

70-22,972

ARMSTRONG, Willie Clifford, 1935-  
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITIONS OF  
PERSONS SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS  
CAPACITIES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1970  
Education, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITIONS OF  
PERSONS SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN  
RELATIONS CAPACITIES

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY  
WILLIE CLIFFORD ARMSTRONG  
Norman, Oklahoma

1970

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITIONS OF  
PERSONS SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN  
RELATIONS CAPACITIES

APPROVED BY

George Henderson  
P. J. Purpura  
John B. ...  
Chapman H. Stuart

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. George Henderson, chairman of the doctoral committee, for his patience, guidance, and encouragement during the development of this investigation. Grateful appreciation is also extended to the other members of the committee: Dr. Robert Bibens, Dr. Omer Rupiper, and Dr. Chipman Stuart.

A special expression of gratitude is extended to his wife, Prince, for her sympathetic understanding, patience, support, and encouragement throughout the investigation. In addition, grateful acknowledgement is extended to the Southern Fellowships Fund for financial assistance to study at the University of Oklahoma.

# DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to Prince,  
Kim, and Jada.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
The Specialists in Human Relations for School Systems . . . . .	2
The Application of Role Theory and Analysis to the Study of School Personnel. . . . .	9
II. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	18
Introduction. . . . .	18
Need for the Study. . . . .	22
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	23
Limitation of the Problem . . . . .	23
Definition of Terms . . . . .	24
III. METHOD OF RESEARCH AND PROCEDURE. . . . .	26
Method. . . . .	26
Procedure . . . . .	26
Selection of Samples. . . . .	27
Construction, Validation, and Administration of the Questionnaire. . . . .	28
Method of Presentation and Analyzation of the Data. . . . .	32
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. . . . .	34
Introduction. . . . .	34
Analysis of the Data from Sampling Procedures. . . . .	35

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
Analysis of the Components Used to Investigate Social Positions of Human Relations Specialists . . . . .	38
Professionalization. . . . .	38
Academic Training. . . . .	41
Experience . . . . .	47
Position in the School Hierarchy . . . . .	48
Functions and Responsibilities . . . . .	49
Roles. . . . .	59
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	63
Summary. . . . .	63
Conclusions. . . . .	65
Recommendations. . . . .	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	69
APPENDICES. . . . .	74
Appendix A . . . . .	75
Appendix B . . . . .	84
Appendix C . . . . .	85
Appendix D . . . . .	86
Appendix E . . . . .	87
Appendix F . . . . .	88
Appendix G . . . . .	93
Appendix H . . . . .	94
Appendix I . . . . .	95
Appendix J . . . . .	96
Appendix K . . . . .	97

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Human Relations Organizations and Agencies Comprising Sample I and the Types of Materials Supplied by Each . . . . .	36
2. Percent Distribution of Persons Comprising Samples II and III . . . . .	37
3. Distribution of Percent Returns from Data Collecting Instruments. . . . .	37
4. Percent Endorsement by 60 Specialists in Human Relations Comprising Sample II and 42 School Personnel in Sample III of Human Relations as a Profession in Process. . . . .	39
5. Percent Endorsement by 60 Specialists in Human Relations Comprising Sample II and 42 School Personnel In Sample III of Special Credentials to Denote Expertise . . . . .	40
6. Distribution of the Organization Affiliations Suggested for Human Relations Specialists by Respondents in Samples II and III . . . . .	41
7. Distribution of Academic Background Endorsements for Human Relations by 60 Respondents in Sample II and the 42 School Personnel in Sample III . . . . .	43
8. Areas of Expertise Expected of Human Relations Specialists by Respondents In Samples II and III . . . . .	45

# LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
9. Activities and Percent of 60 Respondents in Sample II and 42 Respondents in Sample III Perceived to Constitute Practicums, Field Experiences and Internships . . . . .	46
10. Positions Perceived to be Most Beneficial to Persons Serving Schools in Human Relations Capacities by Respondents in Samples II and III . . . . .	48
11. Distribution of Perceptions Held Concerning Persons Serving Schools in Human Relations Capacities in Regard to the Line of Responsibility for Specialists in School Systems . . . . .	50
12. Positions Perceived by 60 Respondents in Sample II and 42 School Personnel in Sample III to be Within the Supervisory Capacities of Human Relations Specialists .	51
13. Distribution of Functions and Activities Expected of Specialists . . . . .	52

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITIONS OF  
PERSONS SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN  
RELATIONS CAPACITIES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There have been few studies reported in the literature which dealt specifically with social positions of persons serving school systems in human relations capacities. Yet, educators and interested laymen have accumulated a great amount of information which could, if properly utilized, aid in the production and the maintenance of "good" human relations in both school and community interactions. Much of the failure experienced by teachers in handling problems centering on human relations prior to 1953 was attributed to teacher training institutions that were not optimally utilizing the available knowledge about human relationships to prepare teachers.<sup>1</sup> Although workshops were used as the main source for preparing teachers in the field of human

---

<sup>1</sup>William A. Van Til, "Research on Human Relations Program of Action," Review of Educational Research, XXII (October, 1953), 285-385.

relations, few critical evaluations of such programs are available. The absence of evaluation was consistent with the overall concerns of teacher training institutions toward this aspect of teacher training.

Concepts of education which emphasize the training of the intellect without regard to emotional development are often stressed in teacher education. At advanced graduate levels, particularly those leading to the doctorate and preparing for positions of leadership, the emphasis has been on abstract learning, memory, and intellectual powers rather than on human understanding. Then, too, the exceedingly bookish character of teacher education and the relative shortage of experience on the part of teachers in training with children, school situations, and communities tend to give us teachers who think a book is more important than a boy.<sup>2</sup>

The kinds of teacher preparation cited above are reflected in the methods used by too many teachers, counselors, and administrators to resolve human relations conflicts in the schools. In many systems, the magnitude of human relations problems has expanded beyond the trial and error approaches, competencies, and expectations of most school personnel. The net impact has been the increasing amount of unsolved intergroup, interpersonal, and intercultural relations conflict in school systems.

#### The Specialists in Human Relations for School Systems

Educational literature has provided very little documentation of attempts to apply role analysis to the

---

<sup>2</sup>Earnest O. Melby, "The Forward Look," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIV (February, 1951), 362-363.

study of "specialists" trained in the techniques of resolving human relations conflict in schools. The literature does attest to the emergence of specialists whose social positions are ill-defined and conflicting, in many instances, with other established positions in the school system. An investigation of the handling of human relations activities in California has led Brumenberg<sup>3</sup> to recognize the specialist as a "new breed of educator," one created in response to attempts by school systems to develop mechanisms to direct the changes implicit in the press for equal educational opportunity. The Consultative Center of the University of Oklahoma has begun to recognize its specialist as:

A professional person who is available to educators, community leaders, and interested groups to assist them in dealing more effectively with the highly technical aspects of problems related to education for desegregation and integration. He will be a full time person who is knowledgeable in the general problem areas as identified by the Consultative Center and will have a high degree of expertise in at least one of these areas, i.e., community relations, administrative and organizational policies, faculty interpersonal relations, and curriculum and learning programs.<sup>4</sup>

In most cases, human relations specialists do not have clear-cut definitions of their roles in school systems.

---

<sup>3</sup>Eleanor Blumenberg, "The School Intergroup Relations Specialist: A Profession in Process," Sociology of Education, XLI (Spring, 1968), 221.

<sup>4</sup>Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies: The Consultative Center, The University of Oklahoma, "Program Direction and Rationale for the Consultative Center for School Desegregation," Norman, 1968, p. 25. (Mimeographed.)

They are sure only of the urgent need for their expertise.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, conflicts in role definitions for specialists persist. Inadequate role definitions and lack of agreement or coordination among role definers have resulted in incompatibilities becoming part of role definitions. Such a pattern of role defining has perpetuated role ambiguity.<sup>6</sup>

In spite of the ambiguity surrounding the role of human relations specialists, many educators envision the emergence of a "human relations" profession. Hopefully, the profession will be founded upon an understanding of the theoretical structure of some department of learning or science, and upon the abilities that are applied to the practical affairs of man.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, as a profession it will have a basis of systematic theory; its authority will be recognized by the clientele of professional groups; it will have a broad community sanction; it will have a code of ethics regulating relations of professional persons with clients and with colleagues, and it will have a professional culture sustained by formal professional associations.<sup>8</sup> Some educators are not optimistic in viewing full

---

<sup>5</sup>Blumenberg, "A Profession in Process," p. 221.

<sup>6</sup>Robert L. Kahn, et al., Organizational Stress (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1954), p. 21.

<sup>7</sup>Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, Professionalization (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 49.

<sup>8</sup>Earnest Greenwood, quoted in Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, Professionalization (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 9.

professionalization for human relations specialists in schools. Most skeptics have placed human relations specialists in the category of marginal professionals whose roles are not consonant with existing professionals and, consequently are surrounded with ambiguity and inconsistencies. By definition, the situation describing specialists' role implies inadequate fulfillment of some of the expectations associated with it, or role marginality.<sup>9</sup>

In acknowledging that full professionalization had not been reached, Allen<sup>10</sup> suggested professionalization as the prime goal of intergroup relations officials during the 1960's, whether it was a totally independent profession or in alignment with some of the other disciplines such as education, social work or public administration. To insist that intergroup relations has achieved professional status is to generalize without the benefit of either quantitative or qualitative data. Among the obstacles which have retarded efforts to build a structure of professionalism for human relations specialists, have been the lack of a systematic body of literature and standardized curricula. Further obstructions to full professional status of specialists have been attributed to the absence of certain standards of ethics,

---

<sup>9</sup>Walter I. Wardell, "A Marginal Professional Role: The Chiropractor," Social Forces, XXX (April, 1952), 340.

<sup>10</sup>Alexander J. Allen, "Professionalization of Intergroup Relations Work and Workers," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960), 36.

the lack of competence, and inadequate performance. To obtain professionalization, the public and the employing agencies, it was observed, must understand, appreciate, and demand adherence to standards and be prepared to pay proper compensation for the services rendered. In an attempt to evaluate strides toward professionalization, Scherner compared the positions taken by human relations officials with the requirements for professionalism as formulated by Cohen.

Scherne concluded that:

- (1) The profession has well-defined functions.
- (2) Its philosophy and code of ethics may not be fully documented, but they are emerging, and getting them codified is only a matter of time.
- (3) There exists a reasonably unified pattern of organization.
- (4) The compensation received by most does not indicate the public is willing to pay for skilled and responsible workers.
- (5) The practice is not yet limited to persons with approved general and professional preparation.<sup>11</sup>

Floyd Davis, president of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials (NAIRO) stressed a desire for the professionalization of human relations workers in a recent inaugural address.

Some believe that NAIRO cannot be of much help to a government with the social objectives and means of achieving them without sound, professional criteria and standards for its professional personnel. With no sustained program of professional education, recruitment, or training, many believe that NAIRO's job placement service is merely a game of musical chairs.

---

<sup>11</sup>George Scherner, "Professionalism and Intergroup Workers," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960), 48.

Many among us, seriously believe that if NAIRO is to be a professional organization, it must have a profession to organize and that making intergroup relations a profession should be a priority concern of NAIRO.<sup>12</sup>

Other evidence of the strides NAIRO has made in the direction of professionalizing specialists are exemplified in the stated functions of the organization:

1. Serving the field or profession through efforts to improve and upgrade the level of practice and performance of individuals and organizations working in the field and the caliber of those being recruited to it;
2. Serving the professional worker through efforts to secure adequate salaries, decent working conditions, proper job-security, and recognition of professional integrity so that competent, qualified persons may be attracted to and retained in the field;
3. Serving in an umbrella capacity for a variety of agencies undertaking a common project, where none of them could do it alone--enabling or initiating multiple-agency efforts.
4. Serving as a spokesman for the profession in a voice that is recognized as representative of the best thinking in the field, with no special axe to grind;
5. Furthering the exchange of experience and knowledge among professional workers and others concerned with racial, religious, and ethnic relationships;
6. Furthering the study, analysis, and research of problems and developments affecting intergroup relations;
7. Furthering the collection, compilation, and dissemination of information and ideas regarding programs, methods and techniques; and
8. Furthering the professional training of persons seeking to enter the field of intergroup relations as a career.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Floyd Davis, "Inaugural Address," NAIRO Newsletter (November, 1968-January, 1969), 3.

<sup>13</sup>Taken from the Membership Application of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Organizations for 1969.

Attempts to provide quality training in human relations have been noted in early efforts toward professionalism for specialists. Many such training proposals have incorporated field work and internships. The problems of professional training, observed Dodson,<sup>14</sup> were the same in human relations as in other professions. Speaking specifically about the training and credentials of specialists, Blumenberg<sup>15</sup> probably best summed up the lack of standardized credentials and educational experiences of specialists. She concluded: ". . . despite vaguely expressed educational and experiential prerequisites, there is no standard training or qualification." Most human relations specialists in California, she observed at the time of her study, had public school credentials and experience, several did not possess master's degrees, and only one had a doctorate. Other vague descriptions of training and experiences required of specialists serving schools in human relations capacities are obvious in the descriptions which follow. At the Consultative Center of the University of Oklahoma specialists are required to keep themselves aware and abreast of current knowledge related to the broad problem area of school desegregation.<sup>16</sup> Whereas in

---

<sup>14</sup>Dan W. Dodson, "Field Work and Internship in Professional Training in Human Relations," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIV (February, 1951), 337-345.

<sup>15</sup>Blumenberg, "School Intergroup Relations Specialist," p. 224.

<sup>16</sup>Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies: The Consultative Center, "Program Direction and Rationale," p. 27.

the Detroit Public School System, specialists are required to be experienced, certificated educators possessing a variety of skills and experiences gained in educational administration, community participation, and employment with other agencies.<sup>17</sup>

The absence of a single statement of standards of performance for the human relations field has retarded the drive to full professionalization. The difficulty, in part, reflects a difference in philosophy and a lack of agreement concerning role expectations. If the field of human relations is to grow as rapidly as the demands for its services, adequate ways of training its personnel and passing its specialized knowledge must be developed.

The Application of Role Theory and Analysis to  
the Study of School Personnel

Role analysis has been found to be a useful approach for studying school personnel. In many systems, an analysis of existing and future roles has benefitted school systems by reducing much of the conflict and ambiguity surrounding roles and role expectations. As a concept, does role have relevant implications for the study of human relations specialists in school systems? The following conclusions of Neiman and Hughes are presented in support of the adequacy of the concept:

---

<sup>17</sup>"Intergroup Relations Specialists," Administrative Handbook, Detroit Public Schools, August 25, 1969.

1. The concept role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and non-definitive. Frequently in the literature, the concept is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the concept, the assumption being that both the writer and the reader will achieve an immediate compatible consensus. Concomitantly, the concept is found frequently in popular usage which adds further confusion.
2. In spite of the literature of empirical research, by far the greatest amount of research has been in sociometry, but isolated studies have appeared elsewhere.
3. In spite of the confusion and lack of concensus, the concept role is at present an integral part of sociological vocabulary.
4. There is little research, but theorizing on the process and development of roles.
5. There is an increasing trend toward associating the concept role with that of status. Here is perhaps the most definitive use of the concept, and the one about which there is most consensus.
6. There are few, if any, predictive studies of human behavior involving the concept role. If predictive ability is one measure of scientific construct, this is a telling criticism of the construct.<sup>18</sup>

In support of the above statements, Deasy<sup>19</sup> noted the absence of a single unified body of propositions and empirical findings which fit neatly under the rubric "social role theory." Other writers have found the

---

<sup>18</sup>Lionel J. Neiman and James W. Hughes, "The Problem of the concept of a Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature," Social Forces, XXX (December, 1951), 141-149.

<sup>19</sup>Leila Calhoun Deasy, Social Role Theory: Its Component Parts, and Some Applications (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University Press, 1964), pp. 2-6.

utilization of the concept "role" greatly limited by vague and differing definitions.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, argued Kogan,<sup>21</sup> the concept has utility when used as a synthesis of related concepts such as "past", "expected behavior", or "character assumed or assigned."

Gross, Mason, and McEachern<sup>22</sup> sought to operationalize the term "role." Summarizing the basic ideas in most conceptualizations about roles, they concluded that individuals in social positions behave with reference to expectations. Out of this study grew a method of grouping definitions of roles into categories: (1) according to normative culture patterns, (2) as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and other social positions, and (3) as the behavior of actors occupying social positions.

The results of studies that focus on roles within school systems led Carter<sup>23</sup> to the not-too-surprising observation that all individuals and groups do not hold the same

<sup>20</sup>Edgar Borgatta, "Role and Reference Group Theory," in Social Science Theory and Social Work Research, ed. by Leonard Kogan (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1960), p. 16.

<sup>21</sup>Leonard Kogan, "Relationships Among Social Work and Practice, Social Work Research, and the Social Sciences," Kogan, Op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>22</sup>Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968), p. 3.

<sup>23</sup>Fred D. Carter, "Education Level and Family Income of Citizens and Expectations for the Role of the School Board," The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (July-August, 1968), 447.

expectations. Role incumbents tend to be frequently in conflict as to what they should do as well as how they should do it. Other investigations of professional roles in education have demonstrated that differences exist between and among citizens when grouped according to such factors as income, educational level, and occupation.

The study of expectations of educators in reference to their role and personality as change agents prompted Bos to hypothesize that the role of the teacher or administrator as a change agent in the public school was an emerging one, and that extensive knowledge about implementation of change was lacking. He concluded the study with the following generalizations:

1. In general, there are patterns of role behavior relevant to implementors of change which are congruently expected by administrators, teachers, and college professors.
2. Educators who respond to the study had similar priority of importance expectations for personality characteristics that were associated with change agents.
3. Teachers differ from administrators more than they do from college professors regarding the role expectations for the change agent.
4. Some significant differences of agreement applicable to certain role expectations prevailed among the three groups of educators.
5. Analysis of data revealed that the three groups of educators were more in agreement as to expectations of personality than with the aspects of the role behavior applicable to change agents.
6. Administrators and college professors are more in agreement regarding the expectations of role and

personality than when comparisons are made between administrators and teachers or college professors and teachers.

7. The three groups viewed the role of the change agent as being associated with a style of leadership which supports, assists, and gives direction to the personnel involved in the process of change.
8. The kind of individual educators expect as an implementor of change would possess in some degree personality characteristics which depict the change agent to be intelligent, emotionally stable, adaptable, experimenting, and enthusiastic.<sup>24</sup>

Further implications of the utility of the concept role were found in the School Executive Studies conducted by Gross, Mason, and McEachern. The researchers tested hypotheses involving expectations for the behavior of superintendents thusly:

Our trial interviews revealed that. . . actors frequently were exposed to incongruent expectations as incumbents of single positions. Different school board members had different expectations for their superintendents, as a superintendent, in the same situation. In other cases the teachers and the school board held conflicting expectations for his behavior as a superintendent. These observations led to the conclusion that a single as well as a multiple position incumbency may result in exposure to conflicting expectations, a possibility ignored by many students of role conflict analysis.<sup>25</sup>

In most cases--including school superintendents--the role concept has been defined to embrace normative elements

---

<sup>24</sup>James Herbert Bos, "A Study of the Expectations of Educators for the Role and Personality of Change Agents in an Educational Enterprise" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1966).

<sup>25</sup>Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Studies of the School Superintendency Role, p. 3.

of social behavior: People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants. Clearly, this position does not draw the fine line between the concepts "status" and "role" as does the present study where role and status are used interchangeably to represent social positions and the normative elements of behaviors associated with such positions. This technique of lumping role and status is not unique. Rather it is consistent with the definition of role structure developed by Johnson. "The role structure of a group is the same thing as its status structure, because what is role from the point of view of one member is status from the point of view of others."<sup>26</sup>

Among more recent attempts to operationalize the concept "role" to study school personnel was the study by Young.<sup>27</sup> Young utilized the questionnaire-survey method of investigation to collect data from colleges and universities concerning the training and experiences encountered by persons enrolled in graduate programs and courses in educational sociology and the sociology of education. The purpose

---

<sup>26</sup>Harry M. Johnson, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), p. 16.

<sup>27</sup>Caroline E. Young, "A Study of Educational Sociology and Sociology of Education in Relation to the Role of the School Sociologist," (unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1968).

of the study was to formulate a role-definition for "educational" or "school" sociologists. The study failed due to a lack of data, but it did shed valuable insight into the research and program planning competencies of the sampled school personnel. In a similar study, Braden<sup>28</sup> described factors associated with the role and functions of elementary counselors as perceived by selected elementary school principals, counselor educators, and state supervisors in the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervisors.

In a nationwide survey, Tanner and Tanner studied teacher aids to determine: their legal status in the classroom, and the distinction between their teaching and non-teaching functions. A questionnaire was sent to the chief state school officials of fifty states soliciting information regarding (1) state laws regulating teacher aids, (2) policy statement defining and delimiting their duties, and (3) their role and function as perceived by state education departments, whether there were laws or not concerning them. Rather than making clear distinctions, the study pointed out the extreme ranges of interpretations between teaching and non-teaching tasks. Although the use

---

<sup>28</sup>Billy Braden, et al., "Perceptions of the Elementary School Counselor," (paper presented at the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, New Orleans, October 11, 1966). (Printed).

of teacher aids was found to be nationwide, the study showed no discernible trend in the direction of their role or function.<sup>29</sup>

Sutker and associates<sup>30</sup> designed a study: (1) to depict the roles of vocational agriculture, trade, industrial, and distributive education teachers in Oklahoma, (2) to assess the potential for role conflict associated with their activities, and (3) to operationalize role theory as an approach for investigating educational problems. Significant disparities were found among the roles of the four types of vocational teachers as well as in the ways other people expected them to behave.

Role theory, as employed in the studies cited above, allows one to look at the structural components of the school system as a function of the expectations of the role occupants and those having counter roles. These components, according to Deasy,<sup>31</sup> provide the limits within which each person must carve out his own unique combination of roles, which comprise the substance of his interaction pattern. Role theory may further enable the educator to observe regularities in human

---

<sup>29</sup>Laurel N. Tanner and Daniel Tanner, "The Role of Para-professionals in the Schools: A National Study" (unpublished paper presented at the California Research Association Conference, Los Angeles, March 15, 1969).

<sup>30</sup>Soloman Sutker, "An Exploratory Analysis of the Role Conflicts of Vocational Teachers in Oklahoma," (Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, August, 1967).

<sup>31</sup>Deasy, Social Role Theory, p. 28.

behavior, and to be cognizant of irregularities, providing clues to what is appropriate against which to measure that which is inappropriate.

When conducted by competent investigators, role analysis has proved to be a valuable tool for conceptualizing the behaviors exhibited by and expected of school personnel. In light of increasing attempts to improve public education, new and different social positions are emerging. Often these positions materialize prior to attempts to systematically analyze or define the role expectations of the new role occupant. Consequently, to the dismay of school executives, role conflicts and duplications are created which place stress on the initial organization of the system and, ultimately, its stability. Role analysis has been found to provide logical answers to questions which should be asked prior to the employment of additional school specialists. In fact, through role analyses the right questions are being asked, leading to a better understanding of the roles to be performed.

## CHAPTER II

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

The studies reviewed in Chapter I provide only a limited insight into the social positions of persons serving schools in human relations capacities. The researches do, however, point to the absence of a philosophy of human relations upon which to build programs and courses for training school personnel in the skills and techniques of conflict resolution. The present exploratory study of persons serving in human relations capacities for school systems was desired in order to lay a groundwork for later, more systematic and rigorous testing of hypotheses.<sup>1</sup> Ultimately, the intent of the investigation was to assist in providing a base, and a philosophy of human relations for school personnel.

The formulation of a scientific base and philosophy of human relations was desired in order to make the

---

<sup>1</sup>Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 388.

reduction of human relations conflict in school systems an immediate possibility. However, the alleviation of the conflict is dependent on the improvement of human relations knowledge, skills, and understandings of teachers, counselors, and administrators. As long as there exist a lack of understanding concerning the total human relations dimension among school personnel, and divergent opinions within racial groups about problems and issues related to human relations in schools, ineffective methods of handling human relations problems and conflict will persist.

The absence of consensus concerning a human relations concept in education does not suggest its novelty or that its importance has been neglected in American education. The improvement of human relationships was formally recognized as a function and responsibility of American education by The Educational Policies Commission as early as 1938. During subsequent years, educators have constantly made attempts to improve relationships through school programs. Among the more recent attempts to make school personnel cognizant of their responsibility for the improvement of human relationships are those of the Committee on Human Relations Education<sup>2</sup> and The North Central Association's

---

<sup>2</sup>Report of the Committee on Human Relations Education, "The Teacher and Improved Human Relations Education in the School," J. B. Fox, Jr., chairman (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1966), p. 2.

Committee on Human Relations in the Classroom.<sup>3</sup> Both Committees viewed the development of understandings, attitudes, and skills which contribute to improved relationships between individuals and groups--the dynamics of human interactions--as important responsibilities of Education.

The failure of Education to adequately honor its commitment to the improvement of human relationships in the schools was verified in the findings of a survey of 1075 secondary teachers in North Central Schools. The survey showed that teachers were failing to respond efficiently and effectively to the great range of human relations problems and situations occurring in their classrooms. Many of the ineffective approaches which teachers, counselors, and administrators have used to resolve human relations conflicts in schools can be traced to deficiencies in human relations courses in teacher training programs. In this regard, the Committee stated:

Even though colleges give considerable attention to the less controversial aspects of human relations, more effective preparation needs to be provided in conveying information and understanding about relationships between age groups, between sexes, and students of varying intellectual levels. There is even greater need for adequate preparation to deal with the controversial situation of race, religion, social class, and nationality. Although the Committee's studies show that professors in education, social science, psychology, and anthropology provide most of

---

<sup>3</sup>"Human Relations in the Classroom: A Challenge to Teacher Education," North Central Association Quarterly, XXXVIII (Winter, 1964), 257.

the human relations education, it is quite apparent that teachers are not being adequately prepared to deal with children as persons, to work with parents of all kinds, and to understand community conditions which affect children's development. Although all kinds of methods are used to teach human relations, the direct learning experiences, which are most effective in changing attitudes, in developing sensitivity and in establishing values and skills, <sup>4</sup> were used by only a small percentage of professors.

This inept handling of human relations issues at the college level has contributed in part to the production of teachers, counselors, and administrators who neither understand their pupils nor are able to abate classroom problems. Therefore, many intercultural, intergroup, and interpersonal relationship problems persist due to a lack of preparation and training in the methods of resolving human relations problems rather than a lack of interest by the school personnel.

In-service training programs for school personnel, in many instances, have not provided the experiences needed to minimize the friction of interaction during periods of conflict and stress. Consequently, consultants, and other experienced leaders and knowledgeable persons in human relations have been asked to assist school personnel in finding solutions to their problems. In response to this request, state colleges, universities, centers for human relations studies, commissions on human rights, state

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 240.

departments of education, and other intergroup agencies have made qualified personnel available to school systems.<sup>5</sup>

### Need for the Study

Providing human relations personnel for schools with problems resulting from human relations conflict is too great a task to be left solely to outside agencies. Furthermore, the training of human relations specialists is too important a venture to pursue without the aid of colleges and schools of education. Teacher training institutions, according to the researches reviewed in Chapter I, need to assume more of a leadership role in designing better programs to train school personnel in techniques for resolving problems centering on human relations interactions. The present study was desired to assist in this endeavor by aiding in the development of a descriptive scientific base and a prescriptive philosophy upon which to develop meaningful courses and training programs for persons serving public schools in human relations capacities.

Since persons serving schools in human relations capacities have not, to any great extent, been subjected to role analysis, there is a need for the present study of the professionalization, training, experiences, roles,

---

<sup>5</sup>W. C. Carmichael, "An Instrument to Measure Attitudes and Opinions Toward Human Relations Issues" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968), pp. 86-87.

functions and responsibilities of specialists. The absence of a clear-cut definition for the specialists and the presence of inconsistencies in the social sanctions attending their roles have led to insufficient institutionalizations of the role of human relations specialists in school systems. The ambiguity surrounding the role of specialists, has also caused specialists to be characterized by inadequate fulfillment of the expectations associated with their roles. Hopefully, the study sought to aid significantly in (1) the production of valuable information which can be used in the formulating of a clearly defined body of literature called "Human relations," (2) the enhancement of professionalization and the preparation of specialists, and (3) ultimately, the improvement of human relationships in school systems.

#### Statement of the Problem

This exploratory study was designed to investigate the compatibility of the perceptions of (1) persons performing in human relations capacities for school systems, and (2) school personnel familiar with their services in regard to social positions of human relations specialists for school systems.

#### Limitation of the Problem

This exploratory study was limited to (1) persons performing in human relations capacities in American elementary and secondary schools and (2) those superintendents,

principals, teachers, and counselors familiar with the services provided by such persons. The study was also limited to an analysis of perceptions concerning factors of professionalization, academic training, experience, roles, functions, responsibilities, and position in the school hierarchy as components of the social position of specialists.

### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this investigation significant terms to be used are defined in the following statements:

Interpersonal Relations: Any social interaction or behavior involving two or more persons.<sup>6</sup>

Intergroup Relations: Any social interaction or behavior between individuals within a group or between members of different groups.<sup>7</sup>

Human Relations: The interactions of people and the many varied contacts in which persons influence and are influenced by others.<sup>8</sup>

Specialist in Human Relations: Any person responsible for interpersonal, intergroup, and human relations in a public school system. This definition recognizes the overlap of the terms "interpersonal," "intergroup," and "human" relations.

<sup>6</sup>Carmichael, "Human Relations Issues," p. 7.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>8</sup>William H. Kilpatrick, Modern Education and Better Human Relations (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957), p. 7.

"Good" Human Relations: Those ways of mutual behavior which by common consent are recognized as essential to promoting and safeguarding the desired quality of human living.<sup>9</sup>

Social Position: Both "role" and "status," where role refers to obligations and status to rights.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Lloyd Cook and Elaine Cook, School Problems in Human Relations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947), pp. 15-16.

<sup>10</sup>Harry M. Johnson, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), p. 16.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD OF RESEARCH AND PROCEDURE

#### Method

The descriptive-survey method of investigation was used to facilitate this exploratory study. This method has proved useful when securing evidence concerning an existing situation or current condition, identifying standards or norms with which to compare present conditions in order to plan the next step; and determine how best to take the next step.<sup>1</sup>

#### Procedure

Much of the procedural emphasis in this chapter was placed on the selection of samples; data collection techniques; construction, validation, and administration of data collecting instruments. Some consideration was also given to the establishment of a rationale for making meaningful interpretations for the data collected.

---

<sup>1</sup>Carter V. Good, Introduction to Educational Research, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959), p. 167.

### Selection of Samples

The selection of sources from which to secure data was of foremost importance. Human relations agencies and organizations currently providing services and specialists to systems were the primary sources for securing potential lists of job descriptions and participants. This decision was reached after reading A Directory of Intergroup Relations Agencies-1969,<sup>2</sup> and securing a list of directors of university-in-service consultative centers.<sup>3</sup> From these two sources, agencies and organizations expressing purposes which included the aiding of schools in the resolution of intergroup, interpersonal, intercultural, and human relations problems were selected. The directors of these agencies and organizations constituted Sample I in this study.

A personal letter (Appendix B) was submitted to persons comprising Sample I which included directors of: intergroup relations agencies; university in-service centers; human relations programs in school systems; and college and university human relations training and research programs. The purpose of the letter was to collect from the directors the following types of information: (1) names and addresses of specialists connected with their organization who were

---

<sup>2</sup>A Directory of Intergroup Relations Agencies-1969  
(New York: Brotherhood-in-Action, Inc., 1969).

<sup>3</sup>Supplied by the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies: The Consultative Center, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

serving in human relations capacities for school systems, (2) job descriptions (functions and responsibilities of specialists), (3) names and addresses of schools using specialists, and (4) the official human relations bibliography of the organization or agency. All specialists identified as a result of Item 1 above constituted Sample II of this study.

Forms A and B of "The School Specialists in Human Relations Survey Questionnaire" (Appendix F) were designed to obtain information concerning (1) how human relations specialists and school personnel familiar with their services perceived the professionalization, roles, functions, responsibilities, and position (line-staff) of specialists in school systems; and (2) what types of training and experiences were most beneficial to specialists. In addition to being designed to collect the types of data mentioned above, Form A of the instrument was devised to obtain the names and addresses of the superintendents, principals, teachers, and counselors which comprised Sample III: school personnel familiar with the services of specialists in Sample II.

#### Construction, Validation, and Administration of the Questionnaire

The job descriptions secured from the agencies and organizations responding to the personal letter and the current literature in the area of human relations education,

coupled with selected materials from disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, and intergroup education were used as the main sources for item selection in the construction of the questionnaire. The basic assumption underlying the construction of the instrument was that the literature reviewed represented the universe of items on the role, functions, and responsibilities of human relations specialists--their social positions. With this assumption in mind, a total of one hundred-fifty statements of functions, responsibilities, and roles pertaining to persons serving public schools in human relations capacities and related capacities such as social work, school sociology, and guidance and counseling were selected. A content analysis of the statements describing functions and responsibilities revealed three distinct categories: research, action, and planning. Additional categories deduced from the analysis included professionalization, credentials, academic background, areas of expertise, professional affiliations, types of experiences, positions in the school hierarchy (line-staff), and supervisory capacities. Those statements assumed representative for the categories listed above were developed into the items which appeared in the initial form of the instrument.

The completed instrument represented a composite of both structured and unstructured items. The final product allowed the respondents flexibility for free responses

when they were needed to clarify inadequate answers or to elicit more detailed responses. In other words, the questionnaire was designed to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data.

A commonly accepted method of validating items of a questionnaire and other measuring devices is that of using a jury of qualified judges to evaluate the items. It was decided that current leaders in the field of human relations and college professors knowledgeable, interested, and actively participating in human relations endeavors could best determine the validity of the questionnaire used in this study.

A panel of six judges, three professional educators and three human relations experts from the College of Education and the Consultative Center at the University of Oklahoma was used to validate the questionnaire (Appendix G). Since the formulation, selection, and grouping of the items in the questionnaire were based principally on information obtained from the literature, the judges were requested to evaluate the instrument and each item according to six criteria: (1) Is the item on the subject?, (2) Is the item clear and unambiguous?, (3) Does the item pull or have extractive power?, (4) Is the item sufficiently inclusive?, (5) Do the responses show a reasonable range of variation?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Douglass E. Scates and Alice V. Yeomans. The Effect of Questionnaire Form on Course Requests of Employed Adults, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1950), pp. 4-7.

and (6) Does the item need to be discarded? (Appendix H). It was decided that approval of an item by four of the six judges, as indicated by their response to Item 6 above, was sufficient to include the item in the final form of the questionnaire since this represented a majority decision of judges. None of the original items were discarded. However, certain items were revised and the position of others in the questionnaire was changed.

Prior to the preparation and distribution of the final form, a pre-test was conducted. The questionnaire was submitted to a select group of ten persons consisting of field consultants from the Consultative Center and graduate students in education from the University of Oklahoma. The purpose of the procedure was merely to ascertain whether or not the items were clear and unambiguous. The procedure led to a further refinement and rearrangement of the items.

The final form of the Questionnaire Form A was mailed with a self-addressed envelope to persons comprising Sample II. The composition of this group included persons holding positions as: human relations experts, directors of in-service training, advisory specialists for Title IV Schools, field consultants, and other persons working to improve intergroup, interpersonal, and intercultural relations in public schools. The latter category included school sociologists, consultants, psychologists, supervisors of bilingual programs and community relations, directors of

teacher corps, university administrators and professors. Form B was mailed to Sample III, the persons suggested by respondents in Sample II. Sample III was composed of superintendents, principals, teachers, and counselors familiar with the services of the specialists interviewed in Sample II. After a period of two months, a follow-up letter (Appendix E) containing an additional questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope was submitted to nonresponsive persons in Samples II and III.

#### Method of Presentation and Analyzation of the Data

The data were presented using tabulations of frequency distributions and tables appropriate for the data. Documentary or content analysis was used to analyze the job descriptions (duties, roles and responsibilities) obtained from directors of human relations agencies and organizations comprising Sample I of this study. The purpose of the analysis of content was to formulate items for the questionnaire. Percentages of the number of responses made by persons comprising Samples II and III served as the basis for the comparisons of social position perceptions obtained from the questionnaire.

In order to make meaningful interpretations of the percentage of responses by participants in each sample to questionnaire items, a cut-off percent was desired. Due to the exploratory nature of the investigation, it was concluded that percentages in excess of 50 would be sufficient

to give an indication of the directional tendency of respondents. The directional tendencies were considered great when the percentages exceeded 70.

Finally as a result of the request for bibliographies in human relations, more than 1000 references were secured from the agencies and organizations participating in this study. Forty-five references were selected as being representative of the caliber of material which would be useful and meaningful to persons concerned with improving human relations in schools. The annotated list of references appears in Appendix A.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

Many fundamental questions concerning social positions of persons serving schools in human relations capacities have not been answered in previous studies. The absence of answers, to some extent, has attributed to the vast amount of ambiguity surrounding social positions of specialists. This lack of uniformity has been viewed as a fact of life for a growing profession.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the diversity of functions and roles played by human relations specialists, it is unlikely that without some type of objective analysis a legitimate profession entitled "human relations" will emerge with uniformity in purpose, training, certification, and function.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul E. Eiserer, The School Psychologist, Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963, pp. 1-10.

Analysis of the Data from Sampling Procedures

Table 1 depicts a distribution of the 30 human relations organizations and agencies which met the qualifications necessary to be included in Sample I of this study. Twenty-two or 77 percent of the agencies responded to a personal letter described in Chapter III and provided the names and addresses of 73 persons serving public schools in human relations capacities. These persons comprised Sample II of the study.

Sixty specialists (82.19%) in Sample II responded to Form A of "The School Specialists in Human Relations Survey Questionnaire," 48 to the initial request and 12 to a follow-up letter designed to elicit responses from the 25 non-respondents. The respondents in Sample II supplied the names and addresses of the 63 school personnel familiar with the services of human relations specialists in public schools. (See Table 2.) A total of 42 or 66.67 percent of the persons responded to Form B of the questionnaire and to the initial and follow-up requests for information. The respondents comprised Sample III. Taken collectively, 102 of the 136 persons selected to participate in the study responded to Forms A and B of "The School Specialist in Human Relations Survey Questionnaire." This constituted a 75 percent total return for Samples II and III, as inferred from Table. 3.

TABLE 1

**DISTRIBUTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS ORGANIZATIONS AND  
AGENCIES COMPRISING SAMPLE I AND THE TYPES OF  
MATERIALS SUPPLIED BY EACH**

Agency or Organization	Type Information Supplied					
	Intergroup Relations Agency	University In-Service Center	Names and Addresses	Job Descriptions	Schools Using Services	Recommended Bibliography
Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations	x					
American Friends Service Committee	x					
Bank Street College of Education	*					
Berkeley Unified School District	x		x	x		
Board of Education of the City of New York	x		x	x		x
Denver Public Schools	x		x	x	x	x
Detroit Public Schools	x		x	x		
National Association of Intergroup Organizations	x		x			x
Ouachita Baptist University		x				
Pasadena Unified School District	x		x	x		x
Saint Louis University	*					
Tulane University		x	x	x	x	x
University of South Carolina		x	x	x	x	x
University of Delaware		x	x			
University of Miami		x				
University of North Carolina		x	x			
University of Oklahoma		x	x	x		x
University of South Alabama		x	x	x	x	x
University of Tennessee		x				
University of Texas		x	x			
University of Virginia		x		x		x
Western Kentucky State University		x	x	x		x

\*Supplied information regarding training programs only

TABLE 2

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS COMPRISING  
SAMPLES II AND III

Sample Composition	Number	Percent
Sample II .....	60	100.00
Persons working to improve inter- group, interpersonal, and inter- cultural relations	26	43.33
Advisory specialists in Title IV schools	12	20.00
Director of in-service training	9	15.00
Human relations expert	9	15.00
Educational or school sociologist	4	6.67
Sample III .....	42	100.00
Superintendents	13	30.95
Teachers	11	26.19
Principals	9	21.43
Counselors	9	21.43

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENT RETURNS FROM DATA  
COLLECTING INSTRUMENTS

Instrument	Number Submitted	Returns (%)		
		Initial	Follow-up	Total
Personal letter	30	50.00	100.00	73.33
Questionnaire Form A	73	65.75	80.00	82.19
Questionnaire Form B	63	50.79	83.33	66.67

Analysis of the Components Used to Investigate  
Social Positions of Human  
Relations Specialists

Many factors are considered germane to an investigation of the social position of human relations specialists. However, for the purpose of this exploratory study, only professionalization, academic training, experience, position in the school hierarchy, functions, and roles were used as bases for comparisons, suggestions, inferences, and recommendations made in this study.

Professionalization

The participants in both samples were requested to indicate their perceptions in regard to: (1) professional self-image and the status of a professional that could be called a "human relations specialist," (2) certification and the need for special credentials to denote and guarantee the capabilities of specialists, and (3) professional human relations type organizations and an indication of the tendency toward affiliation. A summary of the responses of participants to questionnaire items concerning professionalization is shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Data in Table 4 revealed that persons serving schools in human relations capacities (86.67%) and those superintendents, teachers, counselors, and principals familiar with their services (71.46%) perceived the emergence of a profession to encompass human relations specialists. Agreement among the various types of personnel comprising

TABLE 4

PERCENT ENDORSEMENT BY 60 SPECIALISTS IN HUMAN RELATIONS  
COMPRISING SAMPLE II AND 42 SCHOOL PERSONNEL  
IN SAMPLE III OF HUMAN RELATIONS AS A  
PROFESSION IN PROCESS

Sample Composition	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	% Yes
Sample II .....	60	86.67
Human relations experts	9	100.00
School sociologists	4	100.00
Directors of in-service training	9	88.89
Persons working to improve intergroup, intercultural, and interpersonal relations	26	84.46
Advisory specialists in Title IV schools	4	66.67
Sample III .....	42	71.46
Counselors	8	88.89
Teachers	8	72.72
Superintendents	9	69.23
Principals	5	55.56

the two samples in regard to this aspect of professionalization was considerably great with exceptions being among advisory specialists, superintendents, and principals.

The manner in which respondents in Samples II and III responded to the need for human relations specialists in school systems to possess special credentials to denote their expertise was consistent with the requirements for professionalization advanced by Scherner.<sup>2</sup> Both respondents in

---

<sup>2</sup>George Scherner, "Professionalism and Intergroup Workers," The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960), 53.

TABLE 5

PERCENT ENDORSEMENT BY 60 SPECIALISTS IN HUMAN RELATIONS  
COMPRISING SAMPLE II AND 42 SCHOOL PERSONNEL  
IN SAMPLE III OF SPECIAL CREDENTIALS  
TO DENOTE EXPERTISE

Sample Composition	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	% Yes
Sample II .....	60	83.33
Human relations experts	9	100.00
School sociologists	4	100.00
Directors of in-service training	9	88.89
Persons working to improve intergroup, intercultural, and interpersonal relations	26	84.62
Advisory specialists in Title IV schools	4	83.33
Sample III .....	42	80.46
Teachers	10	90.91
Counselors	8	88.89
Principals	7	77.78
Superintendents	9	69.29

Sample II (88.34%) and Sample III (80.46%) greatly endorsed special credentials for specialists, another indication of the emerging attitude of professionalization. Table 5 depicts the distribution of responses of the participants in regard to special credentials.

When asked concerning the types of professional organizations most likely to attract specialists, organizations of human relations workers were perceived to be the most suitable choice of the participants in the two samples.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ORGANIZATION AFFILIATIONS SUGGESTED  
FOR HUMAN RELATIONS SPECIALISTS BY RESPONDENTS  
IN SAMPLES II AND III

Respondents		Type of Organization Affiliations						
		Human relations Workers	Teachers	Administrators	Sociologists	Student person- nel workers	Social workers	Others
Sample II (Totals) N = 60	n	47	28	21	14	13	6	6
	%	78.33	46.67	35.00	23.33	21.67	10.00	10.00
Sample III (Totals) N = 42	n	37	22	15	13	11	7	2
	%	88.09	53.38	35.71	30.95	26.20	16.67	4.76

The amount of agreement in this regard was perceived to be slightly greater among the respondents in Sample III (88.09%) than those in Sample II (78.33%). To a lesser degree, affiliation with teacher organizations was considered a beneficial possibility by respondents in the two samples. Table 6 shows a distribution of the organizations suggested for human relations specialists.

#### Academic Training

The principle reason for obtaining data from respondents concerning the academic training of specialists was to assess the perceptions pertaining to the caliber

and composition of training programs. Data were extracted from participants concerning the appropriate training for the roles specialists were expected to perform; as well as the areas in which specialists were expected to show a high degree of expertise. Additional data were sought which would shed some light on the types of activities included in practicums, internships, or field experiences (in this study these activities have the same meaning), and the most appropriate places to conduct the activities.

Table 7 shows a distribution of the perceptions of the participants concerning academic training and background. An analysis of the data revealed the master's degree to be the most appropriate degree credential for human relations specialists. This observation was based on the perceptions of 80 percent of the persons comprising Sample II and 95.24 percent of those in Sample III. Less than 27 percent of the respondents in either sample perceived the doctorate or baccalaureate degrees to be suitable. A distribution of disciplines perceived to provide a background for specialists by participants in Sample II revealed the following: approximately one-third of the respondents perceived the master's degree in human relations, another third perceived the master's degree in education with sociology, and the remaining third distributed their preferences among sociology, education, educational sociology, guidance and counseling, and educational psychology. Further analysis of the

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC BACKGROUND ENDORSEMENTS FOR  
HUMAN RELATIONS BY 60 RESPONDENTS IN SAMPLE II AND  
THE 42 SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN SAMPLE III

Academic Background (Degree*)	Totals							
	Sample II (N=60)				Sample III (N=42)			
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
Sociology	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Education	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Education with sociology	2	16	2	0	0	10	2	0
Educational sociology	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0
Sociology of education	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Human relations	4	17	5	0	1	18	1	0
Guidance and counseling	0	8	2	0	0	6	0	0
Educational psychology	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	0
Other	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0
n =	9	48	16	1	2	40	6	0
Percent =	15.00	80.00	26.67	1.67	4.76	95.24	14.52	00.00

\*A (Bachelor's), B (Master's), C (Doctorate), D (Other)

distribution of responses revealed that 42.86 percent of the participants in Sample III perceived the master's degree in the area of human relations to be appropriate for specialists. Education with a concentration in sociology received the endorsement of only 23.81 percent of the respondents. Other disciplines such as sociology, the sociology of education,

and educational psychology were considered less than adequate background training for human relations specialists serving in school systems.

Additional insights into the training of human relations specialists were revealed when 88 percent of the respondents in Sample II and 83.33 percent of those in Sample III perceived human relations specialists to be capable of providing a high degree of expertise to solving problems pertaining to racial, religious, and minority group relations in the school system. Possessing competence in community relations, faculty and interpersonal relations, and school-home relations were also discerned to be valuable assets for specialists by both Samples II and III. For most persons comprising the two samples, the need to be extremely competent in population trends and administrative and organizational policies was not viewed to be within the purview of specialists. Table 8 shows the areas in which expertise was expected of human relations specialists serving school systems.

Practicums, field experiences, and internships were considered by the participants in both samples to constitute a valuable part of the training of specialists. There was, however, considerably less endorsement or agreement about the types of activities to be included in such programs. Nevertheless, working with special projects in problem schools, and analyzing the school community were highest

TABLE 8

AREAS OF EXPERTISE EXPECTED OF HUMAN RELATIONS  
SPECIALISTS BY RESPONDENTS IN  
SAMPLES II AND III

Areas of Expertise	Distribution of Responses			
	Sample II		Sample III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Faculty interpersonal relations	50	83.33	31	73.81
Racial, religious, and minority group relations	50	83.33	37	88.09
Student interpersonal relations	49	81.67	33	78.57
Community relations	46	76.67	33	78.57
Student integration	37	61.67	21	50.00
School-home relations	33	55.00	30	71.43
Family structures	31	51.67	26	61.90
Curriculum and learning programs	30	50.00	24	57.14
Social customs	29	48.33	29	69.05
Student and faculty dissent	27	45.00	25	59.52
Administrative and organizational policies	25	41.67	18	42.86
Population trends	11	18.33	14	33.33
Other	8	13.33	3	7.14

among the preferences of the respondents in the two samples.

A distribution of the activities perceived to constitute practicums, field experiences, or internships is shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

ACTIVITIES AND PERCENT OF 60 RESPONDENTS IN SAMPLE II  
AND 42 RESPONDENTS IN SAMPLE III PERCEIVED TO  
CONSTITUTE PRACTICUMS, FIELD EXPERIENCES  
AND INTERNSHIPS

Activity	Distribution of Responses			
	Sample II		Sample III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Working with special projects in problem schools	39	65.00	30	71.43
Analyzing school community	40	66.67	27	64.29
Assisting personnel workers	25	41.67	22	52.38
Aiding human relations club sponsors	31	51.67	21	50.00
Assisting school community workers	35	33.33	17	40.49
No practicum needed	0	00.00	1	2.39
Other	6	10.00	3	7.14

In response to a request for suggestions for places to conduct training activities for human relations specialists, respondents in Sample II perceived intergroup relations agencies and integrated schools to be suitable. Respondents in Sample III, likewise endorsed racially integrated schools but were less agreeable in terms of using intergroup relations agencies as a means for training specialists in human relations for school systems. A distribution of locations

perceived by respondents to be appropriate for conducting practicums, field experiences, and internships is listed below:

Places	<u>% Endorsement</u>	
	Sample II (N=60)	Sample III (N=42)
Racially integrated schools	91.67	92.82
Urban schools	63.33	76.19
Intergroup relations agencies	93.33	69.05
Suburban schools	40.00	38.09
Segregated schools	30.00	35.76
Rural schools	36.67	30.95

### Experience

As a component of the social position of human relations specialists, experience was perceived by participants in both samples in a favorable manner. When asked to rank first, second, and third the types of previous positions perceived to afford the most beneficial background for specialists, more than 86 percent of the respondents in Sample II and 83.33 percent of those in Sample III ranked public school teaching as either their first, second, or third choice. Public school social work, public school administration, and school psychological services were also considered valuable experiences for the human relations specialists, but to a lesser degree than teaching. When viewed in terms of first choice ranking only, public school teaching received considerably more endorsement than either public school administration or social work (Table 10).

TABLE 10

POSITIONS PERCEIVED TO BE MOST BENEFICIAL TO PERSONS  
SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS CAPACITIES  
BY RESPONDENTS IN SAMPLES II AND III

Positions	Rankings by Respondents*									
	Sample II					Sample III				
	Totals			Grand total	Percent	Totals			Grand total	Percent
	1	2	3		1,2,3	1	2	3		1,2,3
Public school teaching	42	8	2	52	86.67	32	3	0	35	83.33
Public school administration	7	11	16	34	56.67	1	11	6	18	43.86
Public school social work	7	11	14	32	53.33	3	15	7	25	57.14
School psychological services	4	15	7	26	43.33	0	2	15	17	40.48
College or university teaching	0	0	9	9	15.00	9	5	4	9	21.43
College or university administration	0	1	1	2	3.33	0	0	0	0	00.00
Other	0	2	0	2	3.33	0	0	0	0	00.00

\*Rankings: 1 (First), 2 (Second), 3 (Third)

#### Position in the School Hierarchy

Personnel in the school system whose coordinating and supervising jurisdictions were perceived to include specialists in human relations constituted one source for analyzing the position of human relations specialists in

the school hierarchy. Very little indication was provided by an analysis of the responses made by participants in the two samples as to whom specialists should be directly responsible. However a grouping of the perceptions in a descending order suggested the following direction for responsibility: The human relations specialists were perceived to be responsible to the school superintendent, the human relations director, and the building principal (Table 11). It was interesting to note that the size of the school and school system was considered important in the assignment of specialists to personnel in the system, an observation deduced from the open-ended responses of the participants. When asked concerning positions in school systems perceived to be in the supervising or coordinating range of specialists, none of the personnel listed in Table 12 were perceived by as many as 70 percent of the respondents in Sample II. There was, however, more agreement among the respondents in Sample III in that 80 percent perceived specialists to be capable of supervising or coordinating community workers for the system.

#### Functions and Responsibilities

The literature of human relations and intergroup relations education provided the sources for documents--personal letters, pamphlets, annual reports, newsletters, Federal reports--from which items concerning functions and responsibilities of human relations specialists were selected

TABLE 11

**DISTRIBUTION OF PERCEPTIONS HELD CONCERNING PERSONS  
SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS CAPACITIES  
IN REGARD TO THE LINE OF RESPONSIBILITY  
FOR SPECIALISTS IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

School Personnel	Distribution of Responses			
	Sample II (N=60)		Sample III (N=42)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Superintendent	28	46.67	17	40.49
Human relations director	26	43.33	12	28.57
Principal	10	16.67	9	21.43
Personnel director	2	3.33	0	0.00
Social worker	0	0.00	0	0.00
Visiting teacher	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	0	0.00	1	2.39

for the questionnaire. An analysis of the items revealed three distinct categories: action, planning, and research. Table 13 presents a summary of the pertinent information and the distribution of functions and activities expected of specialists.

Ninety percent of the participants in Sample II and 85.72 percent of those in Sample III viewed conducting training programs in human relations for the entire staff as the most important action function of human relations specialists. To a somewhat lesser degree, promoting programs

TABLE 12

POSITIONS PERCEIVED BY 60 RESPONDENTS IN SAMPLE II  
AND 42 SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN SAMPLE III TO BE  
WITHIN THE SUPERVISORY CAPACITIES OF  
HUMAN RELATIONS SPECIALISTS

School Personnel	Number of Respondents			
	Sample II		Sample III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Community workers	26	66.67	48	80.00
Social workers	28	66.67	36	60.00
Counselors	27	64.29	38	63.00
Visiting teachers	28	61.90	28	46.67
Assistant principals	16	38.09	34	56.67
Principals	14	33.33	38	63.33
Psychologists	13	30.95	23	38.33
Nurses	12	28.57	11	18.33
Others	5	11.90	9	15.00

and activities among pupils, staff and the school-community for the improvement of human relations was considered an action function of specialists by participants. The least important of the action functions presented according to the participants in the two samples was that of enlisting community interests and support in regard to school programs.

Planning as a function of specialists was highly endorsed by participants in both samples. Approximately 90 percent of the participants in the two samples perceived specialists to be designers and evaluators of human relations

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES  
EXPECTED OF SPECIALISTS

Functions and Activities	Type			Respondents								Totals		
	Action	Planning	Research	Human relations experts	Directors of in- service training	Advisory specialists	Persons working with interrelations	School sociologists	Superintendents	Principals	Teachers	Counselors	Sample II	Sample III
Assist school personnel working with individuals and groups within the community on desegregation matters	x			7	7	11	23	4	11	6	9	7	70.00	78.57
Enlist community interests and support in regard to school programs	x			3	3	6	14	2	6	5	5	7	46.67	54.76
Promote programs and activ- ities among pupils, staff and the school-community for the improvement of human relations	x			8	8	11	21	3	11	6	9	7	85.00	78.57
Conduct training programs in human relations for the entire staff	x			8	9	11	23	3	11	6	11	8	90.00	85.72

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents										Totals	
	Action Planning Research Human relations experts Directors of in- service training Advisory specialists Persons working with interrelations School sociologists Superintendents Principals Teachers Counselors										Sample II	Sample III	
Help resolve questions and complaints from students, parents, and other concerned citizens	x		5	4	7	14	2	5	4	5	5	60.00	45.25
Develop leadership in the area of school desegrega- tion	x		4	6	8	17	3	7	3	6	6	63.33	52.38
Assist in developing and implementing Title IV pro- posals administered by local school districts	x		7	5	10	17	1	7	4	8	5	66.67	57.14
Assist colleges and univer- sities in training teachers for the school system	x		8	8	8	20	2	6	3	7	7	76.67	54.76

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents										Totals	
	Action Planning Research Human relations experts Directors of in- service training Advisory specialists Persons working with interrelations School sociologists Superintendents Principals Teachers Counselors Sample II Sample III												
Assist teachers to work effectively with students of different races by providing opportunity to examine, use, and evaluate multi-ethnic materials and classroom activities	x		6	7	9	20	4	8	6	10	6	76.67	71.42
Design and evaluate human relations training programs and institutes for local leaders, teachers, and administrators	x		8	9	10	24	4	12	7	10	8	91.67	88.09
Propose and plan for schools with unusual population trends	x		4	2	6	14	2	6	5	4	3	43.33	42.86

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents									Totals	
	Action Planning Research Human relations experts Directors of in- service training Advisory specialists Persons working with interrelations School sociologists Superintendents Principals Teachers Counselors										Sample II	Sample III
Prepare and evaluate school programs related to the total community needs	x	6	5	6	15	3	6	7	7	7	55.30	64.29
Develop workable approaches to the solution of human relations problems	x	8	8	10	21	4	11	6	9	8	85.00	80.95
Plan programs to promote better human relations in school activities	x	7	8	9	21	3	9	6	11	7	80.00	78.57
Provide leadership in dealing with curriculum and instructional problems at the planning and implementing levels	x	5	7	10	15	1	4	3	6	5	63.33	42.86

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents									Totals	
	Action Planning Research	Human relations experts	Directots of in- service training	Advisory specialists	Persons working with interrelations	School sociologists	Superintendents	Principals	Teachers	Counselors	Sample II	Sample III
Define the role or roles of the child in the family	x 0	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	2	6.67	16.67	
Define the relationships of parents to children and the interpersonal relation- ships of child to sibling and parents	x 1	2	2	3	0	3	1	4	3	13.33	26.19	
Investigate the relations between various racial, religious, and minority groups in the community	x 7	6	9	16	4	11	5	8	6	70.00	71.43	
Study the social interactions both within and outside the school	x 6	6	9	16	3	11	6	7	6	66.67	69.05	

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents										Totals	
	Action Planning Research	Human relations experts	Directors of in- service training	Advisory specialists	Persons working with interrelations	School sociologists	Superintendents	Principals	Teachers	Counselors	Sample II	Sample III	
Identify the fundamental educational and administra- tive problems associated with school desegregation	x 6	6	7	10	16	3	8	7	7	6	70.00	66.67	
Aid in the development of curriculum, guidance and other materials in inter- group education	x 6	6	6	9	18	2	9	3	4	6	68.33	56.38	
Analyze the structure and function of groups to deter- mine how they are influenced or influence the social rela- tionships within the school and community	x 6	6	6	8	13	2	8	5	7	4	58.33	57.14	
Study and analyze the patterns of social interactions and roles within the school organ- ization	x 6	6	7	7	16	2	6	5	8	4	63.33	54.76	

TABLE 13--Continued

Functions and Activities	Type	Respondents									Totals	
	Action Planning Research	Human relations experts	Directors of in- service training	Advisory specialists	Persons working with interrelations	School sociologists	Superintendents	Principals	Teachers	Counselors	Sample II	Sample III
Study and analyze the pat- terns of social interac- tions and roles within the school organization	x	6	7	7	16	2	6	5	8	4	63.53	54.76
Collect, organize, and inter- pret facts concerning com- munity organizations, social customs, family and other social phenomena	x	5	3	6	11	1	6	5	6	5	45.33	52.38
Investigate the many factors involved in student integra- tion, faculty desegregation, and interpersonal relations, involving the total school- community resources	x	7	6	8	21	3	7	7	10	6	75.00	71.43
Others	x	2	0	1	3	4	0	0	1	1	16.67	4.76
	x	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	13.33	0.00
	x	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	6.67	7.14

training programs. Seventy-eight to 85 percent perceived the specialists as developers of workable approaches to solutions of human relations problems, and as planners of programs designed to promote better human relations in school activities.

Considerably less agreement existed among participants in the two samples in regard to research activities than either planning or action. Seventy-five percent of the participants in Sample II, the greatest percent of respondents endorsing any one research function, and 71.43 percent of the participants in Sample III, suggested research in the areas of student integration, faculty desegregation, and interpersonal relations. These types of activities were perceived to be slightly more suitable for specialists than investigating the relations between various racial, religious, and minority groups in the community; or identifying the fundamental educational and administrative problems associated with school desegregation. Defining (1) the role of the child in the family, (2) the relationships of parents to children, and (3) the relationship between siblings and/or parents were not considered to be among the important research functions of specialists.

### Roles

Answers to a number of relevant questions concerning social positions of persons serving schools in human relations capacities were provided through an analysis of

the roles played by specialists in the system. For the purpose of this study only the following roles were considered: working with teachers, specialized personnel in the system, parents, school-community, and students. A summary of the observations constitutes the not-too-surprising final portion of this chapter. One vital role performed by specialists was that of serving as consultants to teachers in school systems. This role, according to a majority of the respondents in Sample II included: (1) conducting training programs, (2) working to improve faculty interpersonal relations, and (3) promoting programs and activities to improve relationships among staff members. To a somewhat lesser degree, giving assistance to colleges and universities which train teachers and to others interested in working effectively with students of different races and cultures was considered among the types of services which specialists were perceived to perform as they consult with teachers.

Human relations specialists were perceived by most respondents in Sample III to work in a consultative capacity with teachers in a manner similar to that found among the respondents in Sample II. However, the responsibility for assisting teachers who work with students of different races, by providing them the opportunity to examine, use, and evaluate multi-ethnic materials and classroom activities was perceived in a slightly lesser degree by participants in Sample III than did the participants in Sample II.

Giving consultative assistance to other specialized personnel in the system was viewed as one of the roles of specialists. This role based on the perceptions of 70 percent of the persons comprising Sample II and 78.57 percent of those comprising Sample III included assisting school personnel working with individual groups and individuals within the community on desegregation matters, and to a lesser degree, aiding schools in the development of curriculum, guidance, and other instructional materials in intergroup education. Working with parents directly in a similar type capacity was not perceived to be within the purview of the human relations specialists serving school systems by respondents in either of the two samples.

The only conceivable role of human relations specialists in the community, based on the perceptions of 60 percent of the respondents in Sample II, was that of helping to resolve questions from students, parents, and other concerned citizens. On the other hand, perceptions of the role of specialists in the community were too ambiguous to have any meaning or value according to the perceptions of persons in Sample III. In regard to working with students, 85 percent of the respondents in Sample II and 78.57 percent of those in Sample III perceived the role of specialists as one of promoting programs and activities among students for the improvement of human relations and student interpersonal relations. While considered appropriate

for research, most respondents did not perceive student dissent as an area for specialists to provide consultative services.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This exploratory study was designed to investigate the compatibility of the perceptions of (1) persons performing in human relations capacities for school systems, and (2) school personnel familiar with their services in regard to social positions of human relations specialists for school systems. Professionalization, academic training, experience, roles, functions, responsibilities, and position in the school hierarchy were used as the components of social position and the basis for all comparisons, suggestions, inferences, and recommendations. The investigation was desired in order to aid in the development of a descriptive scientific base and a prescriptive philosophy upon which to develop meaningful courses and training programs in human relations for school personnel. It was also the intent of the study to aid in the formulation of a clearly defined body of literature called human relations, and in the enhancement of professionalization of specialists.

Ultimately, the investigation was desired in order to aid in the improvement of human relationships in school systems.

The review of the literature served as a basis for the utilization of "role" and "status" interchangeably to represent the social position of human relations specialists. The concept "role" was found to have great utility when employed as a synthesis of concepts that prescribe and describe professional positions in school systems. Adequate support for the usefulness of the concept to investigate persons serving schools in human relations capacities was noted in the studies by Gross, Mason, and McEachern; Carter; Bos; Young; Braden; Tanner and Tanner; Sutker, and Blumenberg. These researches pointed out the fact that school personnel behave with preconceived expectations; that role expectations differ among status groups; and finally, that the behavior of school personnel was influenced to some extent by their own expectations and the expectations of others in the system.

The sampling procedure consisted of submitting a personal letter to the directors of agencies and organizations supplying specialists to school systems. From this source, the 60 persons serving schools in human relations capacities were identified as Sample II of the study. Participants in Sample II provided the names and addresses of the 42 school personnel familiar with the services of specialists, Sample III. Participants in both samples

expressed their perceptions concerning several components of social position as they applied to specialists in human relations capacities. These types of data were collected utilizing "The School Specialists in Human Relations Survey Questionnaire." The percent of responses to questionnaire items constituted the main source for the analyzation of data collected.

### Conclusions

Conclusions accompanying this study were based on the perceptions of persons serving schools in human relations capacities and school personnel familiar with the services of specialists. No attempt was made to ascertain the degree to which the responses of the participants were biased or incompatible with services actually performed. Therefore, the following conclusions were made in light of these limitations to the study:

1. Persons serving public schools in human relations capacities and those persons familiar with the services of such specialists perceive the academic training, professionalization, experiences, and position in the school hierarchy of the human relations specialists in a similar manner.

2. Persons familiar with the services of specialists and those serving schools in human relations capacities agree considerably in terms of what should constitute roles,

functions, and responsibilities of specialists, an observation contrary to the facts documented in the literature.

3. A master's degree in human relations, with experience obtained through public school teaching, practicums, field experiences, and internships in integrated schools was perceived to be an adequate background of training and experiences for specialists.

4. Expertise in racial, religious, minority group relations, and faculty and student interpersonal relations was perceived to enhance the specialists' chances for providing the caliber of assistance needed to improve human relationships in schools.

5. Professionalization of the human relations worker in public schools was perceived to be emerging.

6. Specialists were perceived to work with teachers, specialized personnel in the school system, parents, school-community, and students in a consultative capacity. In working with teachers, their role was one of helping teachers through training programs, and other programs and activities designed to improve teachers interpersonal relationships. To a lesser degree, specialists were perceived to assist other specialized persons in the system. Such a role was perceived to include assisting school personnel to find solutions to problems resulting from desegregation matters. Working with parents and the community directly was not considered by the participants

to be a high priority in the role of specialists. However, promoting programs and activities among students for the improvement of human relations and student interpersonal relations were perceived to be among the role expectations of specialists.

### Recommendations

Future research is needed in order to clearly define the role and role expectations of human relations specialists. The following recommendations are suggested for future study in the area of education and human relations:

1. A detailed investigation of current offerings in human relations in colleges and schools of education.
2. A curriculum to train persons specifically for human relations capacities in school systems.
3. An evaluation of existing programs in human relations with emphasis on the adequacy of such programs to provide the expertise needed to handle problems resulting from intergroup, interpersonal, and intercultural relations in school systems.
4. A study of the human relations competencies of personnel in a typical school system.
5. State certification of all persons serving public schools in human relations capacities.
6. A study of the feasibility of obtaining uniformity in standards and training of human relations specialists by colleges and schools of education.

7. A study of the desirability of initiating degree programs in human relations education by colleges and schools of education.

8. Research in the many facets of human relations education.

9. An evaluation of school systems in terms of their ability to make available to teachers, principals, counselors, students, and other concerned personnel, persons adequately trained in methods of resolving human relations problems that affect public education.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- \_\_\_\_\_. A Dictionary of Intergroup Relations Agencies.  
Brotherhood-in-Action, Inc., 1969.
- Borgatta, Edgar. "Role and Reference Group Theory," Social Science Theory and Social Work Research. Edited by Leonard Kogan, New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1960.
- Cook, Lloyd and Elaine Cook. School Problems in Human Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947.
- Deasy, Leila Calhoun. Social Role Theory: Its Component Parts and Some Applications. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University Press, 1964.
- Eiserer, Paul E. The School Psychologist. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.
- Greenwood, Earnest. Quoted in Vollmer, Howard M. and Mills, Donald L. Professionalization. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- Johnson, Harry M. Sociology: A Systematic Introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960.
- Kahn, Robert L.; Wolfe, Donald M.; Quinn, Robert P.; Snoek, J. Diederick; and Rosenthal, Robert A. Organizational Stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1954.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behaviorial Research.  
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Kilpatrick, William H. Modern Education and Better Human Relations. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957.

Kogan, Leonard. "Relationships Among Social Work and Practice, Social Work Research, and the Social Sciences," Social Science Theory and Social Work Research. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1960.

Scates, Douglass E. and Yeomans, Alice V. The Effect of Questionnaire Form on Course Requests of Employed Adults. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

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

#### Periodicals

Allen, Alexander J. "Professionalization of Intergroup Relations Work and Workers." The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960), 36.

Blumenberg, Eleanor. "The School Intergroup Relations Specialists: A Profession in Process." Sociology of Education, XLI (Spring, 1968), 221-226.

Carter, Fred D. "Education Level and Family Income of Citizens and Expectations for the Role of the School Board." The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (July-August, 1968), 447.

Davis, Floyd. "Inaugural Address." NAIRO Newsletter, (November, 1968-January, 1969), 3.

Dodson, Dan W. "Field Work and Internship in Professional Training in Human Relations." The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIV (February, 1951), 337-345.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Human Relations Specialist." Administrative Handbook, Detroit Public Schools, August, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Human Relations in the Classroom: A Challenge to Teacher Education." North Central Association Quarterly, XXXVIII (Winter, 1964), 257.

- Johnson, Wayne B. "Human Relationships in the Concept of Education." School and Community, LIV (February, 1968), 24.
- Melby, Earnest O. "The Forward Look." The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIV (February, 1951), 362-363.
- Neiman, Lionel J. and Hughes, James W. "The Problem of the Concept of a Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature." Social Forces, XXX (December, 1951), 141-149.
- Schermer, George. "Professionalism and Intergroup Workers." The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960), 43-54.
- Van Til, William A. "Research on Human Relations Programs of Action." Review of Educational Research, XXII (October, 1953), 288-385.
- Wardell, Walter I. "A Marginal Professional Role: The Chiropractor," Social Forces, XXX (April, 1952), 340.

#### Reports and Unpublished Materials

- Bos, James Herbert. "A Study of the Expectations of Educators for the Role and Personality of Change Agents in an Educational Enterprise." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1966.
- Braden, Billy. "Perceptions of the Elementary School Counselor." Paper presented at the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, New Orleans, October 11, 1966. (Printed).
- Carmichael, Warren C. "An Instrument to Measure Attitudes and Opinions Toward Human Relations Issues." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.
- Report of the Committee on Human Relations Education. "The Teacher and Improved Human Relations Education in the School." J. B. Fox, chairman. Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1966.
- Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies: The Consultative Center, the University of Oklahoma, "Program Direction and Rationale for the Consultative Center for School Desegregation." Norman, 1968. (Mimeographed).

- Sutker, Soloman. "An Exploratory Analysis of the Role Conflicts of Vocational Teachers in Oklahoma." Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, August, 1967.
- Tanner, Laurel N. and Tanner, Daniel. "The Role of Para-Professionals in the Schools: A National Study." Unpublished paper presented at the California Research Association Conference, Los Angeles, March 15, 1969.
- Young, Caroline E. "A Study of Educational Sociology and Sociology of Education in Relation to the Role of the School Sociologist." Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR PERSONS SERVING SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS CAPACITIES

The annotated references comprising this bibliography were selected from more than 1000 human relations references submitted by human relations organizations and agencies. It is the opinion of the researcher that the references included in this bibliography contain a wealth of knowledge and insight into human relationships which may prove to be beneficial to persons serving in the types of roles and capacities enumerated earlier in this investigation.

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1954.

A comprehensive account of human prejudice: its roots in individual psychology, its history, and its impact on the individual and the community. Suggestions of how a knowledge of the roots of hostility can be used to reduce group tensions appear in the concluding section.

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

The author takes a constructively critical look at the various methods which have come into use in recent years in efforts to reduce intergroup tensions. The Resolution of Intergroup Tensions should be interesting and helpful to students and practitioners in the field of intergroup relations. It should be helpful to those teachers, field workers, workshop directors and researchers who feel constantly and keenly the need for careful evaluation of the methods they use.

Anderson, Margaret. Children of the South. New York: Farrar Straus, and Giroux, 1966.

This is a book that everyone interested in the tremendous process of desegregation and integration, and the problems of life and education should read. Several chapters are based on case histories which illustrate what Southern education needs.

Aptheker, Herbert (ed.) A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States. New York: Citadel, 1964.

A collection of documents by and about the Negro in this country.

\_\_\_\_\_. About 100 Books, 5th Edition. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1966.

An annotated list of books covering the social concerns of the day: war, poverty, inequality, indifference, violence, and brutality as well as minority cultures and the history and mores of other lands. The books are categorized according to the ages: five to nine, eight to thirteen, and thirteen to sixteen.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Guide to Intergroup Education. Department of Instruction, Fairfax County Schools, Virginia, 1965.

This booklet presents guidelines and information for helping schools meet the problems arising from newly desegregated situations. It covers such areas as pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, and school and community relations.

Bash, James H., and Morris, Thomas J. Utilizing Community Resources to Implement School Desegregation. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1968.

This booklet contains a variety of approaches, procedures, techniques, and steps which have been used effectively in working with community agencies.

Bash, James H., and Morris, Thomas J. Practices and Patterns of Faculty Desegregation. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967.

This pamphlet presents concrete examples of successful faculty desegregation and offers suggestions for achieving this goal.

Blalock, Hubert M. Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations. New York: Wiley, 1967.

A set of interrelated essays about the relationship of discrimination to status competition, power, and the size of minorities.

\_\_\_\_\_. Books for Brotherhood. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1957.

A short annually published list of books of general interest for children, young people, and adults. The titles are selected not for their information about any particular religious group but because they do most to promote understanding among various groups.

\_\_\_\_\_. Books for Friendship, 3rd Edition of Books Are Bridges and 1966 Supplement. Philadelphia: American Friends Service and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1962.

An annotated list of books to help children from kindergarten through junior high school appreciate people of different races, religions and nationalities.

Brembeck, Coles S. Social Foundations of Education. New York: Wiley, 1966.

This textbook covers the usual aspects of educational sociology, such as social aspects of teaching, educational aspects of environment, social class influence and the like.

Buchheimer, N. Equality Through Integration: A Report on Greenburg School District No. 8. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

This booklet relates the farsighted and creative efforts of a New York School district to transform its segregated and inferior schools into ones offering quality integrated education.

Burma, John H. Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States. Duke University Press, 1954.

This is a well-organized introduction to problems of the Spanish-speaking people, the Hispanos of New Mexico, the Mexican Americans, the Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans of New York. It describes the important aspects of life of each group and provides a basis for comparisons among them and other minorities.

Colorado Department of Education. Materiales Tocante Los Latinos: A Bibliography of Materials on Spanish-named. Denver: The Department, 1967.

An extensive list of books and materials designed to meet the needs and interests of those wishing to know about the Spanish-named.

Denver Post, The Red Man's Last Struggle. Denver, Colorado: Denver Post, 1966.

The reprint of a ten-part series of "Empire" stories is an account of the "last great Indian struggle to protect their land from the white man's encroachment."

Dean, John P. and Rosen, Alex. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

This handbook is organized around "propositions" and principles which can be applied in areas of community life. Much of the book discussed how to secure changes in community institutions on a voluntary basis.

Epstein, Charlotte. Intergroup Relations for the Classroom Teacher. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

This book discusses the intergroup experiences and outlook of various groups, and the schools in which children of different groups encounter each other. It shows how curriculum materials and texts in many subjects can be used to promote intergroup experiences.

Frazier, E. Franklin. The Negro in the United States. New York: Macmillan Company, 1947; revised 1957.

Both a history and a sociological treatment of the Negro American, the book covers the African background and the slavery period, Civil War, and Reconstruction, and racial segregation into the twentieth century. The major portion describes and analyzes all aspects of Negro life in the United States--family and organizations; business, social, and economic stratification; education and intellectual life, crime and delinquency.

Grambs, Jean D. Understanding Intergroup Relations. Washington: National Educational Association, 1960.

This is a booklet of research materials on teaching intergroup relations which has promise to be most helpful to classroom teachers. It is a readable, non-technical summary of basic concepts in intergroup relations, intergroup concepts of a particular significance to the school, and guidelines to effective intergroup practice.

Greenberg, Jack. Race Relations and American Law. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

This is a basic text of race relations law in the United States. Moving from a philosophical dissertation upon the "Capacity of Law to Affect Race Relation," the author treats race in legal contexts ranging from public accommodations to domestic relations. It is replete with discussions or citations of legal theories and cases which have been adopted and adapted for use by civil rights advocates.

Hannah, John A., et al. Schools Can be Desegregated. CCR Clearinghouse No. 8, Washington: U.S. Government Office, 1957.

This pamphlet identifies some of the elements of successful desegregation and explains some of the techniques communities have used or are planning to use to desegregate their schools. It is based on the study of racial isolation conducted by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Heller, Margaret S. Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Cross Roads. Studies in Sociology. New York: Random House, 1966.

The author probes the cultural background of Hispanic youth of the former Mexican lands of the nation and pinpoints the principal problems and areas of disadvantage facing these young people as a group.

Heaton, Margaret. Feelings Are Facts. Denver, Colorado: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1951.

The writer emphasizes the importance of feelings, describes ways of diagnosing feelings and bringing them out into the open. The book is designed to assist in understanding interpersonal and intergroup relations and their effect on the healthy emotional life of children.

Hartstein, Jacob I. The Jews in American History. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1958.

The role of Jews in America's past covers a variety of topics from colonial settlements to Jewish culture. This book includes plans for classroom use and a detailed list of resource materials.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1962.

The Other America is a report of the invisible sub-culture of poverty in the midst of America's affluent society. It focuses on the poverty among industrial rejects, migrant workers, minorities, and the aged.

Handlin, Oscar. American Jews: Their Story. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

A brief illustrated history of Jewish life in America from 1654 to the present.

Keating, Charlotte Mathews. Building Bridges of Understanding. Tucson, Arizona: Palo Verde Publishing Company, 1967.

A bibliography of books for children and young people divided into categories: Negroes, American Indians, Spanish-speaking Ethnic Groups, Chinese-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Hawaiians, Jews, Selection with Multi-ethnic representation, and other minority groups.

Landes, Ruth. Latin Americans of the Southwest. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

This is an introduction to historical and current information about six million Latin Americans of the Southwest called Hispanoids.

Lipton, Aaron. Integrated Education. "Classroom Grouping and Integration." February-March, 1964.

A Hartsdale, New York principal explains grouping procedures in his school system. Classroom groups reflect complete representation of the racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups in the community.

Madison Public Schools, Department of Curriculum Development, Human Relations: A Basic Booklist. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Curriculum Development, 1965.

Bibliography on race relations with special emphasis on the Negro, but including books on other minority groups. Books portraying universal needs of mankind in other countries and other times are listed as well as biographies and books on the United States.

McNickle, Darcy. The Indian Tribes of the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

"It is a source of surprise to many people--those with a close interest in this subject as well as the uninformed--that the American Indians have not adjusted their lives to the life of the nation, that their special problems persist and their ethnic identity does not dissolve. In this book Mr. McNickle endeavors to explain why this is. He describes the situation as it is in the 1960's, outlines the historical background, and speculates on what changes can be expected now that the Indians have at last become vocal."

McWhirter, Mary Esther. Books for Friendship. Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1962.

Annotated list of 500 books, graded from kindergarten to upper junior high school, which attempts to "depict, fairly, accurately and sympathetically people of all religious, racial, regional, national, and economic groups."

Noar, Gertrude, The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1966.

"This book has been written to counteract a good deal of misinformation which exists about minority group children and their education. This book is not presented as the final word but rather as a constructive approach to

day-by-day work of the teacher. The spirit in which it is written is one of confidence in the resources for human understanding of both teachers and children and in their ability to solve important problems."

Pettigrew, Thomas. A Profile of the Negro American. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1964.

This is a report on Negro American today--his personality, mental health, physical health, intelligence, crime rate, and current protest. Pettigrew discusses the prejudices, ideas, and fallacies concerning the Negro American and demonstrates that many characteristics thought to be racial are, rather, the result of poverty and discrimination.

---

. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volume I and Summary of Report, Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

This report contains the results of an exhaustive study of racial isolation in schools resulting from factors other than segregation by law. The report covers the extent of racial isolation, its causes, its effects on the outcomes of education, and some remedies to it.

Reissman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

An analysis of the problems and needs of culturally deprived children who are taught by middle class teachers in schools managed by school boards from the upper strata. He challenges the public school to adapt its programs to help and encourage these children, denied an equal chance because of their background. Concluding chapters suggest how this can be done.

Rose, Arnold. The Roots of Prejudice. New York: UNESCO, 1958.

This booklet discusses some of the causes of prejudice, the psychology of prejudice and its effects on the personality, and the transmission of prejudice to children.

\_\_\_\_\_. School Racial Policy. Washington: American Association of School Administrators. 1966.

This booklet, intended primarily for school superintendents, contains brief but useful guidelines to help meet, in many areas, the problems that arise from school desegregation. Contains a policy statement by the commission of AASA.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Teacher and Improved Human Relations in the School. Oklahoma State Department of Education. 1966.

This slim pamphlet proposes some guidelines to help teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school personnel understand the problems occasioned by cultural and ethnic diversity and find solutions that will solve these problems and improve human relations through education.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Memorandum to Municipalities: Guidelines for Municipal Human Relation Relations Officials, August, 1965.

"This is a memorandum not a blueprint. It is directed to communities which want to establish official human relations committees."

\_\_\_\_\_. The Journal of Intergroup Relations, I (Spring, 1960).

This special issue is devoted to goals, directions, and priorities in intergroup relations for the 1960's. It includes a series of papers on the changing nature of intergroup relations practice, and the organization of the intergroup relations field and its agencies, and the professionalization of the intergroup relations worker and his work.

## APPENDIX B

### PERSONAL LETTER SUBMITTED TO DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS AGENCIES

Dear Sir:

I am in the process of organizing a degree program in Human Relations here at the University of Oklahoma. In order to plan the best possible program, I am conducting a survey of the "preferred" training and experiences for persons serving in the following public school capacities:

- a. Human Relations Expert or Director of Inservice Training
- b. Advisory Specialist for Title IV Schools
- c. Educational or School Sociologist
- d. Other personnel responsible for intergroup, interpersonal, and intercultural relations.

Your assistance is of great importance in facilitating this study. If possible, please provide me with the following information:

1. Names and addresses of Specialists connected with your organization.
2. Job descriptions (functions and responsibilities) of the Specialists.
3. Names and locations of schools using the services of the Specialists.
4. Your recommended bibliography in Human Relations.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

(S)

George Henderson  
Goldman Professor of  
Human Relations

GH: jt

## APPENDIX C

### FOLLOW-UP LETTER SUBMITTED TO DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS AGENCIES

Dear Sir:

A short time ago I wrote you and asked your cooperation in an investigation of the social positions of persons serving public schools in human relations capacities. Since only a select group of persons were invited to participate in the study, it is vital to the success of the investigation that I secure information from you.

In the event you have not responded to the initial request, please send me the following information so that I may complete this study by December 1, 1969:

- \*1. Names and addresses of Specialists connected with your organization.
2. Job descriptions (functions and responsibilities) of the Specialists.
3. Names and locations of schools using the services of the Specialists.
4. Your recommended bibliography in Human Relations.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

(S)

George Henderson  
Goldman Professor of  
Human Relations

\*If you are unable to respond to all the items listed above, please send the information requested in Item #1.

2729 Dewey, Apt. 11  
Norman, Oklahoma

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER SUBMITTED TO PERSONS SERVING PUBLIC  
SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS CAPACITIES AND TO  
PERSONS FAMILIAR WITH THEIR SERVICES

Dear Sir:

The improvement of human relationships has been formally recognized as a function of American education since the turn of the twentieth century. Yet, nearly fifty years later, many of the problems confronting our schools are the results of human relations conflicts.

Although agencies outside the public schools and colleges of education are devoting time, money, and expertise in order to alleviate human relations conflicts in our schools, the task is too great to be delegated to such agencies alone. Colleges of education, for example, need to expand their curriculums to include more offerings in human relations for the purpose of upgrading teacher education programs and for preparing human relations specialists for school systems. A task of this nature necessitates an analysis of the training, experiences, roles, and functions of persons serving public school systems in human relations capacities.

As one concerned with the improvement of intergroup, interpersonal, and human relations in public schools, I solicit your cooperation in this investigation of the role-definition and activities of persons serving public schools in human relations capacities. Your perceptions, along with those of other superintendents, teachers, counselors, principals and human relations specialists will be analyzed by this researcher. If you request a copy, you will be sent a summary of the findings.

Thanks for your much needed assistance.

Yours truly,

*W. Cliff Armstrong*  
W. Cliff Armstrong

"Mr. Armstrong's study will allow the University of Oklahoma to improve its curriculum offerings for school personnel engaged in intergroup relations. Therefore, I am eagerly awaiting the completion of this study."

George Henderson, Ph.D.  
Goldman Professor of  
Human Relations

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SUBMITTED TO PERSONS SERVING PUBLIC  
SCHOOLS IN HUMAN RELATIONS CAPACITIES AND TO  
PERSONS FAMILIAR WITH THEIR SERVICES

Dear Sir:

A short time ago I mailed to you a questionnaire and asked your cooperation in an investigation of the social positions of persons serving public schools in human relations capacities. Since the instrument was submitted to a select group, it is vital to the success of this investigation that I secure your reactions.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire, if you have not responded to the initial request, and return it to me so that I may complete the study by December 1, 1969. Thanks for your much needed assistance.

Yours truly,

---

Willie C. Armstrong  
Graduate Student

# APPENDIX F

## THE SCHOOL SPECIALIST IN HUMAN RELATIONS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Form A and B\*

1. I am currently serving a public school system in the following capacity (check one):

<input type="checkbox"/> Human Relations Expert	<input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent
<input type="checkbox"/> Director of In-service Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal
<input type="checkbox"/> Advisory Specialist in Title IV Schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher
<input type="checkbox"/> Person working to improve inter-group, interpersonal, and inter-cultural relations	<input type="checkbox"/> Counselor
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sociologist
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____

Please answer the following questions in terms of what you perceive to be the role, status, function, responsibility and "preferred" training of the specialist serving public schools in human relations capacities.

2. Do you perceive specialists as belonging to a "profession in process?" ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Should the specialist possess special credentials to denote his expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No
4. What do you consider to be the best academic background for a specialist? (Select one response from Column II for the degree listed in Column I.)

Column I	Column II
<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree	1. Sociology
<input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree	2. Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate degree	3. Education with Sociology
<input type="checkbox"/> No degree	4. Educational Sociology
	5. Sociology of Education
	6. Human Relations
	7. Guidance and Counseling
	8. Educational Psychology
	9. Other (Specify)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree
	<input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree
	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate degree

\*Same as Form A without Item #15.

5. In what areas would you expect the specialist to have a high degree of expertise? (Check all that apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Community relations	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum and learning programs
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative and organizational policies	<input type="checkbox"/> Family structures
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty interpersonal relations	<input type="checkbox"/> School-home relations
<input type="checkbox"/> Student interpersonal relations	<input type="checkbox"/> Racial, religious, and minority group relations in and outside the school
<input type="checkbox"/> Social customs	<input type="checkbox"/> Student integration
<input type="checkbox"/> Population trends	<input type="checkbox"/> Student and faculty dissent
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	

6. To what professional organizations would you expect the specialist to seek membership? Those designed for (check all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/> Teachers	<input type="checkbox"/> Human relations workers
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrators	<input type="checkbox"/> Sociologists
<input type="checkbox"/> Student personnel workers	<input type="checkbox"/> Social workers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	

7. Where would you recommend practicums, or field experiences, and internships be conducted for the specialist? (Check all that apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Urban schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural schools
<input type="checkbox"/> Suburban schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Segregated schools
<input type="checkbox"/> Racially integrated schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Intergroup relations agencies
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> None needed	

8. What type of activities should constitute practicums and internships? (Check all that apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Special projects in problem schools	<input type="checkbox"/> Assisting the school community workers
<input type="checkbox"/> Assisting school personnel workers	<input type="checkbox"/> Aiding sponsors of human relations clubs
<input type="checkbox"/> Analyzing school community	<input type="checkbox"/> No practicum needed
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	

9. What type of previous positions would benefit the specialist most? (Rank your first three choices in a descending order 1, 2, and 3.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Public school teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> College or University administration
<input type="checkbox"/> College or University teaching	<input type="checkbox"/> Public school social work
<input type="checkbox"/> Public school administration	<input type="checkbox"/> School psychological services
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	

10. Which of the action functions listed below do you perceive as being within the duties of the human relations specialist? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Assist school personnel working with individuals and groups within the community on desegregation matters.
- ☐ Enlist community interests and support in regard to school programs.
- ☐ Promote programs and activities among pupils, staff, and the school-community for the improvement of human relations.
- ☐ Conduct training programs in human relations for the entire staff.
- ☐ Help resolve questions and complaints from students, parents, and other concerned citizens.
- ☐ Develop leadership in the area of school desegregation.
- ☐ Assist in developing and implementing Title IV proposals administered by local school districts.
- ☐ Assist colleges and universities in the training of teachers for the school system.
- ☐ Assist teachers to work effectively with students of different races by providing opportunity to examine, use, and evaluate multi-ethnic materials and classroom activities.
- ☐ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

11. Which of the following planning functions should the human relations specialist be capable of performing for the system? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Design and evaluate human relations training programs and institutes for local leaders, teachers, and administrators.
- ☐ Propose plans for school systems with unusual population trends.
- ☐ Prepare and evaluate school programs related to the total community needs.
- ☐ Develop workable approaches to the solutions of human relations problems.
- ☐ Plan programs to promote better human relations in school activities.
- ☐ Provide leadership in dealing with curriculum and instructional problems at the planning and implementation levels.
- ☐ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

12. What research activities do you think the specialist should perform for the school system? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Define the role or roles of the child in the family.
- ☐ Define the relationships of parents to children and the interpersonal relationships to the child to siblings and parents.
- ☐ Investigate the relations between various racial, religious, and minority groups in the community.
- ☐ Study the social interactions both within and outside the school.
- ☐ Identify the fundamental educational and administrative problems associated with school desegregation.
- ☐ Aid in the development of curriculum, guidance, and other instructional materials in intergroup education.
- ☐ Analyze the structure and function of groups to determine how they are influenced by or influence the social relationships within the school and community.
- ☐ Study and analyze the patterns of social interactions and roles within the school organization.
- ☐ Collect, organize, and interpret facts concerning community organization, social customs, family and other social phenomena.
- ☐ Investigate the many factors involved in student integration, faculty desegregation, and interpersonal relations, involving the total school-community resources.
- ☐ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

13. What positions in the public school system should the specialist be capable of coordinating or supervising? (Check all that apply.)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> School psychologists  | <input type="checkbox"/> Principals        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School social workers | <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting teachers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant principals  | <input type="checkbox"/> Counselors        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School nurses         | <input type="checkbox"/> Community workers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |  |

14. To whom should the specialist be directly responsible?  
(Check one.)

<input type="checkbox"/> School principal	<input type="checkbox"/> School social worker
<input type="checkbox"/> School superintendent	<input type="checkbox"/> Visiting teacher
<input type="checkbox"/> School personnel director	<input type="checkbox"/> Human relations director
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	

15. In order that we may communicate with other school personnel knowledgeable of the work of the specialist, please suggest the names and addresses of a teacher, principal, counselor, and superintendent familiar with your services for the purpose of assessing their perceptions of specialists serving public school systems in human relations capacities. (Please list such persons in the space provided below.)

Name

Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Counselor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

## APPENDIX G

### PANEL OF JUDGES USED TO VALIDATE THE QUESTIONNAIRES IN THE STUDY

1. Mr. Bill Waltman  
Person working to improve intergroup, interpersonal,  
and intercultural relations in public schools  
Consultative Center, University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
2. Dr. George Henderson, Goldman Professor of  
Human Relations  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
3. Dr. Robert Bibens, Professor of Education  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
4. Mr. Gregory E. Shinert, Coordinator for Intergroup  
Relations  
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
5. Dr. George A. Letchworth, Professor of Education  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
6. Mr. J. Mosley, Field Consultant  
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

# APPENDIX H

## VALIDATION CHECK SHEET SUBMITTED TO THE PANEL OF JUDGES USED TO VALIDATE THE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THIS STUDY

Directions: Please evaluate each item in the questionnaire using the five (5) types of evidences indicated below. Check (✓) in the space labeled yes or no for each of the items.

### Validation Evidence

### Item Number

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

1. Is the item on the subject?

Yes  
No


2. Is the item clear and unambiguous?

Yes  
No


3. Does the item pull or have extractive power?

Yes  
No


4. Is the item sufficiently inclusive?

Yes  
No


5. Do the responses show a reasonable range of variation?

Yes  
No


6. Does the item need to be discarded?

Yes  
No


APPENDIX I  
INTERGROUP RELATIONS AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS  
USED IN THE STUDY

American Friends Service Committee  
Community Relations Division  
160 North 15th Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102  
Pamelia Coe, Director of Education and Indian Affairs

Berkeley Unified School District  
Office of Human Relations  
1414 Walnut Street  
Berkeley, California 94709  
Kathryne Favors, Director

Pasadena Unified School District  
Department of Intergroup Education  
351 South Hudson Avenue  
Pasadena, California 91109  
Ralph Hornbeck, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Denver Public Schools  
Office of School-Community Relations  
414 14th Street  
Denver, Colorado  
Gilbert Cruter, Director

Detroit Board of Education  
Schools-Center Building  
Detroit, Michigan

Board of Education of the City of New York  
Office of Intergroup Education  
110 Livingston Street  
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201  
Frederick H. Williams, Assistant Superintendent

## APPENDIX J

### UNIVERSITY CENTERS WITH PROGRAMS IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Bank Street College of Education  
103 East 125th Street  
New York, New York 10035  
Gordon J. Klopff, Director of a Study of Auxiliary  
Personnel in Education

Springfield College  
Community Tensions Center  
Springfield, Massachusetts  
Jacke C. Harris, Chairman of Community Leadership and  
Development

St. Louis University  
Human Relations Center for Training and Research  
221 North Grand Street  
St. Louis, Missouri 63103  
Rev. Trafford P. Maher, S. J., Director

University of Oklahoma  
The Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies  
1700 Asp Street  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

University of Pennsylvania  
Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Melvin M. Tumin, Acting Director

Wayne State University  
College of Education  
Intergroup Relations Center  
Detroit, Michigan 48202  
Dr. Abraham F. Citrom, Director

## APPENDIX K

### DIRECTOR OF UNIVERSITY IN-SERVICE CONSULTATIVE CENTERS

Dr. James Bash, Director  
Consultative Resources Center for School Desegregation  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. David Bjork, Director  
Intercultural Center for Southern Alabama  
University of South Alabama  
Mobile, Alabama 36608

Dr. Strafford Clark, Director  
Auburn Center for Assistance with Problems Arising  
from School Desegregation  
Auburn University  
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. Norman Deeb, Director  
Western Kentucky Human Relations Center for Education  
Western Kentucky University  
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Dr. Ralph Duke, Director  
Educational Consulting Center for School Personnel  
University of Delaware  
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dr. William A. Gaines, Director  
Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center  
St. Augustine's College  
Raleigh, North Carolina 37602

Dr. Joseph Garrison, Director  
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies: The Consultative  
Center  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Dr. Morrill M. Hall, Director  
Consultative and Resource Center for the Solving of Problems  
Caused by School Desegregation  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602

CONSULTATIVE CENTERS--Continued

Dr. Glenn Hontz, Director  
Educational Resource Center on School Desegregation  
Tulane University  
8200 Hampson Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Mr. Percy Reeves, Acting Director  
South Mississippi In-Service Consulting Center  
University of Southern Mississippi  
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

Dr. Larry Winecoff, Director  
South Carolina Desegregation Center  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. Michael Stolee, Director  
Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center  
University of Miami  
Coral Gables, Florida 33146

Texas Educational Desegregation Technical and Advisory  
Center  
University of Texas  
Division of Extension  
Office of Extension Teaching and Field Service Bureau  
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. Frederick P. Venditti, Director  
Educational Opportunities Planning Center  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dr. A. B. Weatherington, Director  
Arkansas Technical Assistance Center  
Ouachita Baptist University  
Arkadelphia, Arkansas