured social scientific research designs.

According to our identification criteria, we found few sources that deal exclusively with Hispanics and no literature that deals with other non-black minorities. The literature on Hispanics is too small to subject to quantitative summaries when compared to the more than 500 pieces that deal with blacks or desegregation in general. Therefore, we decided to treat the literature on Hispanics separately. This will allow us to give more attention to several special problems Hispanics encounter in desegregation.

Two stages comprised the procedure for collecting this literature. In the first stage, we identified ten academic journals and periodicals that traditionally report the opinions of educators and other knowledgeable persons about desegregation in public schools. These journals are often a source of publication for minority scholars. We reviewed every article in these journals pertaining to desegregation in grades K-12. Articles are dated from 1954 through 1980. From these sources we identified a total of 408 articles.

The second stage of identifying material included an informal survey of the advisory committee to this report and the research staff of the project. In addition, we visited Meyer Weinberg* and prepared a tentative bibliography divided by the six desegregation outcomes discussed in Chapter 1 of this report. All articles in the bibliographies not selected by the reviewers of the quantitative literature were included as qualitative literature. In this second stage, we identified 100 additional articles. Sources of the 508 pieces of literature are outlined in Table 1.

The qualitative literature spans the history of school desegregation in the United States. In 1954, articles merely predicted and expressed opinions about things to come. By 1980, the literature was over 25 years old. The current literature reflects over 2 decades of experience with the legal questions of school desegregation and with the practical problems of moving children and teachers from one school to another. As Table 2 suggests, much has been written about desegregation since the mid-1950s. The number of published articles in the qualitative literature increased markedly from 1954 to its highest point in 1977. This increase reflects a growing concern among educators and public officials about the issues of school desegregation and the identification of strategies that can promote the goals of desegregation. The decline of published articles in the last three years probably reflects an incompleteness in our identification of the literature rather than a decrease in writing on this subject.

---

*Meyer Weinberg is the Director of the Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Journals Included in the Analysis of Qualitative Literature*

JOURNAL CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	0.	3	0.6	0.6	0.6
BLACK SCHOLAR	1.	7	1.4	1.4	2.0
CRISIS	2.	14	2.8	2.8	4.8
EDUC. LEADERSHIP	3.	76	15.0	15.1	19.9
HARVARD ED. REV.	4.	25	4.9	5.0	24.9
INTEGRATED EDUCATION	5.	202	39.8	40.2	65.0
J. OF AFRO-AM. ISSUE	6.	5	1.0	1.0	66.0
J. OF NEGRO ED.	7.	53	10.4	10.5	76.5
NEGRO ED. REV.	8.	17	3.3	3.4	79.9
PHYLON	9.	9	1.8	1.8	81.7
URBAN REVIEW	11.	9	1.8	1.8	83.5
LAW & CONT. PROB.	12.	6	1.2	1.2	84.7
SOUTHERN EXPOSURE	13.	6	1.2	1.2	85.9
HIGH SCHOOL JOURNAL	23.	1	0.2	0.2	86.1
OTHER JOURNAL	30.	15	3.0	3.0	89.1
PROFESSIONAL CONF.	70.	7	1.4	1.4	90.5
PROFESSIONAL CONF.	71.	2	0.4	0.4	90.9
PROFESSIONAL CONF.	72.	4	0.8	0.8	91.7
U.S. COMM. CIV. RTS.	80.	28	5.5	5.6	97.2
BOOK	90.	14	2.8	2.8	100.0
	99.	5	1.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	508	100.0	100.0	

*Excludes articles on Hispanics and non-black minorities. See text for definition of qualitative literature.

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of the Date of Publication of Articles Included in the Qualitative Literature

CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
0.	1	0.2	0.2	0.2
1954.	6	1.2	1.2	1.4
1955.	15	3.0	3.0	4.4
1956.	3	0.6	0.6	5.0
1957.	4	0.8	0.8	5.8
1958.	16	3.1	3.2	9.0
1959.	2	0.4	0.4	9.4
1960.	4	0.8	0.8	10.2
1961.	3	0.6	0.6	10.8
1962.	3	0.6	0.6	11.4
1963.	26	5.1	5.2	16.5
1964.	4	0.8	0.8	17.3
1965.	18	3.5	3.6	20.9
1966.	22	4.3	4.4	25.3
1967.	20	3.9	4.0	29.3
1968.	31	6.1	6.2	35.5
1969.	11	2.2	2.2	37.6
1970.	29	5.7	5.8	43.4
1971.	19	3.7	3.8	47.2
1972.	26	5.1	5.2	52.4
1973.	27	5.3	5.4	57.8
1974.	30	5.9	6.0	63.7
1975.	32	6.3	6.4	70.1
1976.	24	4.7	4.8	74.9
1977.	57	11.2	11.4	86.3
1978.	33	6.5	6.6	92.8
1979.	28	5.5	5.6	98.4
1980.	8	1.6	1.6	100.0
99.	6	1.2	MISSING	100.0
TOTAL	508	100.0	100.0	

*Excludes articles on Hispanics and nonblack minorities. See text for definition of qualitative literature.

Methodology

Analysis of this literature was conducted in three stages. First, the research staff of the Center for Educational Policy at Duke University read each of the articles and recorded what was written about desegregation strategies, outcomes, and school characteristics. Opinions of the authors about the efficacy of different strategies were also noted. Finally, bibliographic, biographical, and background information about the articles and their authors were recorded. All information was coded on IBM cards.

In the second stage, we enriched the data from the qualitative literature by matching school districts described in the articles with the demographic and legal information in the Taeuber and Wilson data file (1979). This information was also coded on IBM cards for analysis.

Reexamination of the preliminary draft of this review comprised the third and final stage. We received comments and criticisms from the authors of each section of the empirical literature review, from members of the advisory board of the project, and from members of the NIE and OCR staffs. These comments and criticisms were incorporated in this final review of the qualitative literature.

Our primary task was to identify desegregation strategies that relate to specific outcomes. Thus, the authors' experiential or evaluative opinions are the basic unit of our analysis. A coded card for each opinion expressed by an author was produced. For example, if an author argues that a multiethnic curriculum (strategy) would produce higher achievement among minorities (outcome) and avoid resegregation within schools (outcome), we coded two cards. The scores and percentages reported in this review reflect the number of opinions about relationships between particular strategies and outcomes.

In addition, we weighted opinions according to the number of cities referred to by authors in their analyses. For example, an article describing in detail a multiethnic curriculum's effect on resegregation in Denver and Boston would count twice as much as an article describing the same strategy only in Boston.

Opinions about strategies were coded according to whether they related positively, negatively, or neutrally to specified outcomes. In some cases, authors view the relationship as one that improves chances of school desegregation. In others, authors perceive the relationship as one that retards chances of school desegregation. Analysis of these relationships form the next part of this section. From the data enrichment stage, we identified school characteristics and legal and demographic information that might have an impact on both strategies and outcomes. These data were introduced as "control" variables for the analysis of strategies and outcomes.

Opinions of the Qualitative Literature

Desegregation policy in public education has many objectives. The first, and most obvious, is to end racial isolation. Mixing minority and white children in a free and equal setting is an important demand of legal reasoning from Brown to present (Yudof, 1978).

A second objective of school desegregation is to improve race relations. By providing equality of educational opportunity, we can possibly break the pattern of isolation, mutual distrust, and lack of opportunities for minority and ethnic groups in society. Amicable race relations coupled with justice are worthy goals for a desegregated educational system (McConahay, 1978). Perhaps the best indicator of race relations is students' racial attitudes and perceptions of a school's racial climate (Forehand and Ragosta, 1976).

The third objective of school desegregation is academic achievement. Schools are for learning. Unfortunately, society has not provided similar educational opportunities to all its members. Some of the economic and social deprivation of minority and ethnic groups may be overcome by increasing access to higher quality learning experiences. In this sense, school desegregation may promote academic achievement of those who lack educationally enriched backgrounds.

A fourth objective of school desegregation is positive public response. Sometimes, hostility and polarization result from court-ordered school desegregation, especially in the years immediately following implementation. Nevertheless, national support for the principle of equality of educational opportunity appears to be greater than local support of newly implemented plans. Even in those communities with the most violent initial objections to desegregation, opposition eventually subsides. Positive response to desegregation, at least in principle, seems to be growing, especially in the South, the area of greatest forced desegregation (Hawley, 1979).

A fifth objective of school desegregation is to reduce white flight. Once a district begins school desegregation, some individuals will attempt to avoid the school system altogether. Parents may transfer their children to private schools or move out of the desegregating district completely. Both produce white flight, the out-migration of white children from the school system (Rossell, 1978). To stabilize a community and guarantee both a short- and long-term racial balance in schools, white flight must be curtailed.

Another possible outcome of school desegregation is resegregation within schools. In many instances, children have been bused from one school to another to provide racial balance across the system. However, classrooms of

desegregated schools often remain segregated due to specialized curricula, educational policy, or explicit racial prejudice. This type of resegregation meets neither the spirit nor the legal requirements of most court orders. Avoiding resegregation, then, is a sixth goal of desegregation.

These six outcomes of school desegregation form the basis of our analysis of the qualitative literature. School superintendents, principals, teachers, collegiate academicians, and other authors of this literature explicitly or implicitly refer to one or more of these outcomes in their articles, reviews, and written opinions. However, some authors often describe strategies for producing a desirable outcome without precise reference to which outcome they have in mind. Table 3 presents an outline of positive and negative judgments of the authors about the propensity of particular strategies to produce desirable desegregation outcomes. Table 4 summarizes these opinions.

Voluntary Student Assignment

"Voluntary" student assignment has an ideological appeal to most Americans because it is associated with freedom to do what one likes. Many people assume that because they can freely select their housing and neighborhoods in an open market, they have the right similarly to choose their children's schools. Thus, if desegregation plans "require" movement of children from one school to another or from one program to another, many believe the basis for transfer should be voluntary.

Sixty opinions in the qualitative literature favor voluntary student assignment plans and 25 do not. Half of the favorable opinion (31), however, do not describe specific outcomes of voluntary plans. In general, these authors describe the virtues of voluntary programs for desegregation in general terms such as civic duty, enhancing self-esteem, or some other outcome not covered in this report.

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies*

STRATEGY	COUNT	OUTCOME: DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
0. VOLUNTARY ST ASS		6/3	1/6	3/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
1. ..OPEN ENROLLMENT		6/3	1/2	0/0	2/0	0/1	0/0	1/0
3. ..MAJRTY TO MINR		6/1	0/0	2/1	3/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
4. ..MAGNET SCHOOLS		4/0	2/2	2/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
5. ..METCO		1/0	0/1	2/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0
6. ..HOUSING POLICY		5/0	4/0	1/1	0/0	0/1	1/0	0/0
7. ..SITE SELECTION		3/1	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
10. MANDATORY ST ASS		17/2	12/2	8/5	3/0	1/1	2/3	0/1
11. ..REDRAW LINES		13/3	2/1	1/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1
12. ..PAIRINC CLOSIN		10/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
13. ..MODIFY FEEDER		0/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1

*Each cell has the number of positive opinions to the left and the number of negative opinions to the right. For example, 6/3 means six opinions held that this strategy would lead to the specified outcome and three opinions held that this strategy would not lead to that outcome.

(continued)

Table 4

Summary of Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATGEN	OUTCOME COUNT DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
0. VOLUNTARY ST ASS	31/8	8/12	10/3	7/0	1/2	2/0	1/0
10. MANDATORY ST ASS	63/6	28/4	14/6	8/0	1/2	6/3	0/3
20. PRE-IMPLEMENT CO	34/2	9/0	15/3	1/0	6/1	0/0	1/1
30. PRE-IMPLEMENT ST	9/0	1/0	1/2	4/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
40. POST-IMPLEMENT C	36/1	3/0	8/0	7/0	4/1	0/0	2/0
50. POST-IMPLEMENT S	39/1	19/0	19/0	8/0	0/0	1/0	2/0
60. CURRICULUM	29/3	10/0	16/2	23/2	1/0	3/0	2/5
70. HUMAN RELATIONS	25/13	4/0	10/3	4/2	1/0	0/0	6/6
80. SCH & CLASS MNGM	5/0	0/0	3/1	1/0	0/0	1/0	0/0
90. STAFF ASSIGNMENT	11/2	6/0	9/1	1/0	2/1	0/0	1/0
98. GENERAL	13/12	10/3	27/10	15/3	0/1	10/7	1/5
COLUMN TOTAL	296	98	132	79	17	23	16

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATEGY	COUNT / OUTCOME: DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
80. SCH & CLASS MNGM	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
81. ..MAINTAIN ORDER	1/0	0/0	2/1	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0
82. ..DISCIPLINE	2/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
85. ..ST-TEACH CONTA	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
90. STAFF ASSIGNMENT	2/0	4/0	3/1	1/0	0/0	0/0	1/0
92. ..REASSIGNMENT	2/1	2/0	4/0	0/0	1/1	0/0	0/0
93. ..AFFIRM ACTION	7/0	0/0	2/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
98. GENERAL	13/12	10/3	27/10	15/3	0/1	10/7	1/5
COLUMN TOTAL	295	98	132	79	17	23	16

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATEGY	COUNT	OUTCOME DESEG-- OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
..COMPENSATORY F	66.	2/0	0/0	1/0	5/2	0/0	0/0	0/1
..COOP INSTUCTIO	68.	0/0	2/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
..ALT GRADING	69.	3/0	1/0	3/1	2/0	1/0	1/0	0/0
HUMAN RELATIONS	70.	6/1	1/0	6/1	2/0	0/0	0/0	1/0
..TEACHER AIDS	71.	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
..MIN SUSPENSION	72.	12/0	1/0	0/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	3/0
..ABILITY GROUP	74.	1/5	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/3
..EXTRA CURR ACT	75.	3/0	1/0	2/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	2/0
..SPECIAL EX CUR	76.	2/0	1/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0

(continued)

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATEGY	COUNT / OUTCOME: DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RELATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGREGATION 6.
51. ..TEACHER SKILLS	1/1	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
52. ..TEACHER TRAIN	0/0	1/0	2/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
53. ..FACULTY SUPERV	7/0	3/0	3/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
54. ..HUMAN RFLATNS	9/0	1/0	6/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0
55. ..COOP LEARN EX	8/0	7/0	1/0	3/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
57. ..SENSITIVITY TR	3/0	2/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
59. ..NON-DIS PLACEM	0/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0
60. CURRICULUM	4/0	0/0	2/0	4/0	0/0	0/0	1/2
61. ..ENRICHMENT	11/0	2/0	4/0	6/0	0/0	2/0	0/0
62. ..CLASS SIZE	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
63. ..MULTIETHNIC CU	6/2	2/0	4/1	4/0	0/0	0/0	0/1

(continued)

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATEGY	COUNT / OUTCOME: DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
27. ..DIST MONITOR C	4/0	2/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
30. PRE-IMPLEMENT ST	6/0	1/0	1/2	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
31. ..TRAIN TEACHERS	2/0	0/0	0/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
32. ..STUDENT CONTAC	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
33. ..FACULTY EXCHAN	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
40. POST-IMPLEMENT C	30/1	1/0	6/0	5/0	2/0	0/0	1/0
41. ..MULTIETHNIC PT	4/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0
42. ..MULTIETHNIC CN	1/0	2/0	1/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
44. ..PARENT ACTIVIT	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
45. ..SCH-HOME CONTA	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	1/0
50. POST-IMPLEMENT S	12/0	2/0	5/0	3/0	0/0	0/0	1/0

(continued)

Table 3

Opinions about the Outcomes of Desegregation Strategies

STRATEGY	COUNT	OUTCOME: DESEG--OTHER 0.	END RACIAL ISOLATION 1.	RACE RE-LATIONS 2.	ACADEMIC ACHIEVE 3.	PUBLIC RESPONSE 4.	WHITE FLIGHT 5.	RESEGRE-GATION 6.
..GRADE REORG	15.	4/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
..RENOVATIONS	16.	1/0	1/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	1/0	0/0
..MAGNET-MAND.	17.	5/0	2/0	1/0	2/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
..METRO PLAN	18.	10/0	5/0	2/0	1/0	0/0	3/0	0/0
..EARLY YRS, K-6	19.	3/1	1/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
PRE-IMPLEMENT CO	20.	9/0	2/0	4/2	0/0	4/1	0/0	0/0
..MULTIETHNIC PT	21.	1/0	1/0	4/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0
..MULTIETHNIC CO	22.	11/1	4/0	4/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1
..RUMOR CENTER	23.	1/0	0/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
..PUBLIC RELATIO	25.	6/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	1/0
..COURT MONITOR	26.	2/1	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0

(Continued)

Most of the positive opinions about voluntary majority to minority transfers were made before 1968 (7), while half that many (4) were expressed later. Since the pre-1968 period was an era of optimism among academicians about the possibilities for school desegregation, one may wish to discount the implicit recommendations of these qualitative articles. Positive judgments generally reflect academic hope for a successful desegregation policy. Early discussion from research centers predicted advances in all facets of minority education and in majority (i.e. white) compliance and cooperation with the goals of desegregation. School administrators appeared willing to "go along" although they were less precise about the outcomes of such programs. In general, empirical studies support qualitative opinion that majority to minority transfers promote few goals of desegregation.

Another type of voluntary student assignment program involves "magnet schools." As the name implies, these schools are designed to attract students from all over a district on a voluntary basis. Often superior educational curricula in magnet schools serve to attract minorities and whites from several school zones in a district. Such plans have considerable appeal in both minority and white communities since the goal of quality education is stressed along with other goals of desegregation. Magnet school plans have recently been proposed in Los Angeles and accepted by courts for San Diego and Milwaukee.

A difficulty with magnet schools is that they do not produce much change in the racial balance of students throughout an entire school system. Furthermore, magnet schools often substitute class discrimination for racial discrimination since middle class minorities generally volunteer for magnet schools leaving a disproportionate share of poor minorities in neighborhood schools. In addition, the propensity of magnet schools to improve race relations,

percent cumulative change in the minority enrollment of some school districts over a 5 to 10 year period.

The literature reflects early support for majority to minority transfer policies. Twelve articles favor while only 2 criticize this strategy. Positive opinion points to improved race relations (2), higher academic achievement (3), and a favorable public response (1). Negative opinion is either very general or describes negative impact on race relations (1).

A critique of the arguments about academic achievement and voluntary transfer programs has been presented elsewhere (Crain and Mahard, 1978) and produces doubt about opinion in the qualitative literature. It is quite possible, however, that transfer programs may result in better race relations. For some students, the greatest amount of contact with persons of other races comes at school and this interaction is generally friendly and positive (McConahay, 1978). A voluntary transfer plan that produces friendly interracial interaction among students clearly results in better race relations than a program that fosters racial segregation. This proposition accounts for many of the positive opinions about majority to minority transfer programs, and it is a point that may be lost in describing the outcomes of voluntary school assignment plans.

As one might expect, college academicians made more positive judgments about majority to minority transfer programs than did superintendents, principals, or teachers in public school systems. Academicians were more optimistic about positive race relations, achievement gains, and favorable public responses that might result from voluntary plans. The most positive reaction from a school superintendent was less precise about the benefits and alluded only to an unspecified positive outcome of this desegregation strategy.

may attract highly motivated minorities who are then compared to some base line of minority achievement. Such comparison may produce spurious results since the high scores of minorities who volunteered for the program may result from high motivation rather than the effect of the open enrollment itself. Most of the qualitative literature does not consider this possibility.

The chronology of support for open enrollment programs follows a predictable pattern. In articles published before 1968, 4 opinions were favorable and 1 was unfavorable. In the period from 1969 to 1973, 5 opinions were favorable and 2 unfavorable. Current thought, now that there is some experience with the policy, is divided; 2 judgments are favorable and 3 are unfavorable. Negative assessment of this strategy derives from new evidence that open enrollment will not desegregate an entire school system and produces less positive results than mandatory desegregation plans.

A majority to minority transfer program is a constrained open enrollment policy. With open enrollment, students are allowed to select any school in the district. While the intent of this policy is to allow minorities to select better financed, often superior, white schools, the consequence is generally resegregation. Whites living in predominantly minority school zones tend to select white majority schools while minorities living in predominantly white school zones select predominantly minority schools. Consequently, a majority to minority transfer program allows selection of a new school only if student transfer would create a favorable racial balance.

In general, majority to minority transfer programs do not desegregate schools because neither minorities nor whites transfer. However, some recent evidence suggests that small changes in the minority enrollment of predominantly white schools, 1 to 2 percent per year, may have gone unnoticed by policymakers in some cities. This yearly change could produce as much as 10

Not surprisingly, many of the author's positive opinions about voluntary student assignment were reported before 1968 a period with only token desegregation; another 12 were reported before 1973 when large scale busing began. Some authors argue that people should volunteer to desegregate schools because forcing them to do things is not right. Others claim that people will volunteer now that the courts have recognized the importance of equal educational opportunity. These optimistic opinions are restricted almost exclusively to ending racial isolation or improving race relations. However, only 7 judgments claim that voluntary student assignment could or should produce higher academic achievement for minorities. These opinions are supported by more systematic research on the relationship between voluntary assignment and minority achievement (Crain and Mahard, 1978).

Open enrollment is a voluntary student assignment plan that allows students to attend any school within the system they choose. This concept had wide appeal among educators in the early years of desegregation because it gave parents the choice of where to send their children and produced little or no opposition from whites. Educators believed that minority students would attend white schools that offered greater educational opportunities. In fact, almost no whites chose to attend minority schools and only a few minorities voluntarily chose to attend white schools. The net effect was maintenance of racially identifiable schools.

Nevertheless, some authors report positive results from open enrollment. Of the 10 positive opinions, 6 simply argue in favor of the plan without describing precise outcomes of the strategy. Two articles assert that open enrollment would lead to greater academic achievement among minorities. Crain and Mahard (1978) point out, however, that open enrollment programs

involve small numbers of students (only 2500 students in Boston); thus they are not generally effective for large scale desegregation.

An excellent summary of the literature on metropolitan cooperation is Havighurst and Levine's Education in Metropolitan Areas (1971). That study describes requirements for eliminating socioeconomically and racially segregated schools as "social urban renewal" in which officials are encouraged to "develop the central city so that all kinds of people - rich and poor, black and white - will want to live there and raise their children there." Educational policies must be designed to 1) stop the flight of middle class, and 2) build self-contained communities that represent cross sections of the whole area. Havighurst and Levine's summary of socioeconomic and racial stratification exemplifies the optimism of the literature on voluntary interdistrict cooperation:

> This [discussion] can be summarized by saying that metropolitan development as it has taken place in America during the present century has made it more difficult for boys and girls to get a good education, both in and out of school. The schools have been handicapped by the growing economic and racial stratification of the metropolitan area. [Social] urban renewal of a fundamental kind will restore and create educational values in the city. But [social] urban renewal cannot take place without substantial changes in educational organization and policy (p. 90, emphasis added).

In our analysis, 4 opinions of voluntary interdistrict projects are favorable and only 1 is unfavorable. Two authors claim that these projects result in improved race relations and decreased white flight. The negative opinion of voluntary interdistrict projects stresses that they do not end the racial isolation created by segregated housing patterns in large cities. Not surprisingly, the only people in our analysis to study interdistrict projects are college academicians. The problems of metropolitan education are theoretical, with practical implications to be sure,

achievement, and so forth is difficult to evaluate since these schools tend to attract highly motivated students. Few experimental designs with adequate controls are reported in the empirical literature and school teachers and administrators who write articles using soft data are generally insensitive to this problem of self-selection.

Positive opinion about magnet schools claim these programs help end racial isolation (2), improve race relations (2), improve academic achievement (2), and have generally positive, yet unspecified outcomes (6). Negative opinions are skeptical about the ability of magnet programs to end racial isolation (2), a concern supported by quantitative research on this subject (Rossell, 1978). In general, most positive opinion about magnet school plans was written before 1968 when "freedom of choice" was still an acceptable legal remedy for dual school systems.

Examination of characteristics of authors supporting magnet schools is instructive. None of the positive opinion claiming higher achievement or improved race relations was written by superintendents, principals, or teachers, those individuals most directly involved with primary or secondary education. College professors and government officials wrote most of these articles, which generally are prescriptions about policies to adopt rather than evaluations of policies that have been implemented.

A fourth voluntary student assignment program is a voluntary interdistrict project. In the Boston and Hartford METCO programs, students are bused to schools that voluntarily participate in the program. METCO involves two kinds of voluntary participation, by students and by school districts. The state encourages participation by paying the educational and transportation costs of METCO students. Generally, METCO programs

but school officials have written less than theoreticians and policy evaluators in academia about such wide ranging solutions to desegregation. As Havighurst and Levine note, superintendents and school board members traditionally address intra-systemic functions rather than broader "paths to metropolitanism" (1971, pp. 302-303).

A fifth voluntary strategy for desegregation is open housing or scattered-site housing policies. In 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court held that housing discrimination is unconstitutional (Jones v. Mayer, 392 U.S. 409, 1968). Challenges to local zoning laws and passage of open housing bills made open housing seem like the best remedy for segregated public schools. Open housing would mean that people could live where they choose, and, coupled with neighborhood schools, open housing would mean that schools could voluntarily be as desegregated as housing patterns.

Opinion about open housing policies as a strategy to desegregate schools is generally favorable in the qualitative literature. Four positive judgments assert that housing policies would help end racial isolation and one author argues that they could help improve race relations. The quantitative literature generally refutes these opinions. Orfield (1978) reviews several indices of metropolitan segregation and concludes that "the average family had fewer neighbors of the other race in 1970 than ten years earlier," particularly in metropolitan areas. Orfield's discussion is typical of other work on housing policy. In addition, almost all opinion about housing policies comes from social scientists rather than from school personnel.

A final voluntary student assignment strategy is for school boards to build new schools in racially neutral areas. By selecting construction sites in racially integrated housing zones, the district can desegregate its schools without busing students from one school zone to another.

The qualitative literature relates no specific outcomes of this strategy. The 3 positive opinions do not express what goal might be reached by neutral site selection; only 1 negative opinion stresses that school desegregation could not be promoted by this strategy.

In summary, the qualitative literature asserts that several voluntary programs work. Sixty opinions favor voluntary programs and 25 oppose these plans. However, most authors do not evaluate actual voluntary programs; they simply describe or prescribe voluntary desegregation strategies.

The qualitative literature generally does not report the legal status or the number of students involved in these plans. Consequently, a magnet plan that is thought to increase academic achievement may have been ordered by a court or may have been a school board's anticipatory action in response to pending litigation. Whatever the background, most authors report only that students did better in magnet schools. The distinction between voluntary and mandatory programs is blurred in the literature and consequently our analysis suffers from lack of specificity.

Finally, we should note that 12 of the 25 negative opinions about voluntary programs claim this strategy will not end racial isolation, a primary goal of desegregation. State officials and researchers recognize this shortcoming more than persons involved in daily routines of classroom activities. The view from outside the schools warns about majority unwillingness to change the traditional structure of education in the communities. Thus, voluntary programs for desegregation may work best in combination with mandatory student assignments. We now turn to this topic.

Mandatory Student Assignment

Most school desegregation plans that achieve substantial reductions in racial isolation are mandatory; that is, a government agency or a court orders a school district to desegregate. Of course, orders vary in their specificity and content.

Most of the opinion about mandatory student assignment plans is positive. Although few authors are specific about the exact strategies used by school boards to implement desegregation plans, the enrichment procedure we used allows us to learn more about the components of plans for some districts. The positive opinion about redrawing district lines, modifying feeder schools, grade reorganization, and other unspecified mandatory plans follow a general pattern. Approval is based on improved race relations and decreases in racial isolation. For example, an assistant superintendent of schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg believes that busing led to improved race relations in schools and that this influence spread to churches and other organized groups. Busing exposed weaknesses in several school programs and "galvanized the school system and the community to action" as evidenced by increased numbers of volunteers in schools, local discussion groups, and new clubs (Hanes, 1973). Coles (1966) argues that busing allows students to ride together and thus produces a "cohesion" not possible before implementation of mandatory assignment plans. According to Coles, busing has no adverse effect on black children, who were thought to become more friendly with white classmates as the year progressed.

Negative opinion about mandatory plans generally concerns status deprivation. For example, Newby (1980) argues that any mandatory plan is coercive and decreases the status of blacks. Similarly, J. A. Banks (1972) argues that desegregation subjects blacks to a white environment against their

will and that blacks are forced to open their own schools to white students.

Thus, opinion about mandatory programs depends to some extent upon views of desirable race relations. For those who believe mixing of minorities and whites will promote positive attitudes towards an overall integrated community, mandatory strategies are thought to have several virtues. For others, who focus on minority attitudes toward the white majority, mandatory strategies are viewed as an intrusion into the minority community. Perhaps one reason policymakers have difficulty deciding between voluntary or mandatory student assignment plans is the inability of educators to define desirable outcomes.

Magnet schools often are part of mandatory student assignment plans. Both the quantitative and qualitative literatures suggest that magnet schools have been most effective in reducing racial isolation when students have a choice between attending designated desegregated schools and desegregated magnet schools. For example, in Milwaukee, a magnet school attracted minority and white students from all over the city, had increased attendance, improved race relations, and in a small way reduced racial isolation in this predominantly white city (Metz, 1980).

One reason magnet schools are difficult to evaluate is that they often constitute a "showpiece" for school districts. Milwaukee's magnet school, for example, had extra equipment, extra teacher training, and local community support. In New York City, the magnet schools had improved physical facilities and an upgrading of the desegregated school staff and personnel (New York Urban League, 1963). Superior facilities and renovations are judged to be related to several positive outcomes such as better school-community relations and increased levels of student achievement. Thus, one is not sure if positive opinion is based on the effects of magnet schools' resources and

programs or on the effects of magnet schools that relate to desegregation per se. Nevertheless, magnet schools in a mandatory desegregation program are judged positively for their ability to end racial isolation (2), improve race relations (1), and improve academic achievement of minorities (2). The negative comments point out that magnet schools take the best students out of neighborhood schools, making the maintenance of middle or fixed status populations in inner city schools less likely.

Of all the mandatory student assignment plans, metropolitan busing programs have the most widespread support. Metropolitan plans are thought effective in simultaneously attacking the competing problems of racial isolation and white flight. Minorities and whites can be bused to desegregated schools without fear that the plan will cause a great number of whites to flee the school system.

Metropolitan plans are judged positively because they are compatible with almost all of the other strategies discussed in this report. For example, Levine and Levine (1978) argue that voluntary city-suburban programs, magnet schools, district reorganization, and federal incentives for cooperation are all possible under a comprehensive regional approach to desegregation. He points out that a metropolitan program would be easier to administer and presumably less expensive to manage in the long run.

Baltimore is an excellent example of a city with a need for a metropolitan plan (Pietila, 1974). An urban setting with a 70:30 black-white ratio requires a comprehensive plan. Current zoning, housing, and inadequately enforced desegregation laws exclude blacks and poor whites from the best schools. In addition, the expansion of private schools has led to resegregation in several schools. It seems unlikely that this trend will reverse

without a metropolitan effort. Epps (1978) argues:

> It is only through court ordered metropolitan desegregation plans, or state or federally funded proposals to provide financial incentives for voluntary efforts, that cities and suburbs can be brought together for consideration of metropolitan-wide problems.

Positive opinions about metropolitan plans suggest several specific benefits. First, metropolitan plans are thought to equalize busing outside school zones between blacks and whites. In Richmond, Virginia, for example, the metropolitan plan would have bused 36,000 students outside their immediate school zone; roughly 18,000 students were white and 18,000 were black (Mehrige, 1972). Second, metropolitan plans substantially reduce the probability of white flight. As Brett (1977) concludes in her examination of Illinois schools, "It may be very difficult for a district to achieve long-term stability in its racially mixed schools if the district covers only part of a metropolitan area."

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (402 U.S. 1, 1971) prompted scholarly inquiry into metropolitan busing. That decision rendered metropolitan busing an "acceptable tool of educational policy." Although court-ordered metropolitan busing was qualified by Milliken v. Bradley (418 U.S. 717, 1974), educators continued to argue that metropolitan remedies provide the best available solution for past segregation. Indeed the number of such positive opinions in our analysis gradually increased from 5 before 1968, to 6 from 1968 to 1971, and 12 from 1972 to the present.

A final consideration of mandatory student assignment involves the issue of the age levels of students included in desegregation plans. In general, this literature suggests that inclusion of early elementary grades will increase the likelihood that a desegregation plan will end racial isolation (1), improve race relations (1), and improve academic achievement (1). Opponents argue that early desegregation increases white flight and is inherently harmful to

the academic and psychological development of elementary students. This latter reasoning was important in the court orders not to desegregate grades 1 to 3 in Los Angeles (Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, 1980), and appears to be present in litigation involving the desegregation of elementary schools in Nashville, Tennessee. Improving race relations appears to be a function of the age of children in the desegregation plan. In Louisville, for example, segregated elementary schools provided a pattern for social racial isolation. Students who entered the desegregated junior high schools kept a social distance from students of other races (Gordon, 1965). This finding is consistent with the perceptions of administrators, students, teachers, and parents about race relations in 13 school districts in the Southeast (OCR, 1967).

In sum, the qualitative literature generally supports mandatory student assignment plans. Most opinions call for magnet schools in combination with mandatory assignment, metropolitan plans, and plans that include the early elementary grades. The prevailing opinion stresses that mandatory student assignments can end racial isolation (28 positive; 4 negative) and improve race relations (14 positive; 6 negative). The greatest expressed concerns involve white flight in the absence of a metropolitan plan (6 positive; 3 negative) and resegregation (0 positive; 3 negative).

Parent/Community Involvement in the Pre-Implementation Period

General agreement exists in the qualitative literature that parent and community support is an important factor influencing the success of any desegregation plan. One way that such support may be engendered is involving parents and community groups in planning school desegregation. Several early case studies suggest that access of community groups to the decision making process is vital to early public acceptance of desegregation plans (Williams and

Ryan, 1954; Inger and Stout, 1968). In addition, Rogers (1962) contends that citizen participation in planning for desegregation results in greater community commitment to social change.

The most extensive analysis of community participation in school desegregation is Willie and Greenblatt's Community Politics and Educational Change (1981). From their assessment of 10 school systems under court order to desegregate, they conclude:

> In order to make effective use of citizen participation, citizens must be allowed to participate in the planning from the outset. Although much citizen participation in planning is more symbolic than real, it may have a positive effect in avoiding conflict if participation tak place before specific decisions about how to desegregate are made. If citizens feel that they have a mechanism that channels their opinions to school administrators, they are more likely to accept the final plan that emerges. Participation through voluntary organizations that help implement the plan and the establishment of information centers may also result in increased citizen commitment to desegregation. It is especially important that citizen participation be obtained in areas where there is likely to be strong resistance. In this way, officials can co-opt the residents to a value system favoring desegregation prior to the resistance group's efforts in these areas (p. 340).

Several articles in the qualitative literature recommend that multiethnic parent-teacher-student committees be established to involve parents in the planning of school desegregation. This literature asserts that these committees help increase public support by providing groups most directly associated with desegregation the opportunity to influence policy. It further contends that this type of participation in the planning stage helps allay myths and fears of school desegregation.

In St. Louis, an ad hoc parent group had a considerable impact on the formulation of that city's desegregation plan. Ironically, many of the members of this committee had opposed one another in testimony during that district's desegregation litigation. The qualitative literature identifies positive relationships between active multiethnic parent-teacher-student committees and

public support for school desegregation in other Missouri cities (Billington, 1966), South Carolina (Mizell, 1967), and Boston (Leftwich and Blanc, 1977). Overall, the literature records 7 positive and only 3 negative opinions about the formation of this type of committee with respect to engendering public support for desegregation.

Involvement of parents and community groups in planning desegregation is thought to help improve race relations in schools as well as increase general public support of desegregation. In addition to parent-teacher-student groups at the school level, multiethnic community committees are thought to have a positive impact on the success of desegregation plans. Alexander (1975) argues that such community groups are often helpful in improving race relations among students and members of school staffs. Also, Bosma (1977) stresses that the lack of community participation in planning for desegregation is linked to the isolation of minority teachers and the deterioration of race relations in schools. The literature suggests that community involvement in planning and resulting community support for school desegregation are associated to school-related outcomes. Four assessments claim that multiethnic community committees help reduce levels of racial isolation in final desegregation plans and 4 others claim that involvement of this type of committee in planning leads to improved race relations in schools. Eleven other articles express favorable opinions of these committees without specifying particular outcomes.

Communication of complete and accurate information about desegregation and the formulation of desegregation plans is also considered important to foster public support during the pre-implementation stage. One way that this type of information may be disseminated to the public is through the establishment of rumor control centers that are staffed by parents, teachers, students, and members of community groups. The qualitative literature notes that these

centers often lead to the improvement of relations among groups that staff them and serve to cool public response to desegregation during tense periods of both pre-implementation and implementation stages.

School boards often do not realize how their deliberations and policies are communicated to the public. Rumor control centers may serve to clarify and prevent public misinterpretation of school board debates and decisions. Some observers believe that school boards could help improve their images and the images of school systems, as well as facilitate greater public understanding of school desegregation, by providing more and better information to the media. Grant, formerly a columnist for the Detroit Free Press, points to the inability and sometimes unwillingness of the press to report certain aspects of school desegregation issues (1976). He argues that reporters often do not understand the legal, political, and educational intricacies of desegregation plans. The Memphis, Tennessee, city school system reports that complete and accurate media coverage encouraged public acceptance of its desegregation plan (1978). School boards must relate, therefore, to journalists in much the same manner that they relate to other public and private groups in the community. In essence, school boards must attempt to avoid adversarial relationships with the press if they hope to gain coverage to facilitate greater public understanding of and foster greater public support for school desegregation.

Another strategy for community involvement in the pre-implementation stage is the appointment of monitoring commissions. There are two general types of monitoring commissions: court-appointed and district-appointed. Court-appointed commissions tend to be composed of community experts--academics, lawyers, and minority and business leaders--while district-appointed commissions tend to be composed of school leaders--parents, teachers, and school administrators. Most of the qualitative literature on monitoring commissions examine

those appointed by courts. In an analysis of sixteen districts with desegregation monitoring commissions, Hochschild and Hedrick (1980) conclude that these organizations have made an impact on legal, political, educational, and social aspects of school desegregation. For example, the Community Education Council in Denver petitioned the court and obtained hearings on affirmative action, inservice teacher training, and long-range student assignments. These hearings provided a forum in which members of community groups could exert influence on school-related matters. In other cities, such as Dayton, Ohio, monitoring commissions are thought to have influenced the improvement of race relations in schools. This influence was not discovered, however, in every district in the study.

Teacher/Administrative/Staff and Student Readiness

Failure of some desegregation plans is due, at least in part, to inadequate preparation of school personnel. Desegregation presents most educators with new experiences that challenge their professional capabilities and personal values. In general, the qualitative literature urges school districts to provide preparatory programs to help teachers, administrators, other staff members, and students meet these new challenges.

The need for teacher preparedness is recognized in the qualitative literature by Mays (1963). He examined behavioral expectations of white and black teachers and found the "previous experience in a cross-race teaching relationship predicted success for the teacher in the school situation." For those teachers who lack such experience, pre-implementation training is necessary. Wayson (1966) also concludes that pre-implementation and inservice training programs are particularly important to prepare teachers to meet the challenges of inner city schools.

Some experts believe that inservice training can enhance student achievement. For example, Faulk (1972), Superintendent of a Pennsylvania school district, used ESAA funds for an inservice training program for teachers. He reports a three month increase on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for pupils of teachers involved in the training. On the other hand, King, Carney, and Stasz's analysis of 16 school districts in the North, Midwest, and Far West (but excluding the South and Southwest) found that staff development programs "had a greater effect on staff morale, staff competence and intergroup relations than on student attitudes and achievement" (1980). This study suggests that teacher, administrator, staff, and student readiness programs are likely to result in better race relations among the teachers, administrators and staff. In addition, this analysis and results from other qualitative studies indicate that pre- and in-service training of teachers, staff, and students helps reduce racial tension and conflict in desegregated schools.

The only negative opinion about pre-implementation training programs related to academic achievement notes resistance of some teachers to inservice programs that may be time consuming with no assurance of success. In sum, however, 16 assessments of pre-implementation teacher/administrator/staff readiness programs are positive; only 2 are negative. In addition, district size, stage of desegregation, racial composition, or program characteristics seem to make no difference in positive assessments of this strategy (King, 1980:7).

2. Take action to personally contact all parents who fail to attend the initial meeting of students, parents, and teachers.

3. Assess the barriers to communication. Determine what actions might be taken to increase the participation of all parents.

4. Survey the school's parent orgainzations. If any major ethnic group is underrepresented, take positive action to enlist additional representatives.

5. When barriers exist to prevent home-school interaction, take the initiative in eliminating the barriers.

6. Investigate ways of making school facilities useful in meeting the special problems of working parents.

7. When there are parent (or community) concerns about the equity of school policies or practices, form a multi-ethnic advisory group of parents to help establish policy.

The qualitative literature contains 60 positive opinions and only 2 negative opinions about parent and community involvement strategies for the post-implementation stage. The positive opinions relate this involvement to improved race relations and higher academic achievement among minorities. Those writing about specific outcomes tend to be superintendents (4) and principals (3), suggesting, perhaps, a sensitivity of administrators to the potential of this type of strategy for dealing with problems of school desegregation. It is also worth noting that not a single teacher or teachers' representative (excluding college professors) wrote about the parent-community involvement strategy. This may suggest that the trade-off between community control and teacher control is an important issue that has been overlooked in the quantitative research on desegregation.

Post-Implementation Parent and Community Involvement in School Affairs

Parent and community involvement is considered important in the post-implementation period. Participation is one way that parents can ensure a smooth transition from old operating procedures of the school system to the new procedures of a desegregated school system. The qualitative literature suggests that by becoming involved in this stage, parents, students, and educators may influence the implementation of desegregation policies to ensure a responsive school system.

Strategies for community involvement at this stage are numerous. Multi-ethnic in-school parent-teacher committees are important forums for participation. These committees may also be an excellent way to provide counseling and to handle grievances to solve school-related problems such as "push outs" and racially motivated suspension. For example, evidence from assessment of Missouri school systems shows that discriminatory discipline procedures were frequently used by school administrators (Monti, 1979). A multi-ethnic parent-teacher grievance panel was thought to be an effective way to handle this type of problem. Similarly, parent-student-teacher intervention teams might have helped combat this problem.

Forehand and Ragosta (1976) outline several techniques to improve home-school communication and cooperation and to alleviate home-school confrontation in desegregated districts. All these recommendations are applicable to the post-implementation period:

1. Before schools open, devise a plan for home and school communication. An effective plan should allow for initial contact between teachers and parents early in the school year to be followed by two or more programs for home-school communication during the year.

Administrator/Teacher/Staff Training to Upgrade Skills and Capabilities

Agreement exists in the qualitative literature that upgrading teacher skills and improving interpersonal relations will help facilitate successful implementation of desegregation plans. For example, Goldin (1970) describes a range of experiences and programs to sensitize teachers to problems and needs in desegregated classrooms. These programs emphasize training teachers in racial awareness. Hawkins (1976) reports that a three day seminar for teachers in Louisville, Kentucky, helped increase their sensitivity to problems such as language forms, sexual aggression, and discipline. Written evaluations of this program by participants were generally favorable. These kinds of programs have been judged favorably in the qualitative literature, especially for improving race relations.

According to this literature, training of staff and teachers should cover a variety of subjects. For example, teachers need to learn instructional techniques that accommodate wide variations in student abilities.

Another topic for training is faculty supervision of students. One particularly sensitive problem in inner city schools is the adversarial relationship that may exist between teachers and pupils (Ornstein, 1967). Teachers sometimes become "inspectors" rather than "instructors" because they are rewarded for "mediocrity without trouble." According to the literature, this incentive system can be changed through teacher training and responsible administration.

Teacher training programs are often eligible for extra federal and/or state funds. In Los Angeles, for example, a teacher exchange and training program, called Area Program of Enrichment Exchange, was funded by Title III ESEA funds. The program includes the exchange and training of teachers in five area high schools (Gregg, 1968).

Another important element of teacher staff training is to match the staff skills with the needs of the students. School officials, staff, and teachers receiving training must also devise administrative policies that facilitate the implementation of strategies imparted through training. For example, students must be placed according to special curricular needs, and officials must make the placement in non-discriminatory ways.

A general theme of the qualitative literature is that desegregated schools should facilitate a "cooperative integrated learning experience." Some experts suggest "team learning" and "cooperative learning" approaches to classroom instruction. In addition, there is general agreement that teacher and student relationships must involve self-awareness, empathy, and sensitivity. Human relations programs and sensitivity training are suggested as effective ways to promote this goal.

The qualitative literature on teacher training is uniformly positive. Few authors claim that training is directly related to improvements in student achievement (3 such claims were made about cooperative learning approaches), but most assert that training helps improve interpersonal relations.

In sum, 58 articles stress a need for teacher training in the post-implementation period. Of these articles, 19 report that such programs could help end racial isolation and 19 report that these programs are effective in improving race relations. The most serious negative opinion warned of adverse public response that sometimes results from training about controversial issues. Overall, however, the qualitative literature supports upgrading teacher and staff skills and sensitivity.

Curricula and Instructional Programs

As mentioned several times throughout this report, a good educational system is often viewed as the best strategy for desegregation. The qualitative literature reflects a concern for educational quality as well as equity in desegregated schools. For a number of observers, enriching or improving curricula throughout a school system is an important way to bring about effective desegregation.

This literature identifies class size as a particularly important variable in promoting educational quality. Reducing class size is thought to help the implementation of a greater variety of teaching techniques, including small group and individualized instruction. These instructional strategies are difficult to implement in large classes.

Another concern addressed in the qualitative literature is alternatives to structured classroom environments. Compensatory education and tutorials for low achieving students, adult volunteer teacher aides, peer advising, cooperative instruction, and non-graded instruction are some alternatives discussed. Many of these techniques, especially compensatory education, are thought to improve academic achievement among minorities.

One third (23 of 79) of the positive opinion about instructional and curricular changes note improvement in academic achievement. Some of these changes are also thought to improve race relations. Some observers (3) are concerned that curricular reform that focuses on low achieving students can accelerate white flight. Although the quantitative literature suggests that desegregation does not lower the achievement of white students, many parents are thought to believe that non-grading or cooperative instruction is not beneficial to their children. Concern is expressed that if schools adopt certain instructional or curricular reforms, parents may either enroll their children in private schools or move to another school district.

Human Relations

Many of the strategies thought to promote effective desegregation involve efforts to improve relations among teachers, administrators, other staff members, and students. Adoption and implementation of these types of strategies often depend on whether teachers and administrators perceive actual or potential problems in human or interpersonal relations. Winecoff and Kelly (1971) argue that educators may believe that all is well in a desegregated school simply because there is an absence of visible trouble. That perception may be inaccurate, Winecoff and Kelly contend, because educators may fail to perceive or may be insensitive to the subtle dynamics of human and interpersonal relations.

The qualitative literature is generally favorable of a number of strategies designed to heighten educator sensitivity to human relations problems and to help them to avoid or correct such problems in schools. For example, biracial discussion groups established to examine problems of desegregation from students' perspectives are thought to have improved student race relations in one desegregated high school (Gaughan, 1965). Other studies of similar programs suggest that these discussion groups may be more helpful for minority girls than for minority boys (Boney, Dunn, and Bass, 1971), especially if they are directed by trained counselors or professional mental health personnel (Nash, 1968). In addition, these programs are thought to increase levels of biracial friendship in desegregated schools. For example, Bullock and Stewart (1977) argue that students who participate in these discussion groups become more tolerant of students of other races and that this increased level of tolerance fosters biracial friendships. They further contend that students who did not participate in these groups did not seek biracial friendships as actively as did students who did participate in the programs.

Forehand and Ragosta (1976) strongly endorse activities to promote better human and interpersonal relations among faculty, administrators and other

members of school staffs. They argue that the quality of race relations among school personnel often determines the interpersonal climate of an entire school. In other words, race relations among students is often determined by relations among faculty, administrators, and staff members. Forehand and Ragosta (1976) recommend training and other activities designed to improve relations among educators as well as programs designed to improve race relations among students. These activities include sensitivity training, lectures and discussions of human and interpersonal relations problems and strategies for their solution, and staff-conducted activities for both educators and students.

Ability grouping and tracking often effect human and interpersonal relations in schools. Limiting the diversity of student achievement levels in any given classroom is attractive to many teachers. However, grouping or tracking by academic ability or achievement may result in racially identifiable separation of students that perpetuates the disadvantaged status of minorities in schools. Brodbelt (1972) and Arnez (1978) stress this point. If minorities are disproportionately assigned to lower tracked classes, they may continue to be stigmatized not only by race but by achievement level and social relationships. In essence, placement of students in classes and curricula by ability or achievement that results in distinguishable separation of races in schools may have a negative impact on efforts to improve race relations among students.

As with the quantitative literature, the qualitative literature expresses mixed opinions on tracking and ability grouping. Hansen (1963) defends tracking by indicating that in high schools that group students by ability, retention rates of minorities increased from 48% to 65% over a five year period. He asserts that the overall effect of tracking is beneficial because schools can not help minority students who drop out or are "pushed out" by unresponsive teachers or curricula.

In general, however, the qualitative literature does not support Hansen's argument. Twenty-two articles express negative opinions about tracking and ability grouping whereas only 1 supports these placement strategies. The greatest concern among opponents to grouping and tracking is that these systems of placement lead to resegregation in schools. In addition, opponents argue tracking does not result in increased academic achievement of minority students and that it retards the improvement of race relations by identifying minorities with a separate, usually academically inferior, curriculum and by perpetuating racial stereotypes. Green (1973) believes that tracking and grouping by ability reinforce years of discriminatory treatment of minorities in schools by locking them in classroom situations in which stigmas are the same or worse than before desegregation.

Biased disciplinary actions also effect improvement of race relations in schools. The qualitative literature identifies disproportionate rates of minority school suspensions in Boston (Miller, 1975), Lousiville (Arnez, 1976), San Francisco, and Mobile, Alabama (Wright, 1973). These rates are perceived as evidence of continued discrimination against minority students. Whether bias is a factor that contributes to disproportionate suspension rates is just as important an issue in improving race relations in schools as is the perception of both minority and white students that they are being and will be treated fairly and equitably when disciplined. The qualitative literature stresses not only that disciplinary actions be taken in an unbiased manner but that schools should adopt disciplinary codes that provide the same standards of due process for all students. Unless students of all races believe that they will be treated fairly and equitably, it will be difficult to make any long-term gains in improving race relations among students, teachers, and administrators.

Another strategy for improving race relations in schools is the desegregation of extracurricular activities. Winecoff and Kelly (1971) argue that extracurricular activities often remain segregated after schools have become desegregated. School administrators and teachers may be insensitive to this problem because they focus attention on classroom activities. In general, the qualitative literature asserts that extracurricular activities receive little attention unless problems erupt. However, these activities may become a means to improve race relations among students if white and minority students learn to interact outside the classroom.

School and Classroom Management

Maintaining order in schools has become a growing issue for educators in recent years. Disciplinary and classroom management strategies that consider the rights of students as well as means to avoid and punish disruptive behavior are much discussed in the qualitative literature.

Nobiit and Collins (1978) argue that school administrators should negotiate with students in applying disciplinary codes. They state that "negotiation" within strict administration of discipline can be effective for ending disruptions. Drewry (1955) contends that the key to fair discipline is to allow the widest possible participation of all groups in drawing up codes. These groups include teachers and students. In this way, he argues, the cultural patterns of all groups will be reflected in the administration of disciplinary action. In addition to writing fair codes of discipline, the literature stresses that staff and personnel responsible for administering disciplinary action receive training in discipline techniques. Teacher aides, and security aides where necessary, may be employed to make schools safe.

While there is general agreement that schools cannot carry out their missions without order, this literature is not very useful in suggesting specific

classroom or school-wide management strategies. For example, we found no articles that describe or evaluate intervention teams, and we found 1 article that describes and evaluates the impact of employing teacher aides, security officers, or other personnel to maintain order in schools (Higgins, 1974). Furthermore, most of the discussion about classroom management is descriptive of problems or consists of normative assessments about the inequalities and injustices of current types of management systems.

An informative analysis of classroom management systems and authority structures is Metz's Classrooms and Corridors (1978). His study describes the tension students experience between learning acceptable patterns of behavior on their own and being forced to conform to those patterns without understanding their purpose or value. Metz argues, however, that "without undue regimentation or harsh methods, the school can establish order...through the institutionalization of innocence." Of course, problems arise with respect of this recommendation when students arrive questioning or doubting the value of behavioral standards or schooling itself.

In general, the qualitative literature stresses the need for school and classroom management systems. Not surprisingly the topic is addressed more frequently by school administrators than academic researchers and has received attention throughout the period covered by the literature.

Teacher/Administrator Assignments

The qualitative literature contends that students require role models and that desegregation at the faculty and staff level is the best way to provide role models for minority students (e.g., Haney, 1978).

As noted by Ethridge (1968), the success of desegregation may be judged according to reducing racial isolation among members of school staffs as well as among students. This idea is based on an argument that when minority students

sit next to white students and are taught by minority teachers as well as white teachers, their pride and self-esteem are enhanced. In addition, some authors argue that assignment of at least 10% minority teachers to predominantly white schools is important in producing an integrated society.

The discussion of staff assignments in the qualitative literature is generally associated with improving race relations. Nine articles contend that desegregating school staffs can improve race relations. In addition, others claim that changing staff assignments could help improve public response to school desegregation.

Hispanics and Desegregation

As noted in the introduction to this review, we decided to give separate attention to the literature dealing with Hispanics and desegregation. We reviewed 15 items which include magazine articles, legal reviews, court documents, and conference reports. Some of this literature examines more than one desegregation strategy or outcome (e.g., NIE, 1977). We identified a number of other items that are unpublished or were otherwise unavailable to us in time to include in this analysis. These items are included in the reference section of the report.

The problems faced by Hispanics in desegregation are often considered different from those faced by blacks. Even within the Hispanic community, different Hispanic groups face different problems. The literature focuses primarily on desegregation strategies linked to bilingual and bicultural programs. Bilingual programs that emphasize instruction in primary languages are supported as a successful strategy to improve the academic achievement of Hispanic students. Although Hispanics generally support desegregation theoretically, they sometimes believe that special bilingual programs may be jeopardized if Hispanics are dispersed under desegregation plans. Indeed, in many instances, successful

bilingual programs have been terminated because desegregation plans involving mandatory student assignment scatter Hispanic children among predominantly white or predominantly black schools in which no bilingual programs exist or will be implemented. This problem is exacerbated by the limited number of teachers who are qualified to teach bilingual classes or who are bilingual themselves.

Desegregation and bilingual education are not incompatible in theory. It is possible to institute bilingual programs in schools where Hispanics comprise a small minority of the student population. Implementation of new bilingual programs or the preservation of existing programs in desegregated schools may raise serious problems. While bilingual programs are thought to increase the academic achievement of Hispanics and promote better relations among all students by teaching Hispanics English, such programs also tend to resegregate Hispanics within schools. Bilingual classes that only enroll Hispanics tend to separate them from other students. Resegregation within schools, due to language differences, is identified by Valverde (1977). Yet, even if Hispanics are enrolled in desegregated classes that do not depend on the use of spoken and written English (e.g., music, physical education), their separation in bilingual classes often sets them apart from the other students, which, in turn, often leads to social and greater racial separation. If bilingual classes were desegregated, an argument may be raised that black and white students may be hurt academically by the Spanish (and other) language emphasis. In short, there appears to be some agreement that the strategy that seems to work best for increasing the academic achievement of Hispanic students appears, at least as desegregation plans are normally implemented, to undermine avoiding resegregation within schools and promoting interracial, intercultural interaction.

The literature stresses that successful desegregation of Hispanic students depends on the extent to which parents and other members of the Hispanic commu-

nity support and participate in planning and implementing desegregation and academic programs for their children. The literature also notes that the presence of bilingual programs encourages acceptance of desegregation plans in communities with large Hispanic populations. Teacher and staff training is also emphasized so that teachers may better understand Hispanic students and their culture and language, prepare and implement successful instructional strategies, and deal with desegregated classrooms.

A final issue raised, but left unresolved, about the desegregation of Hispanic students is whether they are classified as white, black or Hispanic. Depending on the school system, the location of predominantly Hispanic schools, and the determination of classification, Hispanic students may be treated as members of the majority or minority racial population and dispersed accordingly. The determination of racial classification may in turn determine whether existing instructional programs, local community control of school activities are continued or discontinued.

In summary, the few pieces of qualitative literature dealing primarily with the desegregation of Hispanic students raise issues of importance but provide little guidance to ways that questions posed can be answered. Moreover, this literature is dominated by a concern for dealing with the language needs of Hispanic students. Other issues, such as the ways whites, blacks and Hispanics view each other and the factors that affect these views, are not dealt with in more than a passing way. Similarly, whether different cultural patterns--such as the role of family or peer interaction norms--relate to desegregation strategies receives little attention.

We recognize that we need to intensify our search for commentary and evidence on the similarities and differences between the desegregation-related needs of blacks and Hispanics. As noted in the introduction of this report, several efforts in this respect are underway.

Conclusion: Words of Caution

The qualitative literature provides an abundant source of information about and perceptions of strategies for school desegregation. By analyzing the reviews, observations, interpretations, and opinions of knowledgeable people, we can better understand the effectiveness, or at least the perceived effectiveness, of different strategies. This analysis is one of the first attempts to organize the qualitative literature for this purpose.

There are, however, many limitations to these data and our preliminary analysis of them. Two reservations, in particular, warrant mention here. First, many opinions expressed in the literature are "guesstimates" about what has happened or what will happen, and some are more wishful than predictive. Sometimes it is not clear which of these types of opinions are made.

Conclusions one might reach after examining this literature should be viewed as hypotheses or propositions for further analysis. While the authors of this literature are knowledgeable, and some employ systematic analysis of observations (e.g., the ethnographic work by sociologists and anthropologists), by and large this literature does not constitute research in a strict sense.

A second, and related, reservation about the qualitative literature is that it is based on perceptions, not on measurable observations. Conceptually, most of the literature is viewed best as interviews and should be treated as such. That is, it tells us how people of different backgrounds, in different contexts, view events. Most of the authors of the qualitative literature bring to their observations especially well-developed perspectives on school desegregation. The fact that many of the authors have vested interests in some perspectives over others should also cause the reader to have reservations about the opinions expressed in this qualitative literature. Of course, scientific analysis is also subject to the intrusion of values and previous

conceptions of reality, but the qualitative literature is thoroughly and inextricably embedded in such predispositions.

Nevertheless, we conclude that the qualitative literature is an important source of information about school desegregation. Informed opinion is one of many sources available to evaluate public policy and identify further needs. In this sense, the qualitative literature provides valuable information for decision makers who are responsible for desegregation policies. Further analysis of these data, along the lines suggested in the introduction to this section, should help clarify the meaning of this literature and its utility in understanding the effectiveness of alternative desegregation strategies.

References

Alexander, K. Is Boston burning? The Crisis, 1975, 82, 90-92.

Arnez, N. L. Desegregation of public schools: A discriminatory process. Journal of Afro-American Issues, 1976, 4(1), 274-282.

Arnez, N. L. Implementation of desegregation as a discriminatory process. Journal of Negro Education, 1978, 47(1), 28-45.

Banks, J. A. The destruction of black schools: An American tragedy. Educational Leadership, 1972, 30(3), 269-271.

Billington, Public school integration in Missouri, 1954-1965. Journal of Negro Education, 1966, 35, 1556-1606.

Boney, J. D., Dunn, C., & Bass, T. An analysis of the participation of racially integrated guidance groups of culturally different children in elementary schools. Journal of Negro Education, 1971, 40, 390-393.

Bosma, B. The role of teachers in school desegregation. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(6), 106-111.

Brett, D. Stability of racial mix in Illinois' integrated schools. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(2), 3-8.

Brodbelt, S. Disguised racism in public schools. Educational Leadership, 1972, 29(8), 699-702.

Bullock, C. S., III, & Stewart, J., Jr. Perceived parental and student racial attitudes. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(6), 120-122.

Coles, R. When northern schools desegregate. Integrated Education, 1966, 4(1), 9-11.

Crain, R. L., & Mahard, R. Desegregation and black achievement: A review of the research. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42(3), 17-56.

Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles (Case No. 822 854, 1980).

Drewry, G. N. The principal faces desegregation. Educational Leadership, 1955, 13(1), 14-17.

Epps, E. G. City and suburbs: Perspectives on interdistrict desegregation efforts. The Urban Review, 1978, 10(2), 82-89.

Ethridge, S. B. Court decisions: Impact on staff balance. Educational Leadership, 1960, 26(3), 235-239.

Faulk, H. R. Desegregation in McKeesport. Integrated Education, 1972, 10(1), 35-38.

Forehand, G. A., & Ragosta, M. A handbook for integrated schooling. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Gaughan, B. Bi-racial discussion group in a high school. Integrated Education, 1965, 3(4), 14-16.

Goldin, P. C. A model for racial awareness training of teachers in integrated schools. Integrated Education, 1970, 8(1), 62-64.

Gordon, L. The Carver-Oak-Park merger. Integrated Education, 1965, 3(3), 45-51.

Grant, W. R. The media and school desegregation. Integrated Education, 1976, 14(6), 12-14.

Green, R. L. Educational leadership and multiracial schools. July 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 951)

Gregg, J. Apex: Quality integrated classes in Los Angeles high schools. Integrated Education, 1968, 6(6), 19-23.

Hanes, R. C. Busing? If it can work here. . . . Educational Leadership, 1973, 30(4), 305-306.

Haney, J. E. The effect of the Brown decision on black educators. Journal of Negro Education, 1978, 47, 88-95.

Hansen, C. F. A defense of the track system. Integrated Education, 1963, 2(3), 48-49.

Havighurst, R. J., & Levine, D. U. Education in metropolitan areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Hawkins, G. M. Woerner '75: What? Why? How? The story of a Louisville school. Integrated Education, 1976, 14(4), 16-18.

Hawley, W. D. Getting the facts straight about the effects of school desegregation. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36(5), 314-321.

Hochschild, J., & Hedrick, V. The character and effectiveness of citizen monitoring groups in implementing civil rights in public schools. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education and the Office for Civil Rights, 1980.

Inger, M., & Stout, T. School desegregation: The need to govern. Urban Review, 1968, 3, 35-38.

Jones v. Mayer (392 U.S. 409, 1968).

King, N., Carney, M., & Stasz, C. Staff development programs in desegregated settings. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, February 1980.

twich, C. W., & Blanc, D. New roles for parents in desegregating schools. Integrated Education, 1977, 15(1), 40-42.

ine, D. U., & Levine, R. F. The social and instructional setting for metropolitan integration. The Urban Review, 1978, 10(2), 157-183.

s, N. Behavioral expectations of Negro and white teachers in recently desegregated public school facilities. Journal of Negro Education, 1963, 22, 218-226.

onahay, J. B. The effects of school desegregation upon students racial attitudes and behavior: A critical review of the literature and a prolegomenon to future research. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42(3), 77-107.

rige, R. R. The Richmond school decision. Integrated Education, 1972, 10(2), 51-63.

phis City Schools. Parent and student responsibility and school accountability. Memphis, Tenn.: Memphis City Schools, 1978.

, M. H. Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1978.

, M. H. Questioning the centipede: Sources of climate in a magnet school. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

er, J. D. Student suspensions in Boston: Derailing desegregation. Inequality in Education, 1975, No. 20, pp. 16-24.

iken v. Bradley (418 U.S. 717, 1974).

ll, M. H. School desegregation in South Carolina. Integrated Education, 967, 4(6), 30-50.

, D. J. Governmental abandonment of desegregation in Missouri. Integrated ducation, 1979, 15(1&2), 2-8.

K. B. Mental health in the desegregated school. Integrated Education, 68, 5(6), 28-36.

nal Institute of Education. Desegregation and education concerns of the spanic community (Conference Report, Department of Health, Education and lfare). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1977.

ork Urban League. A decade of New York change. Integrated Education, 63, 2(2), 34-38.

, R. G. Segregation, desegregation and racial balance: Toward conceptual clarity and the status implications of these concepts for Afro-Americans. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Noblit, G. W., & Collins, T. W. Order and disruption in a desegregated high school. Crime and Delinquency, 1978, 24(3), 277-289.

Orfield, G. If wishes were houses then busing could stop: Demographic trends and desegregation policy. The Urban Review, 1978, 10(2), 108-121.

Ornstein, A. C. What is it really like for most slum school teachers. Integrated Education, 1967, 5(5), 48-53.

Pietila, A. Baltimore desegregation: Tug of war. Integrated Education, 1974, 12(5), 17-19.

Rogers, E. Diffusion of innovation. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Rossell, C. H. Assessing the unintended impacts of public policy: School desegregation and resegregation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Board of Education (402 U.S. 1, 1971).

Taeuber, K. E., & Wilson, F. D. Analysis of trends in school segregation. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, Institute for Research on Poverty, October 1979.

U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Racial isolation in the public schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Valverde, L. A. A multicultural education: Social and educational justice. Educational Leadership, 1977, 35, 196-202.

Wayson, W. W. Securing teachers for slum schools. Integrated Education, 1966, 4(1), 31-38.

Williams, R., & Ryan, M. Schools in transition. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Willie, C. V., & Greenblatt, S. Community politics and educational change: Ten school systems under court order. New York: Longman, 1981.

Winecoff, H. L., & Kelly, E. Problems in school desegregation: Real or imaginary? Integrated Education, 1971, 9(1), 3-10.

Wright, L. The new word is PUSHOUT. Race Relations Reporter, 1973, 4(9), 8-13.

Yudof, M. G. School desegregation: Legal realism, reasoned elaboration, and social science research in the Supreme Court. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42(4), 57-110.

ADDENDUM

CODEBOOK--QUALITATIVE LITERATURE

Strategies and Outcomes of Desegregation

Variable	Name	Location
V1	Article Identification	1-4

(Author's last name begins with the following codes)

A	0001-0100	N	1301-1400
B	0101-0200	O	1401-1500
C	0201-0300	P	1501-1600
D	0301-0400	Q	1601-1700
E	0401-0500	R	1701-1800
F	0501-0600	S	1801-1900
G	0601-0700	T	1901-2000
H	0701-0800	U	2001-2100
I	0801-0900	V	2101-2200
J	0901-1000	W	2201-2300
K	1001-1100	X	2301-2400
L	1101-1200	Y	2401-2500
M	1201-1300	Z	2501-2600

V2	Card Number	5
V3	Journal of Publication	6-7

01 Black Scholar
02 Crisis
03 Education Leadership
04 Harvard Education Review
05 Integrated Education
06 Journal of Afro-Am Issues
07 Journal of Negro Education
08 Negro Education Review
09 Phylon
11 Urban Review
12 Law and Contemporary Problems
13 Southern Exposure

70 Conference
80 Government Publication

Variable	Name	Location
	90 Book 91 Article in a book	
V4	Date of Publication (Year of publication, e.g., 1954 coded 54)	8-9
V5	Strategy	10-11

00. Voluntary Student Assignment - General
    - 01. Open Enrollment
    - 02. Optional School Zones
    - 03. Majority to Minority Pupil Transfers
    - 04. Magnet Schools and Special Programs
    - 05. Metropolitan Cooperation
    - 06. Housing Policies (e.g. open housing, scattered site housing)
    - 07. Site Selection and Construction Policies to Emphasize Racially Neutral Areas

10. Mandatory Student Assignment* - General
    - 11. Redrawing Zone Lines
    - 12. Pairing and Grouping Schools/ Closing Schools
    - 13. Modified Feeder Patterns
    - 14. Skip Zoning
    - 15. Grade Reorganization
    - 16. Renovations in Schools Receiving Bussed Students
    - 17. Magnet Schools as Part of a Mandatory Plan
    - 18. Interdistrict/Metropolitan Plans
    - 19. Implement Desegregation Plans in Early Years (K & pre-K, 1-6)

*Most of the Strategies of this type could also be used in voluntary plans; typically, they are not.

20. Community/Parent Information Techniques-General — Pre Implementation
    - 21. Establishing Multiethnic Parent-Teacher-Student Committees to Plan Desegregation Process
    - 22. Establishing Broad Based Multiethnic School and Community Committees to Plan Desegregation Process
    - 23. Information and Rumor Control Centers
    - 24. Parent Field Trips
    - 25. Provide Positive Feedback to the Media About the Process of School Desegregation

Variable	Name	Location
V5 (continued)	Strategy (continued) 26. Court Appointed Monitoring Commission 27. District Appointed Monitoring Commission	10-11
	30. Teacher/Administrator/Staff & Student Readiness - General 31. Train Teachers/Staff Prior to Implementation of Desegregation Concerning What to Expect 32. Plan and Establish Student/New School Contact Prior to Implementation of Desegregation 33. Planned Faculty Exchange and Faculty Field Trips Before and After Implementing School Desegregation Plan	Pre Implementatio
	40. Parent and Community Involvement in School Affairs - General 41. Establishing Multiethnic In-School Parent-Teacher Committees to Serve as Resource Specialists (minority parents in particular) 42. Establishing Multiethnic In-School Parent-Teacher Committees to Provide Counseling to and Handle Grievances of Parents, Teachers, and Students 43. Intervention Teams Composed of Parent-Teachers-Students 44. Parent Involvement in School Activities/Parent-Staff, Faculty Social Activities 45. Increased and Improved School-Home Contacts 46. Provide the Use of the School for Community Meetings, Gatherings and Activities	Post Implementation
	50. Administrator/Teacher/Staff Training to Upgrade Skills and Capacities General 51. Upgrading Teacher Skills in Instruction 52. Staff and Teachers Receive Training in Classroom Teaching Strategies to Accommodate Wide Variations in Student Ability 53. Improve Faculty Supervision and Evaluation (Upgrade leadership skills of principals)	Post Implementation (People)

Variable	Name	Location
V5 (continued)	Strategy (Continued)	10-11

54. Staff, Teacher Training in Human Relations
55. Staff and Teachers Receive Training in Teaching Strategies that Facilitate Cooperative Integrated Learning Experiences
56. Obtain State Education Agency Assistance and Support for Training Programs for Administrators and Teachers
57. Teacher Training and Self Awareness, Empathy and Sensitivity
58. Training of Non Academic Staff
59. School Officials, Staff and Teachers Receive Training in and Develop Explicit Policies for Identifying and Placing Students in Special Curriculum in Ways That are Nondiscriminatory

60. Programs Related to Educational Achievement - General
    61. Enriched or Improved Curricula Throughout the System
    62. Reduced Class Sizes
    63. Implementing Multiethnic Curriculum
    64. Bilingual Programs with English Language Emphasis
    65. Establishing Bilingual Program in School Emphasizing Bicultural Matters/Instruction in Primary Language and English
    66. Compensatory Classes for Low Achieving Students
    67. Tutorials for Low Achieving Students (e.g. peers, and adult volunteers teacher aides)
    68. Providing Cooperative Instruction
    69. Non-Graded/Alternative Grading Instructional Format

70. Programs Related to Human Relations - General
    71. Employ Teacher Aides/ Reduce Student Instructor Ratio

Variable	Name	Location
V5 (continued)	Strategy (continued)	10-11
	72. Policies to Prevent Disproportionate Minority Suspensions/Expulsions (e.g. explicit discipline code with due process provisions)	
	73. Tracking	
	74. Ability Grouping	
	75. Staff, Parents, Teachers, Students Plan, Develop and Support Extra-Curricular Activities to Assure Multiethnic Representation and Participation	
	76. Special Extracurricular and Non-Academic Programs	
	80. School and Classroom Management - General	
	81. Maintaining Order (minimizing disruption)	
	82. Staff, Teachers Receive Training in Classroom Discipline Techniques	
	83. Intervention Teams Composed of Teachers-Students-Staff	
	84. Employ Teacher Aides and Security	
	85. Increase Student/Teacher Contact	
	90. Teacher/Administrator Assignments - General	
	91. Voluntary Intradistrict Faculty Transfers	
	92. Staff and Faculty Reassignment to Achieve Racial Balance	
	93. Affirmative Action Hiring Policies to Create Multiethnic/Racially Balanced Staff and Faculty	
	98. General - Unspecified	
	99. MD	
V6	0. Outcome - General Desegregation	12
	1. End Racial Isolation, Racial Balance	
	2. Improve Race Relations Attitudes, Intergroup behavior, Among Students, Integration	
	3. Improve Academic Achievement	
	4. Improve Public Response, Accept, Support, Attitude	

Variable	Name	Location
V6 (continued)	Outcome - General Desegregation (continued)	12
	5. Avoid Resegregation Across Schools - White Flight	
	6. Avoid Resegregation within Schools	
	8. Other - Self Esteem, Justice etc.	
	9. Unspecified	
V7	Opinion of Author	13
	1. Positive Relationship	
	2. Neutral	
	3. Negative Relationship	
	8. Unclear	
	9. NA (Either a Strategy or an Outcome Not Specified)	
V8	Data Base	14
	1. Opinion, Review, etc. Soft Literature	
	2. Research Report Supported by Quantified Data	
	9. NA	
V9	Biographical Information	15-16
	Position of Author at Time of Writing	
	01 Superintendent	
	02 Principal	
	03 Teacher	
	04 Student	
	11 Consultant	
	12 Academic-College	
	31 Bureaucrat-State	
	32 Bureaucrat-Federal	
	41 State Legislator	
	99 NA	

Variable	Name	Location
V10	Date of Study (1968 coded '68') 99 NA	17-18
V11	School District-State OE Code	19-25
V12	Type of District 1. Within SMSA 2. Not in SMSA 9. NA	26
V13	Reason for Plan 1. Federal Court Order 2. State Court Order 3. Required by DHEW/USOE 4. Required by State Agency 5. Board-Ordered/Self Initiated 8. Other 9. NA	27
V14	Year of Court Order (1968 Coded '68') 99 NA	28-29
V15	Enrollment of School District Number of Students Coded 9999999 NA	30-36
V16	Number of Schools 000 NA	37-39
V17	Percent Black in District 99 NA	40-41
V18	Percent Minority in District 99 NA	42-43
V19	Percent Change in Blacks the Year After Court Order 99 NA	44-45

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE "CONSENSUS" LITERATURE: STUDIES SUMMARIZING THE PERSPECTIVES OF DESEGREGATION EXPERTS AND PRACTITIONERS

William T. Trent

Introduction

Within the body of school desegregation literature, there are several sources that focus on the views of participants in the desegregation process (parents, students, and involved members of school communities). We have chosen to focus on four reports which we have labeled "consensus" studies because they identify strategies about which there is significant agreement among surveyed respondents. Before discussing the specific findings of these studies, a brief description of the four reports will help point out differences in the data bases and the methodological approaches used in each.

Smith, Downs, and Lachman (1979) recommend a prototype for effectively desegregated schools based on survey data gathered under contract with the U.S. Office of Education for the Cabinet Committee on Education. The report includes working definitions of effective desegregation as well as principles for the timing and implementation of desegregation techniques. The authors distinguish five core areas of intervention in the efforts to successfully desegregate school systems:

1. Administration
2. Teaching
3. Community relations
4. Student needs
5. Curriculum planning.

Although the authors have used a "problem-policy" approach to school desegregation issues in each case of these intervention areas, we have interpolated a variety of techniques which may effect desegregation-related outcomes.

A report by Forehand and Ragosta (1976) offers recommendations based on data gathered from a study of over 200 schools. These data were collected from tests, questionnaires, and interviews and represent a variety of geographic and economic conditions, population mixes, and social histories. The study concentrates on two objectives--enhanced academic achievement and improved race relations.

In their discussion of academic achievement, Forehand and Ragosta identify several broad areas of concern. First, because of disparities in the preparation and performance levels of minority and majority children, desegregation often necessitates changes in teaching methods and practices. However, events in the desegregation process, especially at the point of initial implementation, may mitigate against optimum academic growth. In addition, they argue that the existence of real racial discrimination is a constant threat to the success of desegregation.

According to the authors, the improvement of race relations in desegregated settings hinges primarily on students' attitudes toward schoolmates of other races and their perceptions of the racial climate of schools themselves. Meaningful interracial contact in schools is a critical component of positive race relations.

The report treats desegregation issues in elementary and secondary schools separately. Both the elementary and high school diagnostic questions used in the research are included in the report. Note that the recommendations made in this handbook are based on a previous, more

detailed, and empirically based analysis (Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, 1976). That study is incorporated in our review of the quantitative literature.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report (1976) presents information collected during Commission Hearings and four State Advisory Committee Open Meetings, from a mail survey of respondents in 1,292 school districts, and from 900 in-depth interviews in 29 school districts across the United States. This report contains a discussion of initiatives taken by the Commission, a summary and analysis of 29 desegregated school districts, and a discussion of the data from the national survey. The present summary focuses on the chapter of the report which examines concerns related to the process of school desegregation and to within-school experiences resulting from desegregation. The chapter identifies problems and treatment techniques, and suggests specific positive strategies for desegregation.

Murphy (1980) reports the results of a mailed survey of superintendents in 132 school districts in six southwestern states: 11 in Arkansas, 18 in Louisiana, 10 in Mississippi, 11 in New Mexico, 7 in Oklahoma, and 65 in Texas. The aggregate total represents 63% of all school districts in this six state area. The instrument combined both open and closed response items to which one superintendent in each district responded. The author identified some 90 strategies categorized by eight desegregation goal areas:

1. Student and/or faculty racial balancing
2. Promoting community involvement
3. Crisis prevention and resolution
4. Multicultural/multiethnic curriculum
5. Compensatory education

6. Positive race relations

7. Staff development

8. Administrative procedures.

The findings report choices and effectiveness of strategies based on the perceptions of the responding school superintendents. The demographic characteristics of each district were used as control variables. Only 16 of the 20 strategies rated most effective were reported in the study.

Findings

From the above descriptions, it is clear that these reports are based on different types of data, different data collection techniques, and different forms of analysis. Each study does provide, however, a substantial sample of school systems and all but one (Murphy, 1980) provide data from more than one source in each school system. Even in the case of Murphy, the respondents, school superintendents, are sufficiently high in their organizational structures to have insight into the identification and evaluation of strategies appropriate for certain school desegregation outcomes. Nonetheless, the potential for specific bias in the latter study is noted.

We have organized the information from the four studies by strategy and outcome (see Table 1). The listed strategies were identified through a lengthy review process. We began by selecting strategies from several articles, reports, non-data based reviews, and informed commentaries (e.g., Henderson and Von Euler, 1979; Orfield, 1975; and Foster, 1973). These were then coded by outcome. The resulting list of 211 strategies was then collapsed into several broad categories, each differentiated by purpose. Within each goal all studies are listed so that we can immediately compare agreements about strategies within goals.

Table 1.

Summary of Conclusions from the Consensus Literature

Concerning the Effectiveness of Desegregation Strategies

GOAL	Ending Racial Isolation				Enhancing Academic Achievement				Improving Race Relations				Avoiding Resegregation				Improving Public Response			
AUTHORS	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy
STRATEGIES																				
00. Voluntary Student Assignment-General	•		•																	
01. Open Enrollment			—	•																
02. Optional School Zones				•																
03. Majority to Minority Pupil Transfers				•																
04. Magnet Schools and Special Programs			—(1)				+													
05. Metropolitan Cooperation				•																
06. Housing Policies (e.g., open housing, scattered site housing)																				
07. Site Selection and Construction Policies to Emphasize Racially Neutral Areas	•			•																
08. Mandatory Student Assignment*-General																				
09. Redrawing Zone Lines												•								
10. Pairing and Grouping Schools/Closing Schools			•	•																
11. Modified Feeder Patterns			•	•																
12. Skip Zoning																				
13. Grade Reorganization																				
14. Renovations in Schools Receiving Bussed Students			•	•																
							+	+								+				

*Most of the strategies of this type could also be used in voluntary plans; typically, they are not.
(1)All magnet plans (magnet only) not effective.

GOAL	Ending Racial Isolation				Enhancing Academic Achievement				Improving Race Relations				Avoiding Resegregation				Improving Public Response			
AUTHORS	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy
STRATEGIES																				
15. Magnet Schools as Part of a Mandatory Plan			+	•			+													
16. Interdistrict/Metropolitan Plans			•	•																
17. Implement Desegregation Plans in Early Years (K & pre-K, 1-6)																				
18. Community/Parent Information Techniques-General Pre-Implementation																				
19. Establishing Multiethnic Parent-Teacher-Student Committees to Plan Desegregation Process	+		+	+				+				+				+			+	+
20. Establishing Broad Based Multiethnic School and Community Committees to Plan Desegregation Process	+		+																+	
21. Information and Rumor Control Centers			+							+									+	+
22. Parent Field Trips			+																	
23. Provide Positive Feedback to the Media About the Process of School Desegregation			+																+	+
24. Court Appointed Monitoring Commission			•																•	
25. District Appointed Monitoring Commission	+		•														+		+	
26. Teacher/Administrator/Staff & Student Readiness-Gen. Pre-Implementation			+																	
27. Train Teachers/Staff Prior to Implementation of Desegregation Concerning What to Expect	+								+		+									
28. Plan and Establish Student/New School Contact Prior to Implementation of Desegregation					+				+		+	•					+			
29. Planned Faculty Exchange and Faculty Field Trips Before and After Implementing School Deseg. Plan	+								+			•								
30. Parent and Community Involvement in School Affairs-General Post-Implementation																				

GOAL	Ending Racial Isolation				Enhancing Academic Achievement				Improving Race Relations				Avoiding Resegregation				Improving Public Response			
AUTHORS / STRATEGIES	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy
31. Establishing Multiethnic In-School Parent-Teacher Comm. to Serve as Resource Spec. (minority parents)			+		+	+	+	•	+	+	+	+			+	+	+		+	•
32. Establishing Multiethnic In-School P-T Comm. to Provide Counseling to and Handle Grievance of P-T-S			+		+				+	+	+				+		+		+	•
33. Intervention Teams Composed of Parents-Teachers-Students						+				+										•
34. Parent Involvement in School Activities/Parent-Staff, Faculty Social Activities			+		+	+				+							+			•
35. Increased and Improved School-Home Contacts			+			+		•	+	+							+		+	
36. Provide the Use of the School for Community Meetings, Gatherings and Activities										+									+	
37. Administrator/Tea./Staff Training to Upgrade Skills & Capacities-General Post-Implementation (People)																				
38. Upgrading Teacher Skills in Instruction					+		+													
39. Staff and Teachers Rec. Training in Class. Teaching Strat. to Accommodate Wide Variations in Stu. Ability					+	+	+			+	+									
40. Improve Faculty Supervision & Evaluation (Upgrade leadership skills of principals)	+		+		+			•		+										
41. Staff, Teacher Training in Human Relations	+					+	+		+	+	+	•			+					•
42. Staff and Teachers Rec. Training in Teach. Strat. that Facilitate Cooperative Integ. Learning Exp.					+	+	+	•	+	+		•								
43. Obtain State Ed. Agency Asst. & Support for Training Programs for Administrators and Teachers			+				+				+									
44. Teacher Training and Self Awareness, Empathy and Sensitivity									+	+		•			+					
45. Training of Non-Academic Staff																				
46. School Officials, Staff & Tea. Rec. Training in & Dev. Explicit Policies for Identifying & Placing Stu. in Spec. Curriculum in Nondiscriminatory ways					+	+			+	+					+					

GOAL	Ending Racial Isolation				Enhancing Academic Achievement				Improving Race Relations				Avoiding Resegregation				Improving Public Responses			
AUTHORS / STRATEGIES	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Sagoets	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Sagoets	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs & Lachman	Forehand-Sagoets	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Sagoets	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Sagoets	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy
47. Related to Educational Achievement-Gen. Programs																				
48. Enriched or Improved Curricula Throughout the System					+		+	•				•								
49. Reduced Class Sizes					+	+	+	+												
50. Implementing Multiethnic Curriculum					+			•	+			•								
51. Bilingual Programs with English Language Emphasis					+		+	+	+			+								
52. Establishing Bilingual Prog. in School Emphasizing Bicultural Matters/Instruction in Fri.Lang. & Eng.					+		+	+	+			+								
53. Compensatory Classes for Low Achieving Students							+	•												
54. Tutorials for Low Achieving Students (e.g., peers, and adult volunteers, teacher aides)					+	+	+	•												
55. Providing Cooperative Instruction					+	+		•	+	+					+					
56. Non-Graded/Alternative Grading Instructional Format					+		+		+											
57. Programs Related to Human Relations-General												•								
58. Employ Teacher Aides/Reduce Student Instructor Ratio					+			+												
59. Policies to Prevent Disproportionate Min. Suspensions Expul. (e.g., explicit discipline code w/due process								+		+	+				+					
60. Tracking					—								—	—	—					
61. Ability Grouping					—	+—	—			(—)		—	—	—	—	—				
62. Staff, Parents, Teachers, Students Plan, Dev. & Support Extra-Curricular Activities to Ensure Multi-Ethnic Representation and Participation					+			•	+	+	+		+	+		+				

GOAL	Ending Racial Isolation				Enhancing Academic Achievement				Improving Race Relations				Avoiding Re-segregation				Improving Public Response			
AUTHORS / STRATEGIES	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy	Smith, Downs, & Lachman	Forehand-Ragosta	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	Hardy R. Murphy
63. Special Extra-Curricular and Non-Academic Programs					+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+				
64. School and Classroom Management-General																				
65. Maintaining Order (minimizing disruption)					+				+											
66. Staff, Teachers Receive Training in Classroom Discipline Techniques					+	+			+	+		•			+	•				•
67. Intervention Teams Composed of Teachers-Students-Staff										+										+
68. Employ Teacher Aides and Security																				
69. Increase Student/Teacher Contact					+	+	+	+	+			+								
70. Teacher/Administrator Assignments-General																				
71. Voluntary Intradistrict Faculty Transfers				+																
72. Staff and Faculty Reassignment to Achieve Racial Balance	+			+				•			+					+	+			
73. Affirmative Action Hiring Policies to Create Multi-Ethnic/Racially Balanced Staff and Faculty	+																+			
74. General-Unspecified																				
75. ND																				

alternative teaching strategies. The Commission report recommends that school officials, teachers, and staff receive training in methods and in policies which place students in special curricula in non-discriminatory ways.

In addition to being viewed as negatively affecting classroom racial balance, tracking and ability grouping are all too often paths from which students seldom escape, and in which they may experience lesser quality education. It is important to stress, however, as do Forehand and Ragosta, that there may be some benefits to tracking but only when it is done in a careful and fully documentable manner.

There are several strategies that are identified in three or more of the studies as having positive impacts on one or more desired outcomes of desegregation. In the pre-implementation stage, two strategies are identified as having a constructive impact on the future success of desegregation. Establishing multiethnic parent-teacher-student committees which help in planning school desegregation is identified by Murphy, Smith, Downs, and Lachman, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights as an important step in ending racial isolation (See Table 1, Strategy 19). These studies view the early structuring of committees which are broadly representative of the school community as a fundamental principle of planned social change. Such an organization can provide greater assurance of issue clarity and reasonable treatment of sensitive issues in the final plan. There is some evidence to suggest that such committees establish a basis of broad support for the final plan as well.

Another recommended pre-implementation strategy is the routinized introduction of students to their new schools and to one another prior to implementing desegregation plans (See Table 1, Strategy 28). Pre-implementation orientation activities should center on wide ranging

issues such as human relations, and academic expectations and opportunities.

Once desegregation is under way in school districts, continued parental involvement in school affairs is considered very helpful for ensuring successful implementation. The establishment of multiethnic in-school parent-teacher committees, whose members serve as resource specialists, is identified as particularly effective for improving race relations, student achievement, and public response outcomes (see Table 1, Strategy 31). In addition to increasing the contact between home and school, those committees can place minority parents in a positive view of both minority and majority students and faculty. Moreover, using parents as resource specialists provides the schools with access to multiethnic viewpoints and fosters insights around which they might structure academic and non-academic learning experiences for children. Finally, the presence of a multiethnic parent group, active in school affairs, provides a ready communications network through which positive accomplishments can be disseminated to the larger community.

This same type of committee may also serve to handle grievances of parents, teachers, and students in newly desegregating schools which are often plagued by confusion and tension. Such advisory groups can also provide counseling to students. They are considered in the studies to be effective in fostering positive interracial interaction and promoting positive public response to school desegregation.

Most of the strategies identified in the consensus literature pertain to school-level policies where the potential to influence the course of implementation is high. While many of the techniques identified are desegregation-specific, it becomes evident that practitioners regard

school desegregation as an opportunity to pursue often neglected structural and curricular changes in schools. For example, the recommendation to reduce class size is identified across all studies as an effective technique for improving achievement, though this strategy only indirectly relates to desegregation.

Of more immediate concern to many practitioners are the issues of bilingual education and multiethnic curricula. The first is often viewed as antithetical to desegregation's goal of reducing racial isolation, although bilingual programs were identified by three of the reports as increasing the probabilities for academic success (Table 1, Strategies 51 and 52). The development and use of multiethnic curricula materials was widely approved by respondents. Forehand and Ragosta emphasize the importance of developing an "integrated" curriculum as opposed to simply adding new materials to an existing course of study. They suggest further that caution must be exercised to select non-stereotypical ethnic materials.

Much attention has been given to the function of inservice training programs and their impact on the course of school desegregation. Some of the training needs identified were in human relations, curricular innovations and school and classroom management.

Human relations training programs focus on providing teachers with training designed to increase and improve their human relations capacities and skills. The outcome for which this kind of program seems to be most helpful is improving race relations.

Training teachers in classroom strategies to accomodate wide variations in student abilities is reported to have positive consequences for student achievement. An instructional strategy such as cooperative

learning provides a high expectation, accomplishment-oriented learning setting for many students who, prior to desegregation, may have been insufficiently challenged. The reports recommend the use of tutorials rather than a more permanent solution of tracking. While cooperative learning does provide an alternative to ability grouping and tracking, its implementation requires sufficient staff training to address the needs of teachers in dealing with broad ability heterogeneity within the classroom.

In the area of classroom management and discipline, a major concern is to strengthen teachers' abilities to handle classroom disruptions in a way that does not isolate children and does not preclude opportunities to learn. New or strengthened skills emphasizing clarity and consistency of rules and their enforcement are considered fundamental components of classroom management and discipline. Forehand and Ragosta recommend that students, as well as teachers and administrators, participate in developing school and classroom discipline codes. It is assumed that this kind of interaction and joint decision-making will further the goal of improving race relations.

Finally, the reports highlight the need for parents, teachers, and students themselves to encourage and facilitate integrated extracurricular programs. Cooperative planning and policy development by school officials, parents, and teachers in designing, supporting, and implementing extracurricular activities to assure minority representation is one such strategy. A related strategy calls for implementing special extracurricular activities and non-academic programs. In both instances consideration has to be given to provision of special transportation needs and eligibility for participation in such activities to make extracurricular

programs accessible to students residing greater distances from school as well as to students with lower academic credentials or fewer socioeconomic resources.

As an educational strategy, extracurricular activities often provide the economically disadvantaged with new learning and social experiences that broaden their interests and heighten their expectations. Athletes, for example, may be some of the most traveled residents of their communities, especially inner city youths. Extracurricular programs offer a wide range of social benefits from racially mixed cooperative learning projects to more individualized exposure to different cultures and communities. Involvement of parents and teachers in these activities provides role models for students for positive race relations and increases interracial contact among majority and minority parents, teachers, and school staff--a needed impetus for improving teacher-student race relations.

Conclusions

The policy implications of the strategies identified by the majority of these data-based consensus reports are centered primarily on three outcomes specified in this project--avoiding resegregation, and enhancing race relations and academic achievement. The apparent paucity of consensus about effective strategies for ending racial isolation is perhaps best summarized by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report which concludes that there are a number of ways of restructuring a school system to eliminate one-race schools, but of most importance is what happens at the end of the bus ride.

Fortunately, this portion of our literature review indicates that

several specific strategies appear effective and moreover that they are effective for more than one outcome about which this study is concerned. These strategies deserve particular consideration.

The reports reviewed here are based on data from a variety of sources collected from many different regional and demographic areas. Included in each study are the views of school superintendents. While the comparability of these reports cannot be taken as unequivocal proof, it does strengthen the tenability of desegregation plans that include the most frequently supported strategies outlined above.

Despite the fact that these studies represent views of experienced educators, or interpretations of the views of such persons, their conclusions should not be treated as hard evidence about the effectiveness of any given strategy. There are many unproven assertions that are held by many people in the field and there are reasons why professionals may overstate some ideas and not mention others. For example, school superintendents responding to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights survey have considerable incentive to identify the positive outcomes of desegregation in their communities. The studies reviewed here do not provide any hard and fast answers; they provide additional clues to or pieces of the puzzle. If these conclusions match those in the empirical research, if they make sense theoretically, and if they are supported by the perceptions of most experts and observers who have experience with the issues involved, we may have something.

References

Forehand, G. A., & Ragosta, M. A handbook for integrated schooling. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Forehand, G. A., Ragosta, M., & Rock, D. A. Conditions and processes of effective school desegregation. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 155)

Foster, B., Jr. The case for vouchers. The Black Scholar, 1973, 4, 8-9.

Henderson, R. D., & Von Euler, M. What research and experiences teach us about desegregation large northern cities. Clearing House for Rights Research, 1979, 7(1).

Murphy, H. R. District and community characteristics influencing desegregation strategy choice and effectiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Orfield, G. How to make desegregation work: The adaptation of schools to their newly-integrated student bodies. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 314-340.

Smith, A. D., Downs, A., & Lachman, M. Achieving effective desegregacion. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1979.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the law: Desegregation of the nation's public schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

CHAPTER III

EXPERT OPINION ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ISSUES: FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEWS

William T. Trent

A great deal of what is known about effective strategies for desegregating schools is derived from experiences of practitioners at the local and national levels. In an effort to tap this source of information, interviews were conducted with school officials in 18 sites where schools were desegregated and with 40 national experts. Among the local experts interviewed are state education officials, superintendents, assistant superintendents, attorneys, board members, principals, teachers, and counselors. National experts include plan developers, researchers, federal education officials, and civil rights lawyers. Tables C-1 and C-2 (Appendix A) provide a list of school sites and the positions of the experts interviewed.

The school sites listed in Table C-1 represent great diversity in district size and type of desegregation plan. New Castle County, Delaware, Louisville, Kentucky, and Charlotte, North Carolina are metropolitan or city-county plans involving substantial numbers of schools and students, and they generally have characteristics like many other large urban school systems. Denver, Colorado, and Boston, Massachusetts, while not under metropolitan-wide plans, are also large urban systems. By contrast, systems such as Shaker Heights, Ohio, Evanston, Illinois, and Racine, Wisconsin are smaller in size and quite different from the former sites on a number of demographic variables.

In addition to being varied in size and plan types, the local sites represent different geographic regions and differ in their racial and ethnic compositions. Both Tucson and Denver have substantial Chicano/

Hispanic student populations while Seattle and Minneapolis have significant Asian-American populations. Most often, however, our sites are composed mainly of black and white student populations and desegregation is primarily biracial as opposed to tri-ethnic.

National experts are individuals who, because of their unique positions in the profession, are especially qualified to provide insights into the planning, implementation, and operation of school desegregation. This study has been enriched from information provided by civil rights attorneys, academic researchers with considerable school desegregation research, plan developers, federal officials, regional education experts, representatives from the National Education Association, and directors of federally and privately funded education policy and research centers.

The experts interviewed are also racially and ethnically diverse: 12 respondents are black, 7 are Hispanic and the remainder, white. The research staff has also been careful to include individuals who have somewhat critical views of school desegregation practices.

The results of these interviews were used to enhance and clarify our understanding of the appropriateness of specific school desegregation practices identified in the quantitative and qualitative literatures. The instrument and item design for the interviews was open ended by intention and structured around issues and strategies identified in the qualitative and quantitative literatures. In all, 95 local and 40 national experts were interviewed. A summary of the findings from these interviews is presented below.

A Summary of the Interview Findings

This report contains a discussion of school desegregation issues structured around the outcomes specified in the Project proposal: ending

racial isolation, improving race relations, enhancing academic performance, improving public response, and avoiding resegregation. Listed below are the strategies about which there was considerable agreement among local and national experts.

Ending Racial Isolation

- Use metropolitan or comprehensive assignment strategies.
- Use mandatory plans with magnet components to increase support from white and middle-class parents.
- Avoid phasing-in plans unless it is district-wide and begins at the elementary level.
- Exempt naturally desegregated neighborhoods from the reassignment plan and otherwise encourage housing desegregation.

Improving Race Relations

- Provide racially and ethnically mixed facilities and staffs in all schools and in the central office.
- Train teachers, administrators, and non-teaching staff in new instructional techniques (Cooperative Team Learning and other status equalization techniques), classroom building management, and human relations skills.
- Involve parents in the pre- and post-implementation stages of school desegregation.
- Introduce multiethnic and multicultural curricular emphasis and materials throughout all schools.
- Improve extracurricular activities.

Enhancing Academic Performance

- Selectively use "magnet-type" approaches and otherwise enrich instructional offerings.
- Train teachers in instructional techniques that are better suited for working with heterogeneous groups of students.
- Avoid rigid tracking and ability grouping.
- Introduce multiethnic and multicultural curricular emphases and materials throughout the schools.

Improving Public Response

- Provide early and continuous involvement of parents and citizens in the desegregation planning, implementation, and operation.
- Cultivate an effective, positive, and supportive relationship with the local print and electronic media.
- Develop and disseminate clear and concise information about the desegregation plan and its components.

Avoiding Resegregation

- Develop, with the input of parents, administrators, teachers, and students, clear and precise school discipline codes and policies emphasizing due process in order to avoid disproportionate minority suspensions.
- Offer "academic magnet-type" programs within mandatory plans or otherwise enrich and enhance course offerings at the junior and senior high school level.
- Exempt naturally desegregated communities from the reassignment plan and/or involve the local housing authorities in the desegregation planning and implementation.

These are some of the major findings of the interviews; they will be discussed in more detail in the full report which follows. It is important to note that the results reported here, although obtained from knowledgeable and well informed sources, are not the result of a scientifically selected sample. Those people interviewed were selected because of their expertise in specific areas. However, in these interviews they have probably commented and offered opinions in areas outside their true expertise. In such instances their biases are likely greater. The intention of this study has been to obtain unique and knowledgeable insights about special practices that would amplify or clarify the available information in the quantitative and qualitative literatures. These data serve that more limited objective.

Methodology

Task IV of the Assessment Project called for interviews to be conducted in 20 local school systems which would be generally representative of the sites in which future desegregation would occur. In each site, from four to eight individuals who held key positions with the school system were interviewed yielding 95 interviews with local experts. In addition, interviews were conducted with 40 national experts who, because of their unique type of involvement or position, were especially qualified to respond to issues of school desegregation.

The list of sites and experts was developed by the research team in consultation with the Advisory Board for the Project. Initially a list of approximately 30 sites was prepared using data from the Taeuber and Wilson Office of Civil Rights School Desegregation Survey covering the years 1968 to 1976. These data provided information on school system size, the type of desegregation plan (mandatory vs. voluntary), and the agency level governing the desegregation plan (D.H.E.W., State Court or School Board). In addition, the data indicated the racial and ethnic composition of the system. The primary critera for site selection were: 1) Has the district experienced significant desegregation; 2) Were interesting changes or practices occurring that were successful or significant, and 3) Were the lessons to be learned in that site likely to be generalizable. A final list of sites was then developed and is presented below.

School System Sites

1. Tucson, Arizona
2. Riverside, California
3. Stockton, California
4. Denver, Colorado
5. New Castle County, Delaware
6. Tampa, Florida
7. Atlanta, Georgia
8. Evanston, Illinois
9. Louisville, Kentucky
10. Prince Georges Co., Maryland
11. Boston, Massachusetts
12. Minneapolis, Minnesota
13. Omaha, Nebraska
14. Montclair, New Jersey
15. Charlotte, North Carolina
16. Shaker Heights, Ohio
17. Nashville, Tennessee
18. Seattle, Washington
19. Milwaukee, Wisconsin
20. Racine, Wisconsin

Because Prince Georges County and Nashville were engaged in court actions or system reviews related to desegregation during the interview period, these sites were consequently omitted from the list. Their deletion was based on a rationale that these actions or reviews might affect or limit the responses of local officials.

The research plan placed special emphasis on gathering information from those most involved and informed in the desegregation process in their area. For each school system site researchers were instructed to choose from the following list of local officials and citizens, at least five types of persons to be interviewed:

1. Superintendent and/or senior system staff member(s) involved in desegregation
2. School board members
3. Journalists
4. Teachers
5. Monitoring/citizen committee members
6. Plaintiff's/defendant's attorney
7. Curriculum specialists
8. Court appointed plan masters.

Table C-1 in Appendix A identifies the positions of interviewees in each site along with the total number of persons interviewed there.

The questionnaires used for local and national experts were developed and prepared by the Project staff. No formal pre-test of the instrument was conducted. The types of interview items were discussed with the national Advisory Board and were then assessed by the entire Project team. The open ended items used in the instruments allowed the interviewers to follow his or her own instincts about which issues or questions to pursue. This departure from the format provided considerable richness on certain topics. The local interview instrument contains 31 items, and includes an identification of the characteristics of the local school system, position of the respondent, length and type of interview (personal or telephone). The national expert questionnaire is somewhat longer,

containing 59 items. Both local and national expert interviews averaged one hour and thirty minutes and two hours respectively. Copies of the instruments are included in this report (See Appendices B and C).

Items in both instruments focus on the five outcomes specified in the overall research design: ending racial isolation, improving achievement, preventing resegregation, improving public response, and improving race relations. The open ended questions generally request respondents to identify strategies that would be beneficial in achieving a desired outcome. In many instances probes are used to elicit responses about particular practices about which there has been considerable debate.

Eight senior researchers from the Project Team conducted the interviews between July and December of 1980. Each researcher was responsible for from one to five sites; only one researcher had a single site. The researchers conducting the interviews qualify as experts in their own right, having published or consulted in various areas of school desegregation.* Indeed some interviewers had the unique advantage of having conducted research or provided expert testimony in the school system where their interviews were conducted. Their experience made training unnecessary and also expedited access to key personnel in most systems. For each local site, however, the researchers were provided with available background material on that system. This information was provided by the Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education and the files of its director Meyer Weinberg, editor of the journal Integrateducation.

Interviews with national experts were conducted by the same researchers.

---

*The researchers conducting interviews were:

Robert Crain	William Sampson
Ricardo Fernandez	Rachael Tompkins
Willis D. Hawley	William Trent
Christine Rossell	Ben Williams

Forty such interviews were conducted and Table C2 identifies the roles of these respondents. Careful attention was given to identifying those persons whose professional roles provided valuable insights into school desegregation issues. To select these national experts we 1) solicited names from the Advisory Board and the entire Project Team, and 2) identified authors with multiple publications in the field of school desegregation research.

The completed instruments were returned to us by December 1980. Upon receipt of the completed interviews, the responses to the instruments were coded by the project coordinator and a research assistant. Following the coding of the instruments, the local interview data were put into machine readable form. The simple frequencies from the local and national interviews are somewhat less informative than the full responses from the actual instruments themselves. This is primarily attributable to the range of responses to each item and to the substantial number of non-responses to items where interviewees felt they were inadequately informed. Thus, in some instances as many as 65% of the responses to a very few of the local items are nor responses.

Despite varying rates of response, the local and national interview data provide expert insight into particular desegregation strategies, many of which are identified as successful in facilitating school desegregation (See Volume I of this report, Strategies for Effective Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings for a presentation of these techniques, with illustrative examples and research evidence). In this chapter, the findings from the national and local expert interviews are presented separately. Following these sections is a summary which discusses similarities and differences between the two groups. These interviews report perceptions and

opinions of persons uniquely situated in the field of school desegregation. While they provide valuable and unique insights, they are not objective measures of effective strategies and should not be taken as such.

Findings from Interviews with National Experts

The range of expertise and insight offered by the national interview respondents is both rich and diverse. This is made clear by the number of different responses to the majority of the questions posed in the instrument. Such differences do not reflect a lack of consensus about desegregation issues raised as much as they do the different roles occupied by our respondents in their respective fields. Indeed, as will be shown below, there was considerable agreement on a variety of strategies. Finally, on some occasions, the experts chose not to respond to problems brought up in the questionnaire, due to a felt lack of pertinent knowledge or information. This, combined with the variety of responses given, prohibit any statistical treatment of these national interviews. Rather, these data are best suited to a careful synthesis of the responses to specific items on school desegregation strategies and practices. The presentation of the results begins with a discussion of those strategies that received substantial support from the respondents.

Ensure that Schools Have a Multiracial, Multiethnic Faculty and Administrative Staff

There was near unanimous agreement among the national experts that schools that are desegregated should have faculty members and administrators of different races and ethnic groups to enhance race relations and foster positive self-concepts among minority students.

Three primary reasons were given for supporting this strategy. Seventeen of the respondents expressed support for this strategy on the basis of the importance of minority youngsters having role models of their

own race. Another seven experts identified the importance of students observing an "integrated" work place. An additional five experts reasoned that simple fairness demands a racially and ethnically mixed staff as an indication of equal status conditions. Additional reasons given in support of this strategy include: the need for white children to experience minorities in positions of authority; the need of Hispanic parents to see teachers sympathetic to their children's needs and heritage; the chance that such staffing patterns might minimize the opportunity for teachers and administrators to discriminate; and, the belief that minority students show greater support for minority administrators.

The role model, equal status, and model interracial behavior bases for backing this strategy are consistent with socialization theory and with research analyzed in other volumes of this report. There is, however, some research which suggests that minority teachers in desegregated schools have been found to overreact in some instances toward students of the same race. Still another concern is the difficulty of implementing such a strategy given the consequential role that teachers' unions may play in the assignments and reassignments of teachers with seniority.

Perhaps the best summary of this strategy is the response of a researcher who has studied and published extensively on the issue of race relations in public schools:

> I give very high priority to insuring a mixed faculty and staff in desegregated schools; however, after saying this, I also think it's important to point out that one has to think carefully about the trade-off between racial balance and other factors. For example, it may be difficult to induce some white teachers to teach in a heavily black, but desegregated inner city school. In cases like this, it might be better to stick with a competent faculty that was somewhat disproportionately black than to bring in large numbers of completely inexperienced whites who are only in the school because they don't have the seniority to be elsewhere. Similarly, a school system should make sure that its efforts to hire minority teachers do not result in a pool of minority

teachers which is clearly less competent than a pool of majority teachers. . . .

Desegregating and Desegregated School Systems Should Maximize Parent and Citizen Involvement

The involvement of parents and citizens in the schools at all stages of the desegregation process was cited by the national experts as an effective mechanism for facilitating several desegregation outcomes:

1. improving public acceptance of and support for school desegregation,
2. reducing white and black flight,
3. improving race relations, and
4. minimizing conflict and disruption.

When asked what practical strategies a judge or school system might employ prior to implementation that would lead to greater acceptance and success of the desegregation plan (Item 9), parent involvement was the most often cited activity named by those respondents who had first-hand knowledge of such practices. In addition, the specific strategy of sponsoring visits for white parents to black schools was cited. Finally, other experts noted gaining support of the elite and business community and having court appointed monitoring bodies and advisory councils as ways of achieving greater acceptance of the school desegregation plan. Thus, nearly half of our experts identified securing parent and community involvement as an important pre-desegregation means to facilitate the acceptance and success of implementation.

Given the objective of reducing white and middle class flight, our national experts identified two general areas of parental involvement which aid desegregation: 1) structural and on-going provisions for parents to visit prospective and new schools, and specifically, white parents' visits to black schools; and 2) a well-informed public and posi-

tive media coverage. These latter two strategies both show a concern on the part of the experts interviewed to include the broader (tax paying) community in the school desegregation process. Visitation will help reduce fear on the part of both majority and minority parents according to the experts interviewed. An accurately and regularly informed public by a sensitive and supportive media was considered less likely to become reactionary or volatile in its response to the implementation of school desegregation and more likely to continue its support of the public schools. One point stressed by the civil rights attorneys was that particularly in school systems under court order it must be made clear that the elimination of racial isolation in schools is a legal requirement.

Parent involvement was also identified as an effective means for improving race relations and minimizing conflict and disruption in schools. As identified earlier, the experts felt that students could experience and learn positive interracial interaction from the adults in the school. Achieving and sustaining the participation of minority parents in desegregated schools offers a further experience of effective interracial interaction. Moreover, students, especially in the lower grades, may be more likely to behave better when parents, particularly his or her own, have a known presence in and relationship with the school.

Finally, the experts often reported that parents respond especially well when they feel they can participate in a substantial and meaningful way in the schools. Parents, in turn, may experience an increase in their sense of loyalty to the schools. When this occurs they are more able and likely to be effective spokespersons for the schools and less likely to defect (participate in flight, white or middle class) or tolerate poor conduct from their school-aged children.

The consensus of the experts is that the strategy of securing increased parental and citizen involvement is an important one because of its many potential benefits. Achieving and sustaining minority parent or citizen participation may pose serious challenges, however, particularly where distances between minority residential communities and the schools are great. Moreover, disproportionate busing burden, which contributes to social status difference perceptions, may serve as an added disincentive to sustained minority participation. School officials can anticipate such difficulties in planning locations, activities, and duties of parent committees and other citizen groups.

Finally, listed below are examples of citizen, parent, and community involvement structures that experts identified as most effective:

1. Independent monitoring committees linked to court.
2. Parent/citizens committees involved throughout desegregation process.
3. Para-professional minority liaisons.
4. Human-relations councils in schools.
5. Rumor control centers.
6. Broad range of coalitions (wide representation).
7. Court-ordered models.
8. Information programs.
9. School based committees.

Train Teachers in Skills that Enhance Their Teaching Effectiveness with Heterogeneous Student Groups

Teacher training in instructional techniques, classroom management, and human relations were some of the effective strategies most frequently identified by the national experts to ensure the desegregation outcomes outlined above. In-service training was most closely associated, however, with the challenge

of student heterogeneity which often accompanies school desegregation. When asked about pre-implementation strategies that a judge might use to improve acceptance and success of the desegregation plan, training teachers (and staff) was identified by about a third of the national experts as one of the most immediate concerns and effective approaches.

Types of training identified by the experts covered many areas. First, several of the interviewees specified training teachers in instructional techniques and cooperative learning strategies appropriate for heterogeneous student groupings. These are viewed by the experts as effective strategies for minimizing student disruption and conflict and in reducing discriminatory resegregation within schools (See Items 52 and 41). Half of the substantive responses identified preparing teachers fo multiracial and multi-ability classes as effective educational programs to retard flight from desegregation and to assure effective instructional environments (See Items 13 and 33). Other respondents expressed the need that training prepare enlightened school leadership. Finally, another researcher, having recently examined this issue, specified in-service workshops for superintendents, principals, and teachers that would start early, and be based on a local needs assessment. Most interviewees reiterated concerns about the quality of teacher and staff training by specifying that it be well planned, well funded and designed to confront the problems of teachers in their local school systems.

Teacher training programs are increasingly demanded, yet criticized. As one of the civil rights attorneys explained: "The courts are more frequently including training as a part of the court decisions for remedy but lawyer's access to and knowledge of quality training practices is only beginning." The respondents were asked to tell us about what

types or methods of training programs for teachers are most effective, what they were about, and how long they should last (Item 27). The range of responses is shown below:

Effective methods to conduct teacher training:

* target training to teachers' needs
* engender self-awareness
* provide practical expertise, not just theory
* deal with actual problems and situations in schools
* include peer review.

Content of training programs:

* how to function in a desegregated setting (for teachers, staff, parents, and students)
* human relations
* instructional strategies
* dealing with heterogeneous classrooms
* curriculum innovation
* restructuring classrooms and classroom management
* multiracial and multilingual issues
* working with colleagues
* information about participants' school systems and their problems.

Beginning and length of training:

* begin when students first come into contact with teachers
* begin at least one week prior to implementation of desegregation plan
* training should be on-going
* training should last as long as it takes to resolve multiracial and multilingual issues
* intensive during first year, then long range.

These responses suggest that practical, applicable skills and techniques in instructional strategies are what the experts believe training programs should be about. The responses about human relations and self-awareness training were considerably less optimistic. The dominant reason given was that changing teacher attitudes was not as effective as changing teacher behavior. Programs should begin early, prior to implementation, and continue over time, becoming an integral part of the schools' operation.

The evidence here substantially supports teacher training, as it can have multiple payoffs with respect to important educational outcomes and processes in desegregated schools. One condition not cited by our national experts is the level of regularity of teacher participation in training and its enforcement. Where the courts order such strategies, the mandate for training exists but monitoring of individual schools may still be needed to insure implementation. Where the courts have not included monitoring in their orders or where court orders are not forthcoming, parents and other citizens, including school system officials, will have to develop means to provide improved training. Stressing professional development through skills-needs-based training may be the answer.

Train School Administrators Prior to and Following School Desegregation

National experts were unanimous in calling for training of school administrators (See Item 29). It was the majority opinion that superintendents, central office staff, and principals exercise a crucial measure of leadership and it is important that they be supportive and consistent in the conduct of their duties. One respondent recommended training administrators first and then having them participate in staff training and follow-up training to establish a staff-team approach.

More specifically, national experts indicated that training for administrators should: 1) stress clear school-wide and system-wide goals and objectives; 2) encompass human relations training; 3) include political training to provide participants with insights into working with a more heterogeneous school community; and, 4) emphasize techniques fostering work in desegregated classrooms. A consistently expressed recommendation

was that administrators participate in the training administered to teachers.

Training Non-Teaching Staff Following Initial Implementation

National experts recommend that the non-teaching staff--clerical, staff, bus drivers, custodians, security guards, cafeteria workers, and school liasons--should all receive training. The primary area of training recommended was in race relations with fairness and equal status awareness. Respondents reasoned that the non-teaching staff have a substantial impact on school climate and are a major link to the larger non-school community. One recent example of the importance of training the non-teaching staff is illustrated by an incident in which a school bus driver in a small, southern, university town was reported to the school board for joining in the singing of "praise to the KLAN" as black students boarded the buses. These are unnecessary incidents that training programs may prevent.

Limit the Use of Tracking and Ability Grouping

The survey requested respondents to identify strategies to minimize discriminatory resegregation within schools. In addition, opinions were solicited on the use of ability grouping within or among classes (See Items 41 and 43). More than half of the experts expressed strong disapproval of ability grouping in response to this issue.

According to 15% of the experts, tracking should not be allowed and teachers and counselors should be required to justify any classroom segregation resulting from their assignment practices. Other accountability measures identified by the respondents include tighter monitoring, parent involvement in special education classes, and revision of testing for gifted and talented placement.

Almost 20% of the experts recommended that schools use cooperative

learning strategies that facilitate heterogeneous ability groupings. Only one respondent called for providing incentives to schools to develop innovative ways to avoid within and between classroom resegregation.

While the respondents expressed clear opposition to the current use of ability grouping that contributes to resegregation, it should be understood that they do recognize that some grouping has educational merit. Their responses to Items 40 and 45 demonstrate this. For special education classes, handicapped students, students with limited English skills, and students with documentable remedial needs in certain core subjects--math or reading--the experts show support for limited (part of the day) or temporary groupings. No groupings should be day-long or semester-long and all grouping must be educationally justifiable. Fundamentally, however, the experts interviewed are clearly supportive of very limited use of ability grouping or tracking. This, they feel, will reduce within and between classroom resegregation in desegregated schools.

Desegregating School Systems Should Introduce Special Programs for Hispanic Students

The survey included four items requesting information in programs for Hispanics in desegregating school systems. The first item (#36) requested information on what special programs should be introduced. About 15% of the respondents felt that all desegregation plans must address multiracial and multilingual issues--not just when Hispanics are involved. Beyond this, the experts called for programs that: 1) provide for language instructional needs; 2) contain cultural components; 3) train teachers in ethnic sensitivity; and 4) alter the entire curriculum to reflect Hispanic contributions. When asked what types of bilingual programs are most attractive to students who do speak English fluently, most experts who responded were divided nearly evenly between recommending

maintenance/developmental programs and recommending magnets and multiple language programs available to all students.

Only half of the experts responded to the question of whether or not the effectiveness of programs for Hispanics was different for Hispanic sub-groups (Item 39). Of those, about half indicated that these differences can be attributed to the importance of language dominance for each group and to class differences between Hispanic groups. Some who responded negatively indicated that too much is made of the issue.

Finally, on the question of the consequences of special programs for Hispanics where they have been introduced, a range of responses was given. Three respondents indicated that the programs have had negative consequences for desegregation. However, most experts, particularly the Hispanic experts, report very favorable results where good programs have been introduced. The most frequently mentioned positive outcome of the programs was increased self-esteem. An official of the Mexican-American Legal Defense Educational Fund (MALDEF) reported that enhancement of bilingual programs with appropriate parental involvement is needed for more beneficial results. One civil rights attorney voiced what was a common opinion--that servicing the language needs of limited English-speaking students necessitates some concentration in classes, but that the negative consequences of this concentration for desegregation are negligible. Yet, more importantly, two researchers with considerable professional involvement in this issue felt that the programs themselves, and the services delivered to the students, are a tragedy. They cite the use of teachers with minimal, short-term training in bicultural skills, assisted by bilingual aides, as an inadequate response to Hispanic needs.

Desegregating School Systems Should Establish Clear Disciplinary Guidelines

In Item 53, we asked respondents: "What particular practices for administering discipline do you think are most effective and fair?" Their responses in order of frequency were:

1. Establish clear rules of discipline (9 responses);
2. Strong administrative leadership already articulating acceptable behavior (5 responses);
3. Involve students above the sixth grade in the establishment of school discipline codes (5 responses);
4. Administer discipline even-handedly, avoiding disproportionate blaming of minorities (3 responses);
5. Increase home involvement (2 responses);
6. Make sure rules are widely discussed and disseminated (2 responses);
7. Avoid use of suspensions, expulsions or corporal punishment (2 responses);
8. Sound district level policy (1 response).

The national experts' recommendations underscore a concern that disciplinary procedures in schools are inadequately developed, articulated, and enforced. The unanimous recommendation expressed by the respondents is that due process procedures will reduce the disproportionate disciplining of minority students. In addition, the respondents concur in their disapproval of the extensive use of suspensions and expulsions.

School Desegregation can be Used to Encourage Change in School Systems.

Several of the experts interviewed (36%) agreed that it is generally easier to adopt new school improvements when desegregation occurs. Only one respondent reported that it may be more difficult due to the resistance of teachers unions. For those indicating it would be easier, some explained that desegregation is a time that facilitates change throughout school functions and processes. Others identified three conditions that may lead to the initiation of school improvements. First, administrators will want to improve the schools' educational quality in order to mollify parents. Indeed, the experts report that assuring the educational quality of schools is especially important for retarding flight and ensuring public

acceptance of school desegregation. Second, opponents of school desegregation will be more willing to accept implementing new programs for busing trade-offs. Finally, the experts reasoned that teachers anticipating or experiencing the initial stages of desegregation may be less confident and more receptive to accepting assistance.

These conditions are important to recognize as they represent ways for school systems to introduce creative innovations in schools for the educational benefit of students. Below we report educational improvements viewed by the expert respondents as providing opportunities to improve the effectiveness of desegregation.

The respondents were asked to identify specific programs or curricula that can be introduced to improve race relations (Item 45). A list of the major recommendations follows:*

1. Cooperative team learning in the classroom, e.g., programs developed by Kajan at the University of California-Riverside based on Slavin and Madden's work at Johns Hopkins University;

2. Multiethnic curricula;

3. Status equalization: programs modeled on the work of Elizabeth Cohen;

4. JIGSAW program developed by Aronson;

5. Developing biracial and tri-ethnic student advisory committees with resources adequate to facilitate regular student exchanges of ideas;

6. Increase school community support of and participation in existing and new extra-curricular activities.

Expert respondents also provided insights into the reasons for the success of these programs. Programs centered on cooperative learning approaches and status equalization were credited with providing a common goal, establishing a mutually shared dependency for successful goal attain-

* For details about several of the curricular programs named, see the section on Structural and Curricular Changes in Schools in the "Synthesis" volume of this Project (Vol. 1).

ment, and generally emphasizing cooperation. The Slavin version of cooperative team learning was also deemed successful for its ease of application.

In addition to the emphasis on fairness and equity in these programs, respondents felt students were enjoying school more where these programs were in effect. This was partly attributed to the programs' success at equalizing status relations between low and high ability students and partly to efforts in making the curriculum more racially and ethnically representative. One respondent with extensive experience in desegregation litigation noted the increased granting of educational improvements in court decisions and recommended that better dissemination of evaluative studies of these curricular programs would be beneficial to him and his colleagues.

The recommendations for biracial/tri-ethnic student committees and increased extracurricular activities address two central concerns: 1) increasing the opportunity for effective communication in a racially mixed student body, and 2) providing increased opportunities for students to develop a sense of being part of the school community. These recommended strategies are in many ways less difficult to implement, are perhaps less costly and may not [illegible]re as much change within schools. They have the disadvantage, however, of being somewhat removed from the core mission of schools--education. Thus, while they both may enhance race relations, the educational returns may not be forthcoming. In addition, although not as many administrators or teachers may be involved in these activities, they remain primary determiners of the school's social climate.

The curricular programs are not without fault either. Many teachers may resist these new practices because they require more work. Also, these practices may not be available to all students in the same schools.

Nonetheless, even though the evidence is limited, among those respondents providing a substantive response, well over half considered the programs effective.

In addition to the cooperative learning techniques and equal status programs named above, the respondents identified the use of magnet schools and innovative curricula as effective responses to the challenges accompanying school desegregation. Magnets and enriched curricular programs were said to be successful because they draw administrative support and enhance the perceptions of the public that schools retain their commitment to educational quality.

Magnets were considered to be effective in producing desegregation only in a limited context and under the following conditions: 1) when part of a mandatory plan, as in Boston or Racine; 2) when there is a small number of minority sutdents, as in Takoma, Washington; or 3) when all schools are magnets. Because of the attention given to magnets as a desegregation strategy, the following list enumerates the experts' opinions on the advantages, disadvantages and conditions under which magnets would be recommended as part of a reassignment plan.

Advantages of Magnet Programs:

* maintains white and middle class students
* maximizes individual choice within context of desegregation
* schools may be better
* thrust on educationl programs, advancement
* educational creativity and innovation
* attention focused on race issues-psychologically beneficial
* high schools can specialize curricula at low cost
* mandatory - make positive impact on white parents
* creates impression of quality elite education, improves self-esteem
* opportunity for parents to get involved
* provides options in a mandatory plan.

Disadvantages of Magnet Programs:

* cost ($)--no permanent funds allocated

* inconvenience to pupils
* when in minority neighborhoods, community often loses access
* focusing resources on magnet deprives other schools
* faced with parochial loyalties and community priorities, they remove educational influence of parents--no substantial involvement of community
* discriminate against minority students
* won't desegregate alone
* may resegregate rest of schools
* creates a dual system in which other schools considered less prestigious
* cream off best minority students
* no intentions for them to be really powerful factors for desegregation
* draw attention to desegregation provoking criticism
* sap community and parent resources
* none
* location often causes magnets to fall
* copout for not developing a comprehensive plan.

Circumstances Under Which Magnets Could Be Recommended:

* mandatory plan component:
  as a way to handle problem of creaming
  as a way to avoid resegregation
* when there is extreme racial isolation and concentration in few schools
* blacks in charge--commitment to quality schooling
* have to be sure not just a delaying mechanism
* have 4 schools grouped together so students could have choices of programs
* only as one aspect of a desegregation plan, not as ENTIRE plan
* in smaller school systems, with good, supportive administration
* only as TEMPORARY measure
* when there is much opposition
* should provide access to higher education
* should incorporate educational innovation and improvement
* always when given sufficient time for effectiveness to develop.

Pupil Assignment Strategies that will Achieve and Maintain the Targeted Racial Composition

Respondents were asked to comment on pupil assignment strategies that provide the greatest likelihood of achieving and maintaining the racial composition sought in the plan. Three specific pupil assignment strategies were named: metropolitan, pairing/grouping schools and magnets. Generally, experts felt that the plans should be comprehensive, equitable, accommodate parent involvement and secure parent and community support if the desired racial

composition was to be maintained.

Specifically on the issue of equity in burden, the experts were in near total agreement that disproportionate busing of blacks was unjust, unfair and tended to reinforce the belief that racial isolation is a black problem. Moreover, their response suggests that plans that are less equitable will increase minority resistance to busing. At the same time the experts stated that some apparent busing inequities may be inescapable in places where blacks are heavily concentrated and the school building facilities will not hold a sufficient number of students to achieve a truly equitable balance, as was the case in New Castle County, Delaware. Moreover, they add that some inequities may be politically necessary in order to prevent white flight and enhance the stability of desegregation plans. The experts were nonetheless able to identify several sites where they felt two-way busing was operating and where white flight was minimal or non-existant. Thus, there is the perception that two way busing can and does work in a variety of places with different size school districts.

Pupil Assignment Plans that Yield Educational Benefits to Students

Many pupil assignment strategies were identified by the experts as having a direct or indirect impact on the educational achievement of students. The responses reveal a concern about the use of strategies which group disadvantaged students together, and stress likewise the disproportionate busing burden on minority students. In addition to reiterating the advantages of magnet programs, several of the experts' suggestions which follow endorse pupil assignment strategies which necessarily inform educational programs and opportunities:

1. Magnets
2. Strategies that entail some voluntary component, e.g., magnet
3. Plans encompassing a smaller region and emphasizing parent involvement

4. Strategies emphasizing community involvement in process and knowledge of the plan
5. Assignments that avoid grouping only disadvantaged students from two or more ethnic groups
6. Strategies that do not put burden on white students
7. Strategies that do not count non-black minorities as white, maintain economic diversity and avoid too large/too small ethnic group concentrations
8. Avoid placing burden of displacement on minorities and maintain minimum (30%) and maximum (2/3) of each group
9. Strategies that minimize social class differences between races and avoid small proportions of minorities spread around too thinly
10. Cross district strategies dividing district into geographic areas that resemble large neighborhoods
11. Strategies that entail a thorough plan and avoid tokenism
12. Avoid one-grade schools and pairing in some instances
13. Mandatory strategies that avoid busing students from communities where some racial mix already exists

Planning Time for School Desegregation and Phasing in of Plans

National experts were asked to comment on the amount of time a desegregating school system should be allowed for planning and preparation prior to implementation, and whether or not "phasing-in" of a plan should be allowed and under what circumstances.

The optimal time period specified was "one year" by more than 50% of the respondents. Most explained that this was a sufficient amount of time once the courts had announced its decision. A longer delay could facilitate the growth of opposition, communicate a lack of commitment to implementation, or allow for considerable flight to other districts as well as alternative schools. A leading civil rights attorney said that the law requires immediate remedy and that once a decision is rendered, any unrequired delay constitutes a violation. Similarly an academician who has studied white flight extensively reported that long planning time and drawn-out debate can exacerbate negative public response and generate more white flight. In all, the consensus of the national experts was one year for planning and preparation.

There was even greater consensus about "phasing-in" plans. The experts found almost no merit in "phasing-in" plans. In particular, those plans that elect to phase in by geographic area were roundly denounced for increasing negative public response. Whereas some areas might feel "picked on," others would feel excluded, but would have additional time to develop arguments to oppose desegregation or to seek alternative schools.

The only conditions under which "phasing-in" was acceptable was by beginning with the earliest grades (K-6), and on a district wide basis. The reasoning behind this was that according to the experts, research suggests that the benefits of school desegregation were more identifiable when it began in the lower grades and that student relations in the higher grades were somewhat more problematical. In general, however, phasing in was not reported to be a favorable strategy.

Results of Local Expert Interviews

Interviews with local experts on school desegregation were conducted in 18 school districts. A total of 95 individuals were interviewed by senior researchers employed by the project. In each site a single researcher interviewed all respondents using a prepared instrument containing mainly open-ended items. These interviews were conducted between July and November of 1980. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes, conducted in person or by telephone.

The repondents in this study were chosen because it was believed they would be especially capable of providing insights to the school desegregation process in their community. Table C-1 identifies the roles of the person interviewed for each site. The only position not represented in the sample is that of judge. Beyond this we have been fortunate in securing the cooperation of many persons well placed for the information

sought in this research. The majority of our respondents are school system administrators including 11 superintendents and assistant superintendents, 31 other system administrators (central office staff, coordinators, desegregation planners), and four teachers and one principal. Overall, school system personnel comprise just about half of our respondents. The next largest categories of respondents are school board members (12), followed by state/federal employees (9) and civic leaders (7). The positions represented provide a diverse set of perspectives.

The sites in which these interviews were conducted are also quite representative of variations in desegregation plans (voluntary vs. mandatory, magnet-mandatory, mainly magnet), length of experience with desegregation (Charlotte-Mecklenberg was the first busing plan), and in size--Charlotte-Mecklenberg, Boston, Tampa-Hillsborough County, Louisville, and Denver are all large systems in contrast to Shaker Heights, Stockton and Riverside. Additionally, there are differences in cultural, racial and ethnic composition of systems' student bodies due to regional variations. For example, while Louisville, Charlotte-Mecklenberg and Atlanta are southern school districts that are mainly bi-racial, Tucson and Denver are western systems with substantial Hispanic populations, and Boston is a northern system which also has a considerable Hispanic population. Both Minneapolis and Seattle have substantial Asian populations, providing still another variable. These systems also have had very different histories with school desegregation: Charlotte-Mecklenberg and New Castle County were both landmark cases, the former for the initiation of large scale busing and the latter as a full metropolitan plan. While Boston experienced well publicized anti-desegregation protests, New Castle County implemented its plan peacefully.

These differences provide a valuable background against which the

findings can be cast, as well as the possibility for limited but interesting comparisons. The following pages present a discussion of findings based first on the single frequencies for the total set of responses (88 of the interviews were suitable for machine working) and then upon comparisons between sites on specific issues. This section concludes with a discussion of comparisons based on crosstabulations of selected items.

Local Experts' Views on School Desegregation

Local expert respondents began by identifying the specific techniques used to reassign pupils in their school districts. The most frequently identified pupil assignment strategies were open enrollment and magnet schools as part of a mandatory program, each named by 16% of all respondents. Another 4.5% of the respondents named magnets without specifying that they were a part of a mandatory plan. Because some districts in our sample do have voluntary plans, it was inappropriate to combine the two.

Following these pupil assignment practices were majority to minority pupil transfers identified by almost 15% of the sample, and pairing, grouping and closing schools identified by another 11.4% of the respondents. Because the local experts were asked to name all of the assignment practices in use in their system, when more than three strategies for assigning pupils were identified, a "multiple" code was assigned as the third category. The second most named assignment technique, magnets as part of mandatory plans, was named twice as often (21.6%) as the next largest categories—majority to minority pupil transfers (10.2%) and redrawing zone lines (10.2%). Magnets, then, according to our local experts' knowledge, are extensively utilized as part of mandatory plans. It should be noted that the "multiple" code for this item had to be assigned

to 36% of the sample, indicating that in many instances a wide range of pupil assignment strategies are used by desegregated school systems. The identified use of magnets agrees with the responses of national experts who primarily recommended magnets only as part of mandatory plans. Magnets were also criticized by national experts who felt that they were too costly, could contribute to resegregation, and might engender negative impressions of non-magnet schools of the same grade levels.

Irrespective of the techniques used to assign pupils, local experts overwhelmingly stated that their systems had made progress in achieving racially mixed schools (Item #5). Eighty-six respondents (97.7%) reported this to be the case and 64 (73%) indicated that the actual racial mix/ racial balance in the schools was evidence of substantial progress. The most often cited successes of the plans (Item 6) were "a better racial mix" (20% of the respondents) and "a positive framework and well accepted race mixing." The lack of other measures of success was noted by as many as 10% of the respondents. Importantly, however, 9% cited educational advances specifically and another 13% reported educational advances accompanying the reduction of racial isolation.

Even the "failures of the plan" that were most frequently named suggest the range of expectations local respondents have for school desegregation. With more than 30 different "failures" identified, only one was named by as many as 10% of the respondents: "the academic performance of minorities was not satisfactory." The next most frequently named failures were: "lack of understanding of cultural differences" and "low staff expectations of minority students." The implication of these responses is apparently that while progress in "racial mixing" does result from any variety of pupil assignment strategies, with positive race relations

improvements and some educational advances, there are still problems in minority students' educational experiences in desegregated schools. Underlying these failures were deficient levels of understanding and appreciation of cultural differences.

A series of five items requested information on community reactions to school desegregation. The first three (Items 8, 9, and 10) address the issues of busing burden and white flight while the latter two (Items 11 and 12) examine broader public response to school desegregation evidenced by monetary support for schools, political support for pro- or anti-desegregation advocates, and housing desegregation patterns.

Busing Burden

When the local experts were asked whether or not blacks in their districts are disproportionately bused, the overwhelming answer was yes. Fifty respondents, representing all sites except Stockton, California and Atlanta, Georgia, said that blacks bear an unfair busing burden. The four respondents from Charlotte and Boston were divided in their opinion. The same was true for Shaker Heights and Racine respondents. Six of the seven Stockton interviewees said no, making it unique among all of our sites. More typical were the responses from Tucson and Minneapolis, where all interviewees said yes, and from New Castle County, Evanston, and Milwaukee, where all but one of the respondents said yes.

Two patterns were revealed when respondents described blacks' responses to being bused disproportionately. On the one hand about 41% indicated that blacks ranged from being "very upset and seeking redress," to "tolerating," with equal numbers saying blacks were "mildly upset" or "understood the necessity for it, but were dissatisfied." In sharp contrast, another 42% of the interviewees identified the response of blacks as ranging from "not discernible" to "divided". In the

middle of this cluster, about 17% said they saw no disparity in busing.

It could easily be expected that in those sites where respondents were most unequivocal about the burden of busing, they would report that black responses were more clearly in the first cluster described above. This is what occurs for each of those sites, including Milwaukee, where only three of eight respondents are in the first cluster and the other five all said that "blacks are divided. . . ." For each of the other sites where the "burden" response was clearest, no fewer than half of each site's respondents are in the first cluster. Six of the eight Tucson respondents are in the first cluster, expressing stronger black dissatisfaction with the busing burden.

White Flight

About 59% of the local respondents clearly reported that white flight has occurred in their school districts; and 27% reported that most of this flight was primarily to private schools. In addition, about 7% said that although flight definitely did exist they were not sure where the students were going. Importantly, about 10% said there was very little white flight and another 4.5% said that whites were returning to the schools.

In both Charlotte-Mecklenberg and New Castle County three respondents out of four and five, respectively, indicated flight had been to private schools, and in Tampa six of eight of the school personnel concurred. This is an interesting finding given that these three sites all have comprehensive desegregation programs. In Evanston, all five respondents agreed that there had been very little white flight.

Public Support for Education in Desegregated Schools

Local experts were somewhat divided on the effect school desegregation had on monetary support for the schools. Twenty-six percent said there was no effect

and 30% said there was positive support. Very few experts reported a negative effect. Four school superintendents felt that public monetary support of the schools was substantial (Charlotte-Mecklenberg, Evanston, Shaker Heights and Minneapolis), and in Shaker Heights, all of the respondents reported strong public support. In Seattle and Tampa, almost all of the interviewees concurred that public monetary support for the schools had been strong since the implementation of school desegregation. The Charlotte-Mecklenberg superintendent enjoys telling how he spoke with a group of businessmen seeking support for a new school project costing about $20,000. According to him, the first ten businesses contacted provided all the money requested!

By contrast, all five respondents in New Castle County said that public response to the schools, expressed in dollars, had diminished. Shortly after the interviews were conducted, voters in New Castle County defeated a school bond referendum by a margin of 10 to 1. In other sites, like Tucson, Evanston, Minneapolis, Charlotte-Mecklenberg and Milwaukee, half of the respondents said that desegregation had had no effect. Twenty-four percent either could not determine, did not know, or did not answer.

Local experts' perceptions of political expression of public support for schools were likewise split. Almost 39% reported that local candidates supporting school desegregation had been elected and 19% said that school desegregation had had no effect. By contrast, only three local experts reported that supporters were defeated while six respondents said that it was too soon to tell. Nine respondents said that no local candidates supported school desegregation. Another 18% of the respondents gave no answer.

In New Castle County, where the monetary support for schools was viewed

as quite low, all five respondents reported that no political candidates supported school desegregation. In Shaker Heights, on the other hand, all respondents reported that candidates supporting desegregation had been elected. For Tampa and Seattle five and six of eight interviewees, respectively, felt that there has been strong political support since desegregation; the same holds true for three of the four Atlanta respondents. For Tucson, however, six of the eight respondents said there was no effect.

Another indicator of public response to school desegregation investigated in the interviews was changes or stabilization in housing patterns. About one third of all respondents reported that housing segregation had decreased due to desegregation. Another 3% said that housing stabilized with school desegregation, and nearly 22% said that housing segregation was unchanged. Ten respondents said that housing segregation had decreased but that it was not due to school desegregation, while another five respondents reported being aware that others were saying that housing segregation had decreased since school desegregation, but were personally not sure.

A few sites produced interesting responses. All Evanston respondents said that housing segregation had decreased since school desegregation. In Denver, Tampa, New Castle County, and Charlotte-Mecklenberg, a majority reported that housing segregation had decreased as a result of school desegregation. Also revealing were the responses in Tucson, where three respondents said that housing segregation was unchanged and four said housing segregation increased.

Responses on these different issues illustrate considerable complexity. For example, in New Castle County--a metropolitan plan--flight was reported even though the plan itself and the geography of the site made any move, especially out-of-district ones, quite difficult. In addition,

public support for the schools was said to have declined, whether that decline was expressed monetarily or politically, by ack of support for political candidates who advocated school desegregation. At the same time, the respondents all attribute descreases in housing segregation to school desegregation.

Evanston is a somewhat different example. Respondents there had clear perceptions about white flight to private schools, but had mixed perceptions about monetary support for schools. They all reported that the political support of the schools was "too soon to tell," while clearly attributing decreases in housing segregation to school desegregation.

Parent and Citizen Involvement and Training

Local experts were asked about parent, citizen and community involvement strategies employed during pre- and post-implementation stages of the desegregation process. While half of the respondents were unclear or uninformed about the type or extent of community involvement, many of the local experts indicated that citizen and parent groups did often take part in pre-desegregation planning. In both Tucson and Boston, however, all but one of the local experts said that there was no such involvement for parents and citizens.

While 22% of the interviewees reported that the involvement was in the area of plan development, another 16% identified plan development, orientation activities, and public relations as areas of participation. Evanston, Minneapolis, and Charlotte-Mecklenberg stand apart, with either all or three out of the four respondents agreeing that parents and citizens were involved in actual development of desegregation plans.

More than half of the local respondents were unable to evaluate the impact of this participation on the overall effectiveness of pre-implementation

activities. Among the remaining respondents, only four stated that the pre-implementation involvement was the most important feature of the planning phase. Another 20 said involvement was important and meaningful, and six reported the involvement was very effective. Finally, seven respondents said the pre-plan involvement was not critical but constructive.

According to 37% of the local experts, post-desegregation involvement of parents and citizens was primarily in the form of in-school committees, intervention teams, student-parent counseling groups, or district-wide committees. All but one of the respondents from both Tucson and Evanston reported that in-school committees were the main form of participation, while half of Milwaukee's eight respondents said that participation was mainly through district-wide committees.

As was the case for pre-desegregation involvement, post-desegregation involvement was reported by 39% of all respondents to be broad-based, with representation of the total school community. One third of the respondents, however, failed to specify who the participants were. In New Castle County, three of the four respondents reported that involvement was limited to parents, but also reported difficulty in maintaining the participation of black parents.

Also consistent with the pre-desegregation involvement responses, about 38% percent of the local respondents reported that planning was the primary area of involvement. Other experts specified the areas of extracurricular activities planning and policies (14%). Interestingly, only three respondents identified grievance/dispute settlement and only three said school discipline policies. For Tucson and Denver, all but one respondent reported post-desegregation parent involvement in planning. By comparison, four of the five Evanston respondents said extracurricular activities planning was

the main area of post-desegregation involvement.

At issue in the question of parent involvement was the extent of influence such "citizen" groups exert over actual implementation programs. More than 60% of the respondents said that participants either reviewed existing policies, with no veto power, or recommended new policy decisions. In both Tucson and Evanston all respondents reported that parents and citizens recommended policies and decisions. At least half of those interviewed in Riverside, Minneapolis, Charlotte-Mecklenberg, and Milwaukee responded in kind. For Tampa, four of the eight respondents said the involvement centered on personnel matters, while seven of the eight Seattle respondents said parents reviewed policies without veto power.

The impact of post-desegregation parent/citizen involvement was reported by 44% of respondents to have positive effects on acceptance of desegregation. This was true for over half of the respondents from Tucson, Denver, New Castle County, Evanston, Boston, Minneapolis, and Seattle. Although there was no general agreement about the impact of post-desegregation involvement on student performance, about one third of all respondents said there was a positive effect on student relationships. Important, however, are the non-response categories for these latter two items--57% and 47% respectively. Similarly, only 28 of the respondents attempted to evaluate the overall effectiveness of post-desegregation parent-citizen participation. Of those, 11 said it had positive effects for acceptance of desegregation.

Pre- and Post-Desegregation Training

Local experts were asked several questions about training for teachers, administrators, students, and non-teaching staff during the pre- and post-implementation stages of the desegregation process.

For both the pre- and post-desegregation teacher training items, there was a great deal of consensus among the responses given. About 61% of the

respondents reported that pre-desegregation training for teachers was conducted in their school districts, and about 68% reported some post-desegregation training. A clear majority in Stockton, Denver, Evanston, Boston, Minneapolis, and Seattle reported both pre- and post-desegregation training. In Riverside and Milwaukee, there were no responses indicating that pre-desegregation training of teachers was attempted. Neither the Tampa nor Racine respondents indicated that post-desegregation training for teachers was attempted and only one respondent from New Castle County reported any post-desegregation teacher training.

Only about a third of the respondents identified the content of the teacher training programs during the pre-desegregation stage. Of these, practical or applied techniques in the areas of classroom and crisis management were identified, by three experts in Riverside, Charlotte-Mecklenberg, and Racine. The remaining 35 respondents named some form of training directed at changing the attitudes of teachers--human relations, sensitivity training, interpersonal skills, and multicultural living.

This pattern of responses was similar for the types of post-desegregation training, although many more respondents identified content areas. One respondent each in Tucson, Riverside, Stockton, Atlanta, and Boston and two in Shaker Heights identified strategies focusing on classroom management techniques, while four experts in Tampa and one in Evanston identified training teachers in multicultural curriculum materials. Still other experts cited some form of training aimed at changing teacher attitudes--human relations, sensitivity training, multicultural living, and interpersonal skills.

Only about half of the local experts shared their perceptions of the impact of pre-desegregation teacher training. Of these only 16 rated the quality of this training as good (Evanston, Seattle, Minneapolis). Rating

their post-implementation programs, only Minneapolis and Shaker Heights respondents were in total agreement that their teacher training was effective. In addition, three of the New Castle County respondents felt that the post-desegregation teacher training in that site was effective. Several other respondents rated their districts' programs on a scale from passable to very effective, but had no empirical evidence to substantiate their evaluations. Moreover, it can be noted that three experts in Stockton and two in Boston were among the respondents that suggested that teacher training following desegregation was ineffective.

Pre-desegregation training for system administrators and non-teaching staff was also attempted according to 52% of the local experts. Thirty percent of the respondents provided no response to the inquiry about pre-desegregation training for administrators, while 37% did not respond regarding pre-desegregation training for non-teaching staff. As was the case for teacher training, pre-desegregation training for administrators and staff was primarily focused on changing attitudes and self-awareness. In addition, 17% said that administrators were given training in school management. Fewer than half responded to the items requesting an evaluation of training for administrators and non-teaching staff, and the responses do not reveal any clear pattern.

For each site, with the exception of Atlanta, no fewer than two respondents reported training for administrators and the same was true for training of non-teaching staff, except in Atlanta and Boston. Among the ten respondents who reported that administrators were given training in school management techniques, four were the respondents from Minneapolis. Similarly three respondents in both Tampa and Evanston reported that administrators were given skills-type training either in school management techniques or crisis/

problem management techniques. Also, with regard to the content of training for the non-teaching staff, Minneapolis respondents were all in agreement that the focus was on human relations. This was also true for four of five New Castle County respondents.

Finally, on the impact of training for administrators and non-teaching staff, Minneapolis respondents said that their programs were effective. In New Castle County four respondents reported that the impact of training administrators and non-teaching staff ranged from passable to effective, the same rating given by three of the Shaker Heights respondents.

Changes in Curriculum as a Result of School Desegregation

Local experts were asked about curriculum alterations, including changes in bilingual instruction offerings, that accompanied school desegregation. Slightly more than two thirds of the respondents gave substantive responses to the curriculum questions and about half addressed bilingual instruction issues.

Curriculum alterations. When asked whether school curriculum had undergone a series of changes as a result of desegregation, most respondents in eight sites, answered yes (Riverside, Stockton, Denver, Boston, Charlotte-Mecklenberg, Shaker Heights, Seattle and Racine). In New Castle County and Tucson, experts were unanimous in reporting curriculum alterations as a result of desegregation (5 and 3 respectively).

There was considerable diversity among responses about precisely how the curriculum had changed. Three different types of alterations were identified, although there seemed to be the impression that the changes were not solely attributable to desegregation, but to normal adjustments as well. About 36% stated that the curriculum was altered to reflect a multicultural approach. Eight of these respondents said that

the changes were supplemental while another nine thought that these changes were well integrated into the curriculum. Eleven percent stated that the changes were implemented to enhance the overall quality of educational offerings (e.g., more courses at the high school level, gifted and talented programs, and special magnet programs). Finally, just three respondents reported that accommodations had been made in the curriculum for the new economic diversity or remedial needs of youngsters. One consistency was that respondents in Tucson, Riverside, Stockton and Seattle, sites which are all tri-ethnic, more often stated that changes reflected a multicultural emphasis.

Bilingual education. Local experts were divided in their perceptions of the best strategies for teaching students with limited capacity for speaking English. Eleven experts suggested bilingual instruction involving English as well as non-English speaking students--a multiethnic curriculum. Another 11 recommended an English as a Second Language approach with instruction in English separated from other courses taught in students' native language. In Tucson, the respondents were divided equally between the multiethnic approach and the pull-out program. In Denver, Evanston and Boston, respondents preferred the pull-out approach also. In Shaker Heights, where there is a less concentrated Hispanic population, three respondents indicated that tutoring would be an effective, appropriate strategy.

As a follow-up to this more general question, experts were asked about the character of special programs for Hispanic students introduced in their school systems. The dominant program was bilingual instruction with English speaking students involved. Half of the experts that gave a substantive response identified this approach. Interestingly private tutoring provided by parents

was the second most named strategy (ten respondents), followed by pull-out type programs (nine respondents).

Seven of the eight Tampa respondents named the multiethnic approach as did four of five in Shaker Heights and all three who gave substantive responses in Milwaukee. In Tucson, three of the four experts giving substantive responses named private tutoring provided by parents as did two of three experts responding substantively in Riverside and Stockton. In Evanston three respondents named pull-out programs.

About 38% of all respondents thought that there was conflict between desegregation and bilingual/bicultural programs, yet provided different reasons. While 17% said it was due to Hispanic preferences, 11% said it was due to the pull-out character of the programs. Another 9% did not identify the basis of the conflict. For both Tampa and Shaker Heights, a clear majority of the experts felt that Hispanic preferences were the basis of the conflict, although other Tampa respondents said that there was no conflict. About 34% of the respondents either did not address this question or said they could not determine if such conflict exists.

Resegregation in Desegregated Schools

Local experts were questioned about the existence of one-race classrooms in schools and their opinions about why they exist. In addition, they were asked about discipline problems following school desegregation, especially disproportionate disciplining and suspension of minority students.

Local experts were quite clear about the existence of one-race classes--60% said they existed, about 23% said they did not, and 18% did not respond or did not know. In Tucson, Evanston, and Minneapolis, a clear majority of the respondents said that one race classes did not exist.

About 32% did not respond when asked about a reason for the one-race classes. The major reasons given were "ability grouping" (12.5% of the

respondents), and "student choices" (11.4% of the respondents). Other reasons were "counselor and teacher bias" (5.7%), and "testing practices for track/course level" (1.1%). Another 8% of the respondents named all of the above reasons. Seventeen percent named "other" reasons including "court-allowed segregated schools in the system," "white flight," and "bilingualism." The responses of experts in each site were too varied to suggest that one specific reason accounted for one-race classes in any one school district.

Disciplinary action. Respondents were asked whether disciplinary actions had increased since school desegregation. Just slightly more than half answered affirmatively, but several of the experts attributed it to school size, not desegregation. Of those attributing increases in disciplinary actions to school desegregation, 7% said it was due to teacher reactions to change. Nearly 13% reported that the rates of disciplinary proceedings had remained constant and only 2% said there had been a decrease. Five respondents, in Stockton, Denver, Boston and Shaker Heights, said there had been more disciplinary action taken in the 1970's but that that rate was now decreasing. However, in Stockton, Denver, New Castle County, Tampa, Minneapolis, Charlotte-Mecklenberg, Seattle and Milwaukee, there was considerable agreement that more disciplinary actions had been taken since desegregation.

Exactly half of all respondents said that more minority than white students had been suspended or disciplined since school desegregation. All five New Castle County respondents said that suspensions were disproportionate and that discipline procedures tended to penalize minority students unfairly. A majority of the respondents in Stockton, Tampa, Boston, Minneapolis, Charlotte-Mecklenberg, and Seattle responded similarly. The exact opposite was reported in Tucson and Atlanta where most of the respondents said either "no change" or "less now due to new procedures." Whereas 3% of the experts

said that minority-majority student discipline and suspension rates were not similar before and after desegregation, 26% reported no dissimilarity or problem.

While 16% of the respondents did not give a reason for the disproportionate disciplining of minorities, 38% of the respondents attributed the disparity to teacher biases or insensitivities toward minority students. It is interesting to note that in Seattle, six of the eight respondents attributed this disproportionality to teacher and administrator insensitivity to minorities. Only five respondents gave "minority student's frustrations with standards" as the reason.

When asked about programs to minimize disruption and disorder, and their availability and effectiveness, experts provided very clear responses only to the availability item. Nearly 47% said that some form of program had been introduced, but almost 60% did not provide a response to the question of its effectiveness. For those districts where programs were introduced, the following results speak in general terms to their effectiveness:

- fewer suspensions of minorities after in-service training,
- fewer suspensions of minorities after in-school alternatives adopted,
- fewer suspensions of minorities after new review panel, due process procedures adopted,
- fewer disruptions after students developed school behavior code,
- some lowering of the disproportionality, but still exists.

The distribution of responses over these categories was nearly even except for the first category for which responses were twice as frequent as any other single category.

Improving Race Relations

Local experts were asked to identify, describe, and evaluate the effectiveness of new curricular efforts to improve student race relations. In addition, local experts were asked to comment on the impact of racially mixed faculty and staffs in pursuit of this outcome.

Six different responses in equal distribution were given to the question of curricular efforts to improve race relations. Several experts indicated that nothing new had been integrated into their school systems' curriculum. Another group reported a series of changes which remained unspecified. A total of 23% of the respondents reported an increase in racial sensitivity in their schools due to newly adopted multiethnic and multicultural foci. The presence of human relations programs and accompanying staff in the schools was identified by 12.5% of the respondents as an effective strategy for improving race relations. Another 6.8% identified specific practices, such as the Green Circle and Sociodrama programs (National Council of Christians and Jews), and certain federally funded programs, e.g., home-school. Finally, a substantial number of local experts indicated that affective education programs also helped to further this goal.

More than 60% of the local experts did not provide their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of curricular programs aimed at improving race relations. Of those specific curricular innovations identified, the NCCJ and the home-school relations programs were believed to be the most successful. In addition, there was considerable agreement about the effectiveness of certain extracurricular programs (18%). Finally, affective programs were evaluated by some of the respondents as "marginally successful."

According to the local experts, the strength of the home-school rela-

tions program is first and foremost the improvement of student performance and behavior. This in turn influences the quality of relations within the school. Another positive consequence of human relations programs (Green Circle, Socio-drama, etc.) is increased interracial understanding and tolerance. This product is similar to the one attributed to the introduction of multicultural curricula. Students often feel more involved in school affairs and tend to support, participate in, and even publicize successful programs.

Responses about the shortcomings of curricular innovations pointed overwhelmingly to the issue of funding. Some experts stated that there was a lack of continuity due to the unpredictability of funding, while others reported that the programs had been discontinued because funds had expired. A lack of staff also resulted from the lack of financial support. Another weakness identified was that not all teachers and administrators participated in the programs offered.

Racially mixed staffs and faculties were given a medium or high priority by over 75% of the respondents. Although over a dozen reasons were given for the importance of a racially mixed faculty or staff, the two main reasons posed were that: 1) role models are important for minorities (12.5%), and 2) minorities in leadership roles correct the perspectives of majority members (30.7%). Also stated was the necessity to demonstrate effective interracial behavior that students could emulate.

Recommendations

The final items in the interviews with local experts requested their recommendations about how desegregation can be made more effective in general, and what one thing was needed in their school district to improve the effectiveness of school desegregation. Recommendations cited are

listed below:

Parental and Community Support and Involvement:

* more support by elected officials for desegregation
* strengthen communications between school leadership and members of the community
* improve community response to values behind desegregation; convince white parents of desegregation benefits
* develop strong community support for quality education
* need public relations programs

Curricular and Structural Innovations:

* develop staff commitment to curricular and staff changes prior to desegregation
* concentrate on diversity as a definition of desegregation; develop strong multicultural curriculum; train teachers in multicultural materials and new training techniques
* develop strong teacher commitment to quality education
* include instructional redesign in search of equity
* affirmative action for administrators and faculty
* more equity in resource distribution
* Jigsaw, team learning
* quality teacher training
* monitor each step of the school desegregation process

District Level Changes and Assignment Plans:

* long-range planning
* single district elections
* focus on creating excellent neighborhood schools
* coordinate state and federal housing policy
* implement metropolitan plans through state legislation
* don't phase in; use comprehensive plan all at once
* more court-ordered implementation

Other Recommendations:

* long-term funding for desegregation programs
* fundamental societal change; total dramatic system change

When asked to name the single most important strategy for improving the effectiveness of school desegregation in their individual districts, the local experts provided the following ideas:

* let teachers alone to do their job
* increase parental knowledge of schools
* improve school expectations of minority/low-income children
* increase interpersonal knowledge and racial sensitivity of teachers and administrative staff
* develop broad-based involvement of citizens in evaluation of the plan

* allocate community resources to preserve gains made
* more funding
* pursue housing desegregation
* improve quality of integrated schooling experience
* improve teacher attitudes and teacher training
* strenthen school and political leadership
* develop bicultural pedagogy
* change board election procedures to single district elections
* black and white parents must resist racism and oppressive institutions
* improve the curriculum
* move students more equitably
* encourage positive use of media
* get court to alter contract, removing seniority constraints
* remove political pressure from the desegregation process
* improve the educational system as a whole; concentrate on quality education
* desegregate staff
* whites must return to neighborhood schools
* desegregation orders must come from the state level
* reduce class size
* improve student activities

Synthesis of the Results of Local and National Expert Interviews

It is instructive to begin the summary of these interviews with a synthesis of the responses to the final question in both sets of interviews. The final discussion requested the national and local experts to identify what one thing was most needed to improve the effectiveness of school desegregation. The responses by both local and national experts varied but can be organized into eight categories. These are listed below along with frequencies for local and national expert responses:*

	Local Experts %	National Experts %
-Improved parental participation	9.1	--
-Improved teacher/administrator attitudes and within school race relations	19.3	10.0
-Educational improvements	14.7	20.0
-Improved school and community leadership	5.7	25.0
-Reduce minority burden	3.4	2.5
-Changed political procedures and practices	10.2	15.0
-Community change	5.6	2.5
-Increased adequacy of resources	4.6	2.5

*Actual responses were combined to produce these categories and frequencies.

The important issues for local and national experts clearly differ in two instances as well as showing some basic similarities. Local experts were insistent about the importance of parental participation while this was not identified by the national experts as a critical factor. On the other hand, national experts were at least four times as likely to identify the need for improved leadership as local experts. These differences probably reflect the closeness of involvement that local experts have rather than the actual relative importance of the two factors.

Both the national and local experts identified school-based issues as most important--quality education improvements, improved teacher attitudes and enhanced race relations. Whereas local experts pointed in number to the impact of changing teacher attitudes on within-school race relations, national experts named more often the goal of introducing educational improvements. The differential emphasis notwithstand these results reflect considerable concern for what occurs at the school level in desegregated settings. Finally, both local and national experts were keenly aware of the political nature of school desegregation, and the power political leadership and participation holds over the success of implementation.

These recommendations from local and national experts provide a framework for the following strategies that received some support from both sets of experts.

Summary of Findings Supporting Specific Strategies and Practices for Desegregated School Systems

Improved Parent Participation

Both local and national experts identified parent and citizen participation in the pre-implementation and post-implementation stages of desegregation as important strategies. In fact, national experts suggested that

parental involvement was an activity that could be used prior to the implementation and would lead to greater acceptance and success of the desegregation plan. Local experts reported that parent participation and involvement had generally positive benefits in their school systems.

Specifically mentioned were the following models of parent involvement: 1) independent monitoring committee linked to the court, 2) school building level parent committee, and 3) district-wide committees. The recommended authority of such committees varied from the power to veto to advisory only. Similarly, the range of activities in which these committees should be involved varied from involvement in the actual planning stages of implementation, personnel decision-making, development of and participation in extra-curricular activities, and involvement in school discipline practices. Especially important was the frequent mentioning of parent involvement used to improve public response to desegregation, by operating "rumor control centers" and by participation in pre-implementation of new school visitation programs for minority and majority parents.

Improved Teacher/Administrator Attitudes and Within School Race Relations

National and local experts both expressed support for teacher training programs. Training in human relations, self-awareness or sensitivity was not generally favored by national experts, but was most often the content of both pre- and post-implementation teacher training efforts according to the local experts. Other specific types of training were identified but the preferred training programs were those centering on specific skills: cooperative team-learning techniques, classroom discipline practices, and multi-ethnic and or multicultural curricular materials. Training teachers and administrators in these areas, in addition to human relations training, was perceived to have positive benefits for academic

achievement and status and race relations in heterogeneous classrooms. It was thought, moreover, to decrease resegregation resulting from ability grouping, tracking, and disproportionate disciplining of minority students. Experts reported training should begin prior to implementation and should be on-going following implementation. Several respondents suggested that while pre-implementation training anticipates challenges encountered in desegregated settings, post-implementation training was essential because it is then that the staff members become aware of their needs. As such, pre-implementation training often assumes a great deal about staff preparation needs, some of which is confrontational with staff self-perceptions.

Quality Education Improvements

Experts at the local and national level endorsed a variety of strategies regarding educational improvements. These include:

1. Curriculum development emphasizing multi-ethnic, multicultural contributions and materials.

2. Training teachers in new instructional techniques, especially those emphasizing status equalization in heterogeneous classrooms.

3. Limited and selective use of magnet type programs.

4. Avoidance or elimination of rigid tracking and ability grouping.

5. Increased use of bilingual programs with English speaking students involved.

6. Establishment and articulation of clear school disciplinary procedures and policies including the input of parents, students and school staff in the development of the policies, and the training of teachers and school officials in the development and administration of policies.

7. Establishment of racially and ethnically mixed faculties and staffs (including the central office) in all schools to improve minority student self-concept, enhance race relations and to foster a school climate of equity and fairness.

Improved School and Community Leadership

National experts were far more likely to focus on the need for better

leadership from school officials and community leaders than were local experts, both agreed that such leadership is needed for effective school desegregation to occur. Cultivating an effective relationship with the local print and electronic media places positive emphasis on the successes of the desegregation plan and provides an accurate account of progress. In addition, it was suggested that superintendents, school board members, and civic leaders should clearly state that school desegregation and the type of plan fashioned are legal requirements.

In addition to these two frequently cited strategies, experts advised that individual principals should express positive support of school desegregation, that the courts should send clear messages about plan implementation, and that teacher's unions should be constrained in their impact on implementation decisions.

Finally, national experts expressed a concern that desegregation plans that called for phasing in school desegregation were generally not desirable because they have a tendency to allow unfavorable sentiments to grow.

Reduce Minority Burden

Local and national experts were keenly aware of the disproportionate burden of transportation that minority students and families usually experience during desegregation. While most local experts reported this to be true in their respective sites, they gave mixed views about blacks' response to the burden. National expert were able to identify some sites where two-way busing was occurring with little white flight. One of those sites was Charlotte-Mecklenburg County where the superintendent reported that blacks and whites were bused at roughly equal numbers but not at equal proportions and that whites were returning to the school system. No particular strategy was offered as a remedy for this condition except for

attorneys interviewed suggested that such burdens may not be legal. Generally, however, the burden issue was seen as both a practical and political problem. In New Castle County, for example, the city of Delaware did not have the seats to accommodate a full complement of grades which resulted in the final busing pattern. Respondents there say that blacks are dissatisfied with the disproportionate burden but understand the practical necessity of it. In other instances respondents reported that the disproportionality was the political solution to creating and maintaining some stability in desegregated schools.

Community Change and Political Change

Experts voiced the need for community and political change in a variety of statements. Four specific strategies were suggested:

1. Pursue more housing desegregation.
2. Establish desegregation plans that are more closely geared to the specific characteristics of the individual district.
3. Change school board election procedures to create sub-districts in order to assume minority school board members.
4. Encourage more state-level desegregation orders.

Findings on the housing desegregation issue are worth noting. Local experts generally reported that some housing desegregation had occurred but that it was not all due to school desegregation. National experts agreed that school desegregation can facilitate housing desegregation and that two specific practices should be followed: 1) exempt naturally desegregated communities from the desegregation plan (this was done in New Castle County), and 2) encourage the participation of local housing authorities in the pre- and post-desegregation planning (this was done in Charlotte-Mecklenberg).

The Charlotte-Mecklenberg County superintendent reported that school

desegregation there had contributed to housing desegregation and that coordinated planning with the housing authorities along with a clearly defined feeder plan system had facilitated the stability of the desegregation efforts.

The remaining recommended strategies underline the perception of experts that school desegregation is, in large part, a local political issue and that increased attention must be given to the uniqueness of the specific site.

Increased Adequacy of Resources

Finally, local and national experts had somewhat mixed views on the adequacy of financial support for desegregated schools. In some sites, like Charlotte-Mecklenberg, financial support has remained sound while in others such as New Castle County, financial support has decreased substantially. National experts expressed concern that decreasing financial support for public schools should not be interpreted as a response to school desegregation solely but rather a response to public education generally. At the local level, however, experts expressed a need for better long term funding arrangements for teacher training, special home-school programs, special staff members (e.g., multicurricular materials expert), and for extracurricular activities (i.e., cost for late buses, participation fees).

Conclusion

The evidence provided by these interviews with local and national experts provides reinforcement for some issues, insights to others, and leaves some issues still less than clear. Nonetheless, while these perceptions and opinions are not indisputable facts, they assist in identifying efforts that may prove beneficial in the short and long term as well as providing insights that sensitize us to the variety of practices that

desegregation encompasses and the range of reactions to these practices. For these valuable insights, the Project staff is grateful to the cooperation given by each respondent.

Table C-1 Positions held by local experts interviewed for each school site

	Superintendent	Other System Adm.	Teacher	Principal	Minority Spokes-Person	Sch'l Bd. Member	Judge	Journalist	Researcher	Civic Leader	Mon. Cmte. Person	State-Fed. Off.	Consultant	Attorney for Plaintiffs	Attorney for Sch'l District		**Percent Minority Black	Hispanic	Other	Total	Total Enrollment	Plan Agents[2]
Tucson, AZ		4				1				1				2		8	5	27	3	35	59,627	1
Riverside, CA	2	3	1					1								7	11	16	1	28	24,515	5
Stockton, CA		4	1			1			1							7	16	30	9	55	27,032	2
Denver, CO		2				1				1	1	1				6	21	29	2	52	74,783	1
New Castle, DE		2				1				2						5	84[1]	6[1]	0[1]	90[1]	13,115	1
Tampa, FL	2	5						1								8	20	4	0	24	114,911	1
Atlanta, GA	1					1						1	1			4	88	0	0	88	82,438	1
Evanston, IL	1	2	1						1							5	28	2	3	33	4,297	5
Louisville, KY	1	2										1				4*	26	<1	<1	27	110,433	1
Prince George's Co., MD						1										1*	38	0	0	38	143,720	2
Boston, MA		1			1								2			4	43	10	3	56	73,782	1
Minneapolis, MN		1			1	1				1						4	15	1	7	23	50,988	1
Montclair, NJ												2				2*	42	1	2	45	6,267	2
Charlotte, NC	2								1			1				4	37	<1	<1	38	77,313	1
Shaker Heights, OH		2	1	1		1										5	34	0	0	34	6,706	5
Seattle, WA		2				2		2	1						1	8	18	3	12	33	62,515	5
Milwaukee, WI		1			1	1				2		1	2			8	37	5	2	44	108,798	1
Racine, WI	1					1		1				2				5	15	5	0	20	27,601	5
	11	31	4	1	3	12		5	4	7	1	9	5	2	1	95						

*Not counted in any frequency presentations.

**SOURCE: U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Directory of Elementary and Secondary School Districts, and Schools in School Districts: 1978-79.

[1] Wilmington only

[2] Key to Plan Agents: 1 = Fed. Ct. 2 = State Ct. 3 = HEW 4 = State Agcy. 5 = School Dist. 0 = No Agent

Table C-2

National Expert Positions	Positions held by National Experts Interviewed
Academician/Researcher/Consultant	19
Dir. of Policy/Research Cntr.	7
Fed. Education Admin.	4
Desegregation Planner	1
Civil Rights Attorney	1
Superintendent of Schools	1

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL EXPERT

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewer. Use only those questions about which you feel the interviewee is expert. When in doubt ask the question but you might arrange the questions so that you begin with the individual's area of greatest expertise.

Person Interviewed:

Position:

Address:

Phone Number:

Type of Interview: Phone ____ Personal ____ Date of Interview_____

Length of Interview:

What is the basis for this person's expertise?

***

We'd like to begin by talking about pupil assignment strategies, their educational effects and their consequences for the racial composition of the districts.

1. There are numerous ways to reassign pupils so that racial isolation will be reduced. Are there any strategies you think are more successful than others in terms of the educational benefits to students?

2. Are there any strategies that are more successful than others in terms of their ability to achieve and maintain the racial composition sought in the plan?

3. Many desegregation plans require minorities to bear a disproportionate share of the busing. What do you think the costs and benefits of such strategies are?

4. Specifically, do you know of examples of "two-way busing", where whites and minorities participate proportionately in the busing and has white flight been a problem in that district?

5. Many school systems are employing some type of "magnet school" program to achieve desegregation. Under what conditions, if any, can magnet schools bring about significant desegregation?

6. PROBE: What type of magnet plans, if any, do you believe are effective in attracting and holding white and middle class students?

7. Beyond the point you just made, what are the advantages and disadvantages of magnet schools?

#_____

8. To sum up, under what circumstances, if any, would you recommend to a judge that magnet schools be part of the reassignment plan?

9. Are there any activities or strategies that a judge or school system might employ prior to the implementation of a plan, that will lead to greater acceptance and success of desegregation:

PROBE: What are these activities or strategies?

(For each activity or strategy, ask: Are there conditions under which this strategy is unnecessary or unproductive?)

PROBE for strategies related to (a) citizen involvement of various sorts and (b) staff training.

_____

10. People seem to have different opinions about the desirability of (a) long lead times for planning for desegregation and (b) phasing in a plan. What is your opinion of the most advantageous time period for initial planning?

PROBE: Why do you feel this way?

11. What is your opinion about the advantages and disadvantages of phasing in a plan, say by grade level?

PROBE: Why do you feel this way?

12. If phasing in is done, what approach to phase in do you think is best and why?

#_____

***

Let me ask you a few questions about the so-called "white flight" issue.

13. Assuming that they thought it desirable to reduce or eliminate white and middle class flight, what strategies could desegregating systems employ to do so?

14. What elements of the initial desegregation plans produce the most flight?

PROBE: Does this vary with different conditions?

15. What types of educational programs can be employed to retard flight from desegregation?

16. Are you aware of any districts that have been successful in attracting people back to the school system once they have fled from desegregation? If yes: which are these?

#_____

17. What did these systems do to attract people back?

18. In your opinion, are such strategies useful in most communities? If not: In your opinion, what are the conditions under which these "recovery" strategies appear to be successful?

19. Do you know of any communities or neighborhoods in which school desegregation has increased the amount of <u>residential</u> desegregation ?

#_____

20. If yes: What were these strategies and why were they successful?

21. Do you believe that desegregation affects public support for education in terms of (a) support for adequate spending and/or bond referenda, or (b) school board candidates who support desegregation?

Why is this?

#_____

***

Let me now turn to some issues related to putting a desegregation plan in place and achieving effective desegregation.

22. Once school desegregation has been implemented, what contributions are made by various types of structures for involving parents and citizens in the desegregation process?

23. What models for involvement do you think are most effective?

24. Specifically, what effects do the programs or activities have for students and for community response to desegregation?

25. Who should be involved? e.g., students, parents, teachers, others?

#_____

26. What should the authority and function of the group be?

27. Following initial implementation, what types of training programs for teachers, if any, are most effective?

PROBE: What do these programs do? What are they about?
How long should they last? Who participates?

#_____

28. Is there any hard evidence on what effects they have?

Yes_____No_____

29. Following initial implementation, what training programs for administrators appear to be most effective with respect to positive effects on students, teachers and the community?

PROBE: What do these programs do? What are they about?

How long should they last? Who participates?

30. Is there any hard evidence on what effect they have?

Yes___(please elaborate)_____No_____

#_____

31. Following initial implementation, should there be any training programs for non-teaching staff?

Yes_____No_____

If yes,

PROBE: What should these programs do? What are they about? How long should they last? Who participates?

32. Is there any hard evidence on what effects they have?

Yes_____No_____

#_____

33. What types of new educational programs, if any, do you feel are most important to assuring the effectiveness of desegregation?

34. What factors account for the success or failure of such programs?

35. Is it easier or more difficult to adopt new improvements in school programs as a result of desegregation?
Please elaborate.

#_____

36. What special programs do you believe should be introduced when Hispanic students are involved in the desegregation plan?

37. Where special programs have been introduced for Hispanic students, what have been their consequences?

38. What types of bilingual programs are most attractive to students who do speak English fluently?

39. Is the effectiveness of programs for Hispanics different for different Hispanic sub-groups, e.g. Chicano, Puerto Ricans or Cuban?

#_____

***

40. Some school systems may achieve some measure of racial balance among schools and still have substantial racial isolation within schools. Are there conditions and certain types of students for which special classes and programs are necessary, even if this results in resegregation?

41. In general, what can be done to minimize discriminatory resegregation within schools?

#_____

42. One guideline that is used to determine "acceptable" levels of racial isolation within schools is the provision that students, except those in specific educational programs for which a specific educational benefit can be demonstrated, may not be in racially isolated classes or groups for less than 25 percent of their day. Is this criterion sensible? Please elaborate.

43. Many principals and teachers feel that it is important to group students by ability within or among classes. What is your view of such practices?

44. If ability grouping is used, how should it be employed?

#_____

***

Positive race relations for all students is considered an important school desegregation outcome by many. There is a need to know more about what particular schools/school districts are doing in these areas. Let me ask you some questions in this regard.

45. Are there any specific programs or curricula that can be introduced to improve race relations among students?

Yes_____No _____

If so, please describe these.

46. What are the particular strengths of these programs in operation? What factors account for the success they have?

47. What are the shortcomings of the program? That is, in what ways could they be improved?

_____

48. Overall, have such programs been effective or ineffective? What evidence is available in this regard?

49. In particular, many school systems seek to improve race relations by altering teacher attitudes toward minority children and increasing their awareness of things that might result in racial tension. Have such training programs been effective?
Please elaborate.

50. There is much talk but little evidence about the importance of multi-ethnic curricula in desegregating schools. Do you know of any specific curricula that have been adopted that are effective in improving understanding among and/or knowledge about students of other races?

5 _____

***

51. Some people believe that school desegregation increases interpersonal and interracial conflict amoung students and/or between students and teachers. Do you think this is so? If yes, why does such conflict occur?

52. What can be done to minimize conflict and disruption, especially when it leads to violence?

53. What particular practices for administering discipline do you think are most effective and fair?

#_____

***

54. What priority would you give to ensuring that the faculty and administrators of a desegregated school are of different races and ethnic groups? Why?

55. Some people believe that students undergoing desegregation should have as much continuity with teachers and administrators as possible. Do you agree?

56. If yes: How can this be built into a desegregation plan?

#_____

***

57. Are there any other ideas you would like to share with us about how desegregation can be made more effective?

    a. Does this (these) ideas(s) apply equally to biracial and ethnic or multi-ethnic schools?

    b. Under what circumstances would this (these) ideas(s) work best?

    c. Under what circumstances would it (they) not work?

58. Are there any reports, studies, or other information relating to the effectiveness of school desegregation in this district that we could look at:

    Yes_____No_____

    (ASK FOR COPIES NOW)

59. Finally, what one thing do you think most needs to be done to improve the effectiveness of desegregation?

APPENDIX C

LOCAL EXPERT

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

_____
Interviewer's name

_____
Site

_____
Respondent's name

_____
Position

_____
Address

(Interviewers may introduce the project)

Thank you for giving us your time.

To begin with, this project, "AN ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DESEGREGATION METHODS" is gathering information from a variety of sources, including a review of quantitative research; a review of the qualitative literature and a review of court documents. This interview with you is one of several we are conducting with local, regional, and national experts: persons who because of their professional/civic involvements can offer special, informed insights into issues of school desegregation.

As the project title suggests, we are especially interested in insights about strategies, and practices that have been tried in your school district or which you are familiar with. The project focuses on five goals or outcomes of desegregation: ending racial isolation; improving race relations; enhancing academic achievement; avoiding resegregation and improving public relations. In the course of our interview, we will raise questions covering several types of strategies: pupil assignment; faculty assignment; community preparation and citizen participation; school organization and policy; monitoring: use of other community resources; training and human relations.

If, at the conclusion of these questions, and certainly as we proceed, you feel there are further issues, please feel free to elaborate.

Assessment Interview Questions

Could you please tell me about the pupil assignment plan in your District?

1. Is the plan wholly voluntary?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, go to 4. Skip 2 & 3.

2. Is the plan mandatory?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, go to 4, skip 3.

3. Is it a combination?

   Yes_____ No_____

4. Please describe how it operates.

   Open enrollment
   Optional School Zones
   Majority to Minority Pupil Transfers
   Magnet Schools and Special Programs
   Metropolitan Cooperation
   Housing Policies (e.g., open housing, scattered site housing)
   Site Selection and Construction Policies to Emphasize Racially Neutral Areas
   Redrawing Zone Lines
   Pairing and Grouping Schools/Closing Schools
   Modified Feeder Patterns
   Skip Zoning
   Grade Reorganization
   Renovations in Schools Receiving Bused Students
   Magnet Schools as Part of a Mandatory Plan
   Interdistrict/Metropolitan Plans
   Implement Desegregations Plans in Early Years (K & pre-K, 1-6)

5. In your opinion, has the plan made substantial progress in achieving racially mixed schools?

Yes_____ No_____

Please Explain

6. In your opinion, what are the successes/failures of the plans?

7. Will the current plan have to be revised any ? Why?

Yes_____ No_____

If no, skip to 8.

In some Districts where busing is involved, Blacks are disproportionately bused.

8. If thi is true in your District, please describe the response of the Black community to this condition.

Some Districts undergoing school desegregation report varying amounts of "white flight".

9. If this is true of your school district, does it appear that "white flight" or other forms of resistance by whites is different if they are desegregating with Hispanics as compared to desegregating with Blacks?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If there is such a difference, how do you explain it?

10. Is there information which indicates whether white flight has been to private schools within your district or to residential areas outside the district and what does the pattern appear to be?

Reactions to school desegregation varies widely from one district to the next and it takes many forms.

11. How has desegregtion affected public support for education spending in your district? for example:

    How have tax and bond referenda fared?
    How have cadidates who support desegregation fared?

12. How has residential housing segregation changed since school desegregation?

Some school districts report different pre-desegregation efforts that may influence the success or failure of subsequent plan implementation.

13. Prior to implementating desegregation, were citizens or parents involved in any way in developing the plan or deciding how ti should be implemented?

Yes_____ No_____

If sc.

who was invo.ved/how many?
Black parents
White parents
elected officials (non-school)
businessmen
what kind of activities
actual plan development
orientation
public relations

What were the results?

how would you evaluate this involvement?
could you give examples of what these groups desired and how it is reflected in the eventual plans?

14. Were there any special training programs for teachers, administrators, staff or students prior to desegregation? What, specifically, did these look like? What impact, if any, did they have?

Once school desegregation has been implemented a variety of efforts have been undertaken to assure its success. We would like your insights into some particular efforts about which there is concern.

For example:

15. Has the school district tried to involve the community in the desegregation process by establishing:

    a. in-school committees b. intervention teams

    c. student-parent counseling.

    Who were the participants?

    parents
    students
    teachers
    administrators

    What were the objectives?

    grievances/dispute settlement
    school discipline policies
    extra-curricular activities planning/policies

    How did they work?

    Met after school
    met during school
    reviewed policies/decision wf/wf-out veto power
    recommended policies/decisions

What effect did these programs have on (a) acceptance of desegregation, (b) student performance, and (c) student relationships?

Were any of these efforts effective with respect to the above?

Yes_____No_____

If so, please elaborate (one by one).

16. Since initial implementation, have there been any training programs for teachers?

Yes_____nO_____

If so,

a. what did these programs do? What were they about? How long have they lasted? Who participated?

b. Is there any hard evidence on what effects they have had?

Yes_____ No_____

c. If not, what is your opinion of such programs, and on what did you base your opinion?

17. Since initial implementation, have there been any extensive training programs for administrators to help them be more effective with respect to desegregation?

Yes_____ No____ _____

If yes,

(a) what did these programs do? What were they about? How long have they lasted? Who participated?

(b) is there any hard evidence on what effect they have had?

Yes_____ _____ No_____

(c) if not, what is your opinion of such programs, and on what did you base your opinion?

18. Since initial implemntation, have there been any extensive training programs for non-teaching staff?

Yes_____ NO_____

If yes,

(a) What did these programs do? What were they about? How long have they lasted? Who participated?

(b) is there any hard evidence on what effects they have had

YEs_____ No_____

(c) if not, what is your opinion of such programs and on whatdid you base your opinion?

(Restrict following to District Experts or LEA experts and superintendents)

19. Has the curriculum of the schools in the district been altered in any way as a result of desegregation?

Yes_____ No_____

a. How has it changed?

b. Do you have any idea about how many whites and how many minorities took part in the new curriculum changed?

Yes_____ No_____

c. How has it worked? Have these programs had different benefits for whites, blacks, Hispanics and other minorities? Please elaborate.

20. How have parents and others in the community reacted to these changes?

21. What approach to teaching students who have limited capacity to speak English have you found most effective?

a. if special programs have been introduced for Hispanic students, what are their character?

b. have other students been involved in these programs? How much?

Yes_____ No_____

22. Are there any conflicts between bilingual and bicultural programs on the one hand, and desegregation on the other?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please elaborate.

Following school desegregation, some schools can still have classes where there is little or no racial mixing. (A variety of conditions may produce these results and I would like your insights/opinions about some that have been identified.)

23. Is it true in this District?

Yes_____No_____

What are the reasons such classes exist?

24. Has there been a difference in the rates of amount of student disciplinary action taken since desegregation was implemented?

Yes_____ _____No_____

How do you explain this difference?

25. Are the proportions of minority and white students disciplined roughly similar?

Yes_____ No_____

if not, how do you account for the difference?

26. Have programs been introduced to minimize distruption and disorder?

Yes_____ No_____

If so, how effective have they been?

Positive race relations for all students is considered an important school desegregation outcome by many. There is a need to know more about what particular schools/school districts are doing in these areas.

27. Are there any specific programs or curricula that have been introduced to improve race relations among students?

Yes_____ No_____

If so, please describe these.

/continued

27. (continued)

a. What are the particular strengths of these programs in operation? What factors account for the success it does have?

b. What are the shortcomings of the program? That is, in what ways could it be improved?

c. Overall, has each program been effective or ineffective?

28. What priority would you give to ensuring that the faculty and administrators f a desegregated school are of different races and ethnic groups? Why?

29. Are there any other ideas you would like to share with us about how desegregation can be made more effective?

a. does this (these) idea(s) apply equally to biracial and ethnic or multiethnic schools?

b. Under what circumstances would this (these) ideas(s) work best?

c. Under what circumstances would it (they) not work?

30. Are there any reports, studies or other information relating to the effectiveness of school desegregation in this district that we could look at?

Yes_____ No_____

ASK FOR COPIES NOW!

31. Finally, what one thing most needs to be done in this community to improve the effectiveness of desegregation?