This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

69-17,824

HALL, Donald Joe, 1935-

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION OF TEACHERS INVOLVED IN FACULTY DESEGREGATION.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2580

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION OF TEACHERS INVOLVED IN FACULTY DESEGREGATION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

DONALD JOE HALL

Norman, Oklahoma

1969

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

OF TEACHERS INVOLVED IN FACULTY DESEGREGATION

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This writer is indeed indebted to Dr. Glenn R. Snider, Chairman of the Doctoral Committee and director of this investigation, for his cooperation, encouragement, guidance, and patience during the preparation and development of this study. Further acknowledgment is made for the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Henry Angelino, Dr. Jack F. Parker and Dr. R. F. Bibens.

In conducting this study invaluable assistance was received from the total staff of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation. A special note of appreciation is extended to Mrs. Helen Massey for her understanding assistance in the typing of this paper. A debt of gratitude is extended to the teachers whose participation was indispensable to the study.

Above all, my love goes to my wife, Phyllis, and my children, Cynthia and Susan, whose patience, support, constant understanding and confidence were vital to the success of the entire doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE	1
	Introduction	1
	Background and Need for the Study	4
	Purpose of the Study	9
	Statement of the Problem	10
	Significance of the Study	14
	Major Assumptions	14
	Limitations of the Study	15
	Definition of Terms	16
	Method and Procedure of the Study	18
	Statistical Treatment	19
	Organization of the Study	20
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE	21
	A Rationale for Re-education Experiences	21
	Problems Associated with Faculty Desegregation	28
	Formal Efforts to Alter Attitudes toward School Desegregation	34
III.	PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY	43
	Procedures for Faculty Desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System	44
	Procedures for Faculty Desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System	48
	Procedures for the Development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Oklahoma City Public School System	52
	Procedures for the Development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Tulsa Public School System	53
	Uniqueness of the Experience of Faculty Desegregation in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa Public School Systems	56

Page

Design of the Experiment 58
Selection of the Sample 62
Selection of the Instrument 63
Statistical Method 68

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA 73

The Sample 75
Analysis of the Data 79
Analysis of the Major Hypotheses 79
Analysis of the Sub-Hypotheses 86
Reliability of Attitude Survey Instrument . 98
Summary 99

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 102

Summary 102
Findings 106
Conclusions 110
Recommendations 112

BIBLIOGRAPHY 113

APPENDIX 119

A. COPY OF INSTRUMENT USED IN THE STUDY 120
B. COPY OF RE-EDUCATION EFFORT IN THE OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM 132
C. COPY OF RE-EDUCATION EFFORT IN THE TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM 139
D. SCORES ON INSTRUMENT USED 144
E. CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THE STUDY 148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Data on Teachers Prepared by Method A . . .	77
2.	Data on Teachers Prepared by Method B . . .	78
3.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Difference between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of Teachers Prepared by the Various Methods	80
4.	Total Individuals Who Scored Above and Below the Median from the Pretest to the Posttest for the Teachers Prepared by Method A	88
5.	Chi-Square Scores from the McNemar Test Treatment	90
6.	Percent of Increase (or Decrease) from Pretest to Posttest of the Method A Group	94
7.	Percent of Increase (or Decrease) from Pretest to Posttest of the Method B Group	98

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION OF TEACHERS INVOLVED IN FACULTY DESEGREGATION

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

Introduction

There can be little doubt that the problem of racial discrimination is one of the most crucial issues facing the American democratic society. The American society has paid dearly for the failure to accept persons for what they are without reference to race, religion, or social inheritance. More than a decade has passed since the historic Supreme Court Decision of 1954, which launched the national effort toward desegregation, yet the pressing problems of racial discrimination are evidenced today by an examination of any form of the news media. Religion, education, business, recreation, government, and family life have been affected by this critical issue of racial discrimination. Public education probably has been the one institution with the greatest challenge to meet the problems associated with racial discrimination.

A basic problem to be resolved in the immediate

years ahead is that of bringing about effective school integration. Will the public school as a social institution continue to resist the demands for change? Or will the public school seize the initiative and utilize this time of change and transition to achieve a new standard of educational excellence, "equality of educational opportunity for all youth?" Public education must be the prime vehicle for the assimilation of minority groups into the mainstream of American society. The American Association of School Administrators recently developed a statement on racial policy charging the public schools of today with the task of transforming a culture.

The official statement was:

> The major implication of public school integration is a challenge to public schools to assist the American society to successfully make the transition demanded by law and supported by our fundamental values. The school is the primary vehicle in our society capable of making the changes in our institutions and patterns of living that must be made.
>
> We believe that the schools of America should take the initiative for eliminating the barriers that prevent full access to appropriate educational opportunity for all Negro and other minority children. Pressures for methods of integration which are empty of educational meaning, and pressures against methods of integration which are not educationally productive should be equally resisted. In both curricular and extra-curricular programs, the schools have an opportunity to instill in their pupils that respect for the unique value of the individual which renders human differences desirable rather than undesirable.
>
> Teachers, the superintendent, and the school board, working together with community leaders, have a mandate to provide positive influence and strong leadership to the staff and community in eliminating racial

> segregation, and the social and educational disadvantages which accompany it, in every activity of the school.[1]

The Educational Policies Commission's official position concerning equality of educational opportunity follows:

> From belief in the equal dignity of all men, a demand for equal opportunity of all men logically flows, and American history is in major part a story of the search for it. National origin, religion, and sex gradually became less relevant to chances for personal development and advancement in the United States. Americans even developed an institution, the public school, specifically to make the ideal of equal opportunity a reality.[2]

As stated in the resolution adopted by the American Association of School Administrators, the integration of public schools is demanded by law and supported by our fundamental values. The legal basis for school integration is found in the famous Brown vs. Board of Education Supreme Court decision of 1954 which in effect reversed the 1896 Plessy vs. Ferguson decision of separate but equal facilities. The conclusion of the Brown decision was that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. In the second Brown case in 1955 the courts required that the defendants make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance of school desegregation. Perhaps the one

---

[1] American Association of School Administrators, Resolution Adopted by the 98th Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators (Atlantic City, New Jersey, Feb., 1966).

[2] Educational Policies Commission, American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: N.E.A., 1965), p. 1.

single event which engendered the most optimism over the prospects for the eradication of racial discrimination in the public schools was the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This optimism is based upon Title VI of the act, which provides in Section 601 that, "No person in the United States shall, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."

Educational leaders now have the moral and legal responsibility to develop and implement plans and programs which not only eliminate the dual school systems, but also effectively integrate minority group students into the total life of the educational system. If the public school is to take the initiative during this time of significant social change, educational administrators and school board members must exhibit imaginative, creative, and influential leadership in facilitating the movement toward integration of school enrollments and faculties in the public schools.

Background and Need for the Study

The official policy statements of the various educational organizations, the various legal, moral, and ethical rationales for the implementation of school desegregation combined with the legislative requirements outlined in the 1964 Civil Rights Act are adequate bases for the

necessary establishment of a public educational system which will most effectively provide equal educational opportunity for all youth.

The two major problems related to the provision of equal educational opportunity for minority group students are (1) the elimination of the de jure segregation of southern and border states and (2) the elimination of the de facto segregation of the northern states.

The first problem is compounded because of the emergence of the northern de facto segregation patterns in many southern cities. A wide variety of techniques for the desegregation of schools such as transporting children to schools outside their neighborhoods, redrawing school district lines, the pairing of Negro and Caucasian schools, and other techniques are proving to be temporary and inadequate devices for combating the racial segregation of pupils in the de facto segregation situations in urban areas of the North and South.

A promising factor in the urban setting for desegregated education which can be physically implemented by the educational administrator immediately is the practice of the desegregation of school faculties or the placement of Negro teachers in predominantly Caucasian schools and the placement of Caucasian teachers in predominantly Negro schools.

The right of all pupils to share equally in the

best teaching available means distributing qualified teachers evenly, which, in turn, means assigning white teachers to Negro schools in areas where whites will not live and Negro teachers to white schools in areas where Negroes cannot live.[1]

A rationale for faculty desegregation has been developed and was described by Noar[2] as:

1. A procedure for the development of a positive attitude toward human relationships by the example of teachers of both races working together.
2. An example of the school in a position of leadership concerning race relations. An integrated faculty is an example of what race relations can be.
3. An example of students being provided role models of different races. Students need role models of different races. Faculty desegregation creates a new image of the Negro teacher to white youngsters and a new image of the white teacher to Negro youngsters.

In December, 1966, the United States Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, released the "Revised

---

[1]Peter A. Janssen, "The Next Step: Teacher Integration," The Reporter, XXXV (November, 1966), p. 32.

[2]Gertrude Noar, The Teacher and Integration (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966), p. 87.

Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." Guidelines for the desegregation of school faculties were included in the revised statement. The sections contained in the document concerning faculty desegregation follow:

181.13 Faculty and Staff

(a) Desegregation of Staff. The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether students are subjected to discrimination in educational programs. Each school system is responsible for correcting the effects of all past discriminatory practices in the assignment of teachers and other professional staff.

(b) New Assignments. Race, color, or national origin may not be a factor in the hiring or assignment to schools or within schools of teachers and other professional staff, including student teachers and staff serving two or more schools, except to correct the effects of past discriminatory assignments.

(c) Dismissals. Teachers and other professional staff may not be dismissed, demoted, or passed over for retention, promotion, or rehiring, on the ground of race, color, or national origin. In any instance where one or more teachers or other professional staff vacancy in the school system may be filled through recruitment from outside the system unless the school officials can show that no such displaced staff member is qualified to fill the vacancy. If as a result of desegregation, there is to be a reduction in the total professional staff of the school, the total professional staff must be evaluated in selecting the staff members to be released.

(d) Past Assignments. The pattern of assignment of teachers and other professional staff among the various schools of a system may not be such that schools are identifiable as intended for students of a particular race, color, or national origin, or such that teachers or other professional staff of a particular race are concentrated in those schools where all, or the majority of, the students are of that race. Each school system has a positive duty to make staff assignments and reassignments necessary to eliminate past discriminatory assignment

patterns. Staff desegregation for the 1967-68 school year must include significant progress beyond what was accomplished for the 1966-67 school year in the desegregation of teachers assigned to schools on a regular full-time basis. Patterns of staff assignments to initiate staff desegregation might include, for example: (1) some desegregation of professional staff in each school in the system, (2) the assignment of a significant portion of the professional staff of each race to particular schools in the system where theirs is a minority and where special staff training programs are established to help with the process of staff desegregation, (3) the assignment of a significant portion of the staff on a desegregated basis to those schools in which the student body is desegregated, (4) the reassignment of the staff of schools being closed to other schools in the system where their race is a minority, or (5) an alternative pattern of assignment which will make comparable progress in bringing about staff desegregation successfully.[1]

The recent developments related to the realization of a need for faculty desegregation, the relative ease of the accomplishment of the physical desegregation of faculties, the Title VI guidelines as previously described, and various court orders which specified faculty desegregation indicate a need to understand this educational process in order to insure the success of this venture. The major problems related to faculty desegregation have not been analyzed. There is a definite need for information which will assist local school administrators in making wise decisions related to procedures for the desegregation of faculties and the eventual assignment of teachers without regard to race, color or creed.

---

[1] "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," As Amended for the School Year 1967-68, December, 1966, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, pp. 2-3.

Becuase of the influence exerted by school personnel, efforts should be made to study school systems where faculty desegregation is being accomplished with some degree of success to determine what factors aided effective faculty-staff integration. Special problems encountered in such efforts must be identified and analyzed. Such information must be organized and utilized in assisting educational leaders as they seek to develop the attitudes, abilities, and skills necessary to achieve effective desegregation.

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of two methods of preparing teachers for faculty desegregation. The Oklahoma City and Tulsa public school systems, in cooperation with the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma, each developed re-education programs for teachers involved in faculty desegregation for the 1968-69 school year. A major objective of these re-education programs was to develop positive attitudes toward school desegregation with the Caucasian and Negro teachers involved in the programs. It was the purpose of this investigation to determine the extent that each of the two re-education experiences contributed to positive attitudes toward school desegregation with the involved teachers in the respective groups.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the effectiveness of two re-education programs in altering the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers involved in the experience of faculty desegregation in two metropolitan school districts.

More specifically this study intended to:

1. Determine the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers who were involved in each of two programs designed to prepare teachers for school desegregation before the programs and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

2. Analyze the differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers in each program before the programs and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

3. Analyze the differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of Caucasian and Negro teachers in each program before the programs and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

4. Analyze the differences in the patterns and direction of change in the attitudes toward school desegregation between those individuals who scored above the median on the survey instrument and those individuals who scored below the median on the survey instrument in the various groups described above.

The following null hypotheses were formulated related to the problem of the study:

HO_1 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

HO_2 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

HO_3 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of Caucasian teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

HO_4 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of Negro teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

HO_5 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of Caucasian teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching

in a faculty desegregation setting.

HO_6 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of Negro teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

Six additional relationships were investigated as sub-problems which were related to the patterns and direction of change within various groups involved in the study. The following sub-hypotheses were formulated:

Sub HO_1 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (from pretest to posttest score) between the teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored below the median.

Sub HO_2 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (from pretest to posttest score) between the teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored above the median and teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median.

Sub HO_3 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in

attitudes toward school desegregation (on the pretest instrument) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored below the median.

Sub HO_4 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (on the posttest instrument) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored below the median.

Sub HO_5 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in the attitudes toward school desegregation (on the pretest instrument) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median.

Sub HO_6 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in the attitudes toward school desegregation (on the posttest instrument) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median.

Significance of the Study

This study is important in that it should contribute to a better understanding of how faculty attitudes toward school desegregation may be improved. Additional significant information was obtained concerning the value of efforts to design specific programs to alter attitudes of teachers involved in faculty desegregation. Information developed from this study can serve a useful purpose in facilitating the process of faculty desegregation.

Major Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in advance of the study:

1. Teachers with positive attitudes toward school desegregation would contribute toward the success of faculty desegregation.

2. The faculty desegregation experiences of teachers in the Tulsa and Oklahoma City school systems were similar types of experiences which allowed for generalizations concerning methods of preparing teachers for faculty desegregation.

3. The length of time between the pretest and posttest, as described in the study, was long enough to allow for the reinforcement of the attitudes of the teachers toward school desegregation.

4. The modified version of Rosenbaum's Attitude Toward Desegregation Scale was appropriate to use as the

pretest and posttest instrument for the experiment.[1]

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to approximately 300 faculty members involved for the first time in faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System and the Tulsa Public School System who participated in a program designed to prepare teachers for school desegregation. Approximately 150 of these faculty members were teaching in the Oklahoma City Public School System and were involved in the re-education program. Approximately 150 of the faculty members were teaching in the Tulsa Public School System and were involved in the re-education program. Each group of teachers included a representation of Caucasian and Negro teachers.

The scope of this study did not take into consideration the variables of socio-economic background, professional experience, educational background, type of subject matter or grade level assignment, or the emotional stability of the teachers involved. Because of the impossibility of controlling the variables no formal attempt was made to apply statistical treatment to the differences in the degree of effectiveness of the two re-education programs.

---

[1]Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1967), p. 168.

Definition of Terms

Most of the terms used in this study are in general use in educational literature; however, for sake of clarity the terms unique to this study were defined.

School segregation is the system of separate school facilities and programs for students and faculty members based on race.

School desegregation is the process of abolishing the racial criteria for school attendance and the actual abolishment of separate schools for racial groups. Arrangements are in force which result in students of different racial groups actually attending school together.

School integration is defined as the absence of any racial distinctions within each school and school system. All academic and nonacademic school sponsored activities are participated in by all students in each building.

Faculty desegregation means the assignment pattern of teachers among the various school buildings of a system in such a manner that the individual school may not be identifiable from a faculty standpoint as a school of a particular race. For the purposes of this study the teachers involved in this investigation were teaching in schools where the race of the students constituted less than five percent of the race of the faculty members studied.

The Method A program was the approach used in preparing teachers for faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System and included a planned program for preparing teachers for faculty desegregation conducted for a week in August, 1968. This method is described in Chapter III.

The Method B program was the approach used in preparing teachers for faculty desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System and included a planned program for preparing teachers for faculty desegregation conducted on six consecutive Saturdays beginning in September, 1968. This method is described in Chapter III.

Attitude refers to a relatively enduring system of affective, evaluative reactions based upon the evaluative concepts and/or beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of a social object or class of social objects.[1]

Attitude toward desegregation would refer to a relatively enduring system of affective, evaluative reactions based upon the evaluative concepts and beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of desegregation of the races.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10.

Method and Procedure of the Study

A variation of the classical experimental design as defined by Kerlinger was utilized in the study. Kerlinger defined this design as the "before and after control-group design (pretest-posttest)." For studies of change, or so-called change experiments, he calls this the "classical design" of research.[1]

The teachers to be involved in faculty desegregation in the two school systems were selected by the administrative staffs of the two school systems using regular administrative procedures.

The population used in this study included the total number of teachers who participated in the programs for preparing teachers for faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa school systems. The sample was limited to teachers involved in faculty desegregation as faculty desegregation has been defined. The sample was limited further to those teachers who completed the total re-education effort.

M. E. Rosenbaum's scale, A Survey of Attitudes Toward Desegregation,[2] and twenty-five additional items developed by the investigator were utilized to survey the attitudes of the sample group toward school desegregation.

---

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 308.

[2]Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 168.

The instrument was administered to each group as a pretest prior to the beginning of the programs for preparing the teachers for faculty desegregation in each school system. The program defined as Method A was scheduled from August 12 to 16, 1968. The program defined as Method B began in September, 1968, and was conducted for six consecutive Saturday sessions.

After the two groups had been teaching in this new setting for nine weeks, the survey instrument was administered as a posttest. The significance of the differences, according to the hypotheses of the study, were tested. The extraneous developments preceding and during the study were presented.

Statistical Treatment

A sample, which included all of the teachers involved in faculty desegregation who participated in the re-education effort in the Oklahoma City School System, was selected and identified as being prepared by the Method A program.

A sample, which included all of the teachers involved in faculty desegregation who participated in the re-education effort in the Tulsa School System, was selected and identified as being prepared by the Method B program.

In order to determine the net shift in attitudes within the various groupings, the significance of the differences was tested by comparing the differences in the

mean scores within each grouping. The "t" test was used to test this significance of difference at the .01 level. In order to determine the pattern and dimensional strength of the shift in attitudes, the differences between the scores above the median and the scores below the median in the various groupings were tested. The McNemar Test for the Significance of Change was used to test this significance of difference at the .01 level.

Using a split half method of correlation, the coefficient of correlation was calculated. This provided a method for checking the reliability of the attitude survey instrument.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter constitutes the introduction which identifies the problem investigated and the general plan of the study. The second chapter presents a study of selected literature related to the problem. The third chapter contains a detailed description of the procedures of the study. The fourth chapter contains a presentation and analysis of the data. The fifth chapter is composed of a summary, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

This study was primarily concerned with determining the effectiveness of a program designed to alter the attitudes of teachers who were to become involved in a new professional experience of faculty desegregation. In order to keep the review of literature within its proper limits, several studies were described which were representative of (1) a rationale for re-education experiences for teachers involved in faculty desegregation, (2) problems associated with faculty desegregation, and (3) efforts to build and alter attitudes toward interracial relationships, especially toward the issue of school desegregation.

A Rationale for Re-education Experiences

A special educational problem occasioned by school desegregation is that of faculty-staff integration. As time and effort are devoted to studies of community and pupil involvements related to this social movement, the many-faceted problems related to the smooth and effective assimilation of teachers and other school personnel into the totally integrated school must not be neglected.

Generally, school personnel may be expected to be as unprepared for this move as the communities which they serve. Yet their attitudes and abilities related to this problem can be expected to have significant influence upon the successful accomplishment of the goals of school desegregation.

The teachers' responsibility for guiding and promoting positive learnings by peers in an interracial situation is very clear. In a number of ways teaching in the interracial classroom is like teaching in any other classroom; similar problems related to instructional competence, diagnostic knowledge of one's relations with students, management of peer relations with students, management of peer relations and effective evaluation must arise.[1]

Teachers are in a position to positively or negatively affect problems stemming from school desegregation. Because of their training, experience, and perhaps inclination, most teachers will not be able to achieve positive outcomes without some special experiences relevant to racial relations. The teacher who is a skilled and alert professional has a good start on being successful in an

---

[1]Mark A. Chesler, "Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms," in United States Commission on Civil Rights, National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 165.

interracial situation. The interracial classroom is different from other more homogeneous situations, although there is insufficient research to state boldly what and how major are these differences. Chesler[1] listed several of these differences as follows:

> 1. Since the cultural heritage and reality of mutual ignorance and distance, if not antagonism and fear, between the races probably is present in the minds and views of all Americans, the teacher must wrestle with his or her own views of people of another race.
>
> 2. In the same fashion, student peer relations are likely to be constrained and affected by the same set of deeply rooted attitudes and beliefs. In addition to the students' own views, the adult culture validates and supports such peer cleavages and rejection.
>
> 3. Since few schools of education offer courses focusing on the racial aspects of education, most teachers are not prepared by their preservice experience or training for this instructional challenge.
>
> 4. There may be few professional peers who are in the same position of teaching an interracial class, and thus few colleagues with whom to share fears, hopes, tactics, successes and failures.
>
> 5. There may be few available sources of special assistance relevant to the particular problems faced by teachers of the interracial classroom. Since most schools that have and will have desegregated facilities are new to these patterns, they will be experiencing new pains without a body of tradition and experience to call upon to help handle problems.

In a survey of 145 Dade County, Florida, teachers who were involved in faculty desegregation 64.4 percent of the teachers indicated a need for seminars, orientations, and general information on cultural differences. There

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 165-166.

was an emphasis on obtaining information for the purpose of understanding motivations and feelings within each cultural group.[1]

Fox[2] suggested several specific goals for teachers involved in in-service training programs including: opening a process of professional self-renewal; gaining skill in utilizing the resources of others; developing skill in designing and executing classroom level action-research projects; contributing to the improvement of dynamic working relationships with colleagues; and gaining skill in communicating experiences in learning to others.

Chesler[3] stated that one of the necessary foci of a teacher training program would seem to be a clarification and explanation of the characteristic attitudes and behaviors of the teachers in the classroom. One aspect of such knowledge might well be a review of the cultural styles or biases in the teachers' or group of teachers' backgrounds. Another more contemporaneous form of information may include assessments of attitudes toward self and education, attitudes toward other teachers and administrators, or a

---

[1] Faculty Desegregation Report, Survey Update (Miami, Florida: Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association, 1966), p. 4.

[2] Richard Fox, "In Service Education for Innovation and Change," in Rogge, Robert, and Stormer, Franklin, In-Service Training for Teachers of the Gifted (Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Co., 1966), p. 147.

[3] Chesler, op. cit., pp. 169-70.

more specific focus on attitudes toward racial issues. Reports or locally collected data on how white and Negro teachers view the prospects or realities of an interracial classroom seem very relevant.

Another activity developed by Chesler[1] that undoubtedly was a necessary component of plans for teacher change is a self-examination of each individual's personal feelings and values about racially potent matters. The persons, Caucasian or Negro, who teach in public or private school classrooms are all part of the American society; a society which has been built and is maintained upon racially separate living, working and schooling patterns. As such, teachers can be expected to hold many of the same feelings about racial separatism and mutual fear or resentment as do most Americans. However, we can expect that these teachers are able to invent or modify attitudes for use in the classroom.

Many prospective teachers have developed biases concerning what is a desirable assignment in the public school system. Haubrich[2] noted reports of prospective teachers' desires to be located in a good school, where

---

[1] Ibid., p. 170.

[2] Vernon Haubrich, "Teachers for Big City Schools," in Passow, A. Harry (Ed.), Education in Depressed Areas (New York: Columbia Press, 1963), pp. 246-247.

students are like themselves. In addition, Foley[1] discussed the negative expectations many teachers hold of disadvantaged or minority group youngsters, and speculated upon the development of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The teacher who expects the worst often may create it by his own fear or lack of enthusiasm. The student senses this feeling and is not motivated to excel or exert himself. Having found the worst, the teacher's expectations are thus confirmed.

A serious examination of attitudes by teachers may not lead to changed attitudes, but it may help teachers to understand the potential effects of their views in the classroom and may help teachers to control their attitudes and behaviors.

A summary of the various areas of concern for a re-education experience for teachers involved in faculty desegregation was presented by Chesler as:

> 1. Teaching Practices. Many educators and designers of educational change efforts take it for granted that more adequate knowledge of oneself, one's role, and one's students will lead directly to improved classroom practice.
>
> 2. Peer Relations. Many teachers who generate exciting ideas for use in their own classroom never have the opportunity to share these ideas with their peers. Without this opportunity for sharing, and without the possibility of giving or receiving

---

[1]William Foley, "Teaching Disadvantaged Pupils," in James Beck and Richard Saxe (Eds.), Teaching the Culturally Deprived Pupil (Springfield, Illinois: C. Thomas Company, 1965), pp. 89-90.

feedback, the potential resources and assistance of peers may be lost.

3. Administrative Relations. Principals and superintendents of schools obviously can play key roles in facilitating and supporting teacher change. Administrators can help by providing extra resources to relieve teachers from some daily routines and to provide funds and support for such training programs as we are discussing here. Moreover, they can help set a systemic atmosphere that encourages teachers to get extra training and generates institutional support for their later efforts.

4. Community Relations. A final focus for change efforts is the community within which the particular school or school system operates. Many educational administrators try to preserve their own autonomy by keeping the community ignorant about what they are doing in the schools. One result of this posture is that both the community and the school system are systematically deprived of mutual resources and potential help. The major problem seems to us to be one of enabling the school system to see community agents as collaborators and potential helpers instead of perennial enemies.[1]

As defined by Blake[2] the greater the shift for either a white or Negro teacher, the greater the justification for involving them in a training program. The program would concentrate on working through attitudes and expectations about the new school setting in biracial institute groups. These should run, most ideally, throughout the academic year on a seminar basis where the problems perceived by the teachers as related to the new racial

---

[1]Chesler, op. cit., pp. 171-186.

[2]Elias Blake, Jr., "A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," in the United States Commission of Civil Rights, National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunities in American Cities (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 148-149.

pattern can be worked through. The training program should leave training for the teaching of the disadvantaged to other agencies (NDEA institutes, ESEA, etc.) and deal with improving education in biracial settings.

Problems Associated with Faculty Desegregation

One of the major dilemmas about developing a re-education experience for teachers is the problem of organizing the curriculum in such a way as to be relevant for the participating teachers. A logical approach is to divide the material presented into major problem areas.

Schmuck, Chesler and Lippit listed a five-phase problem solving process in a re-education effort as: (1) identifying classroom problems; (2) diagnosing classroom problems; (3) developing a plan; (4) taking action and (5) feedback and evaluation.[1]

This approach placed a premium upon step by step analyses of the present state of affairs preliminary to action taking. Jung and his associates stated that:[2]

"Research findings seldom provide direct answers about what the educator should do in dealing with a problem."

---

[1]Richard Schmuck, Mark Chesler, and Raymond Lippitt, Problem Solving in the Classroom (Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, 1966), pp. 164-171.

[2]C. Jung, R. Fox, and R. Lippitt, "An Orientation and Strategy for Working on Problems of Change in School Systems," in Alfred Watson (Ed.), Change in School Systems (Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1967), p. 89.

Teachers must be able to look beyond the data or generalizations to derive implications relevant to their own classroom. For example, teachers from divergent ethnic or social groups may be able to provide support to each other if a situation is developed which encourages them to commit themselves to common goals and objectives that are more important than personal goals or fears.

According to Sarason and associates[1] in research on school anxiety it was found that the behavior of teachers in desegregated classrooms is of far greater importance to Negro children than to whites. Anxiety about one's social worth and intellectual adequacy is more prevalent among the minority newcomers. From their observations in classrooms, the Sarason group concluded that teachers vary greatly in the degree to which they provide direction and support to children who approach academic tasks apprehensively. They state:

> In some classrooms failure or lack of progress by a child is responded to by the teacher in a way that increases the child's feeling of inadequacy. In other classrooms such a child is responded to in a way that, while it recognizes the child's failure or rate of progress, does not reject him; i.e., the teacher likes and accepts him despite his inadequacy or failure. It is too frequently forgotten by parents (and also by teachers) how important a figure the teacher is in the life of the child. From the standpoint of the child, what he thinks is the teacher's attitude toward him is of great importance to him,

---

[1] S. B. Sarason, K. S. Davidson, and F. F. Lighthall, Anxiety in Elementary School Children (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1960), p. 186.

> particularly if he likes the teacher and wants to be liked by her. . . . It is when the child is disposed to like and respect the teacher that the ways in which the teacher responds to an adequate performance of the child are of great significance. This would be especially true for the anxious child, who is dependent on the positive attitudes of others toward him for a sense of security.[1]

There is ample evidence to point out that faculty members, particularly Caucasians, are inclined to react negatively to minority group pupils. Davidson and Lang found that regardless of their scholastic standing, elementary school pupils from blue-collar homes tended to perceive their teachers as rejectant.[2] In a small-sample study the race of teachers seemed to make a difference in how they viewed Negro students, with white teachers being more critical of their motivation and ability.[3] Another example of the role of the teacher for the Negro students was developed by Geisel:[4]

> The teacher for the white child is likely to be simply an instrumental agent of the school. For the Negro child she also represents a status position and

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 187-188.

[2] Helen H. Davidson and George Lang, "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX (Summer, 1960), pp. 107-118.

[3] Kenneth B. Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 174.

[4] Paul N. Geisel, "I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: Racial Comparison," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962, Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXII, 1962), pp. 3390-3391.

> a respected social role. . . . The Negro child who feels he is important in the eyes of the teacher is optimistic about the future and also thinks that education is very important. This pattern is much less pronounced for white youth.

In a study of goals and values held by poor youth conducted by Gottlieb[1] it was found that Negro students were more apt to perceive Negro teachers as opposed to white teachers as understanding their goals and as having a desire to help the student attain goals. In segregated classrooms Negro students may find it easier to discuss Negro problems than in interracial classrooms.

In a second study by Gottlieb[2] of inner city Negro and white teachers' views of their students a number of significant views were discovered. White teachers tended to see the Negro child as highstrung, impetuous, lazy, moody, rebellious, and talkative. Negro teachers, on the other hand, viewed students as ambitious, cooperative, energetic, fun-loving, and happy. Clearly, both groups of teachers differed greatly in orientation toward their students.

In the same study Gottlieb[3] presented a checklist

---

[1]David Gottlieb, "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class, but It's Not Easy," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (October, 1967), p. 121.

[2]David Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, LVI (Summer, 1964), pp. 557-560.

[3]Ibid., p. 561.

to the teachers in order to determine the major obstacles to faculty desegregation. The Negro teacher saw the major obstacles in the physical supplies and facilities, whereas the white teachers stressed shortcomings in the students and their parents. White teachers tended to be pessimistic about the educational future of the children.

Wey and Corey[1] reported on desegregation problems and progress in seventy desegregated school districts. Some white teachers were found to have certain difficulties in desegregation. For example, Wey and Corey pointed out that "white teachers who usually knew names of new white pupils within a week found it difficult to identify Negro pupils and call them by names unless the Negroes were placed by seating charts."

In the study by Wey and Corey[2] of the teachers surveyed in the seventy school districts it was found that teachers did not feel they needed special training to teach mixed classes, but teachers repeatedly implied that there is a necessity for ridding oneself of prejudices. They suggested that taking courses and workshops in human relations was a good way to do it.

---

[1]Herbert W. Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation, A Guidebook (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959), p. 226.

[2]Ibid., p. 225.

In the Chesler-Segal study of desegregation[1] the role of teachers was examined in two respects: (1) its relation to classroom atmosphere and (2) its expectancy or non-expectancy of achievement by the Negro students. While three quarters of the Negro students regarded their white teachers as fair minded, most teachers permitted white students to establish the tone of the classroom. This laissez-faire attitude of the teachers increased tensions. Where teachers were seen as fair minded, the white students in the classroom were generally also so regarded. Thus, the classroom atmosphere pretty well reflected the leadership (or lack of it) shown by teachers.

In the Chesler-Segal study some teachers were found to be cruel to the Negro students:[2] "About one third of the descriptions of unfair behavior identified teachers who called students 'nigger,' or had . . . mispronounced 'Negro.'" More than another one third of such unfair reports noted that students felt they were singled out by their teachers or mistreated.

White teachers at first underestimated the academic ability of the Negro students: "Before the Negro students entered desegregated classes 75 percent of the

---

[1]Mark A. Chesler and Phyllis Segal, Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967), p. 41.

[2]Ibid., p. 42.

teachers did not think the Negro students would be as smart as the white students. By the end of a year or two of desegregation, however, half of that 75 percent had changed their minds."[1] Desegregation was an important experience of discovery for many people. Many Negro students found they could do as well as white students; many teachers gained more respect for Negro abilities.

There can be little doubt that many teachers prefer segregation and regret the new policies of school desegregation, specifically faculty desegregation. The studies described are prime reasons for taking special measures as part of the desegregation program. Professional educators cannot depend on the past efforts to prepare teachers for regular experiences. Desegregation of schools is a departure from past social patterns in much of this country. In order for such social experiences as faculty desegregation to be successful further efforts at change are required. "If teachers in a desegregated school are not competent to teach in a desegregated situation, they should be trained further."[2]

Formal Efforts to Alter Attitudes toward School Desegregation

Building and altering attitudes has been and remains one of the basic objectives of formal education.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 78.

[2] Blake, op. cit., p. 147.

Numerous attempts have been made to measure attitudes of teachers in order to determine the portrait of the teacher as a functioning individual.

By far the most popular instrument for the measurement of teacher attitudes is the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.[1]

More than fifty research studies using this instrument were reported in the literature. The general conclusion of the authors was that the attitudes of teachers can be measured with high reliability and that they are significantly correlated with teacher-pupil relations found in the teachers' classrooms.[2]

"Authoritarian personality structure" is one of the most provocative social-psychological concepts, and the California F Scale based upon this concept is one of the most widely used instruments of the past decade.[3]

Getzels and Jackson suggested that teachers' classroom behavior on the Authoritarian-Equalitarian dimension can be predicted with fair accuracy from scores on the F Scale.[4]

---

[1] J. W. Getzels and P. W. Jackson, "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," in N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook on Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 508.

[2] Ibid., p. 509.

[3] Ibid., p. 522.

[4] Ibid., p. 523.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the California F Scale are probably the two most common instruments used to determine teacher attitudes.

The most popular instrument for measuring attitude differences which prevail among subjects from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds is C. E. Osgood's Semantic Differential Test.[1] The authors found that the semantic differential test does measure both the direction and intensity of attitudes.[2] This instrument has been used rather extensively in studies related to race relationships.

A review of the literature disclosed few formal studies designed to determine attitude change of teachers involved in a formal training effort expressly for this purpose. There have been a number of studies conducted which are designed to determine the degree to which formalized educational experiences affect attitudes toward minority groups. Examples of these types of studies and selected studies of re-education experiences for teachers concerning attitudes toward desegregation are presented.

In the area of the social sciences there is a long-held theory that prejudice is due to ignorance. A large number of studies have been made to test this theory. The conclusions are sometimes contradictory. Rose and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 364.

[2] Ibid., p. 362.

Rose[1] summarized a number of these early studies designed to determine if a course in minority group relations creates more favorable attitudes toward minority groups. These studies were summarized as follows:

1. Thirteen studies utilizing school or college courses were made. Eight studies indicated change while four indicated no change and one study was indefinite.

2. Fourteen studies included specific propaganda in attempts to reduce prejudice. Nine indicated change, four indicated no change, and one was indefinite.

3. Twelve studies included knowledge or acquaintance in attempting to reduce prejudice. Nine studies resulted in change, two in no change, and one in the indefinite category.

4. Eighteen studies utilized time spent in general education in attempting to prove reduction in prejudice. Eight studies indicated change while six indicated no change and one was classified as indefinite.

The purpose of a study conducted by Stephenson[2] was concerned with the change in attitudes of college students toward Negroes after a three-semester-hour course

---

[1]Arnold Rose and Caroline Rose, America Divided: Minority Group Relations in the United States (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), p. 282.

[2]Chester M. Stephenson, "The Effect of a Course in Minority Group Relations on the Attitudes of College Students," Progressive Education, XXXII (January, 1955), p. 19.

in minority group relations. A text and several reference books were used in the course. The course time was divided as follows: one-fifth for minority group relations in general, one-fifth for minority group relations concerning Negroes, and three-fifths divided among Jews, Asiatics, Mexicans, Indians, and European immigrants. No special attempt was made during the course to influence any of the students' attitudes. The study suggested that attitude change did occur as measured by the semantic differential test.

In a project conducted by Flanders[1] during 1959-1962 a research design was developed which compared the application of interaction analysis to the in-service training of teachers. The problem of this study was to determine if carefully designed in-service training programs would result in actual changes in the spontaneous patterns of teacher influence. While the evidence supporting the change in attitudes of teachers was not conclusive, there was significant evidence that teachers who were able to provide flexible patterns of influence created situations in which students learned more.

---

[1]Ned A. Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," in Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (Eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1964).

Mays[1] in a study of the behavioral expectations held by Negro and white teachers on recently desegregated public school facilities found that the matters of primary concern of these teachers were: probable interaction of Negro and whites in social activities; their probable behavior in activities considered controversial; and probable behavior toward the school's administration.

Specific findings of this study related to Negro teachers were that Negro teachers in newly desegregated situations may be uncertain or confused regarding what is expected of them, or the extent of their activities in the certain aspects of the new situation. It is possible that as Negro teachers move into schools with recently desegregated teaching staffs they will carry with them intense minority sensitivities and behavior related to past situations.

In a rather extensive study of desegregation in the Riverside California Public Schools elaborate attempts were made to analyze the degree of success or failure of an experimental in-service educational program conducted in the school system.[2]

---

[1]Nebraska Mays, "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers on Recently Desegregated Public School Facilities," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII, 1963, pp. 218-226.

[2]Mabel C. Purl, "Study of Desegregation in the Riverside, California Public Schools," Unpublished Preliminary Report of the Riverside In-Service Institute, Riverside Public Schools, Riverside, California, p. 4.

The semantic differential test and two Likert-type scales developed specifically for this research effort were used to evaluate the degree of attitude change of the teachers as a result of the in-service institute.

The semantic differential test was designed to measure an individual's perception (favorable or unfavorable) of the climate or atmosphere toward school desegregation. This instrument was given to all participants at the opening of the workshop, at the final session, and again after a three to five month interval. The questionnaire attempted to explore the degree (if any) to which participants had become involved in actively working on a specific problem, as a result of interest engendered by the sensitivity training, and the problem solving techniques which had been taught. The questionnaire explored also the individual's reaction to equal educational opportunity for minority group students.

It was hypothesized that feelings of the workshop participants toward school desegregation would become more favorable as an immediate result of the workshop experience, would decrease slightly after a period of several months, but would remain more favorable than before the experience.

Mean scores of all categories of participants increased from the first to the second administration of the semantic differential, indicating that the sessions

were immediately successful in making attitudes more favorable toward school desegregation.

With some variations between categories of participants and between workshops, the delayed testing indicated that the favorable attitudes, although less positive than immediately following the workshops, were significantly higher than on the first testing. Evidence of a "long range" increase in positive attitude toward school desegregation seems to be at hand.

The crucial point for the evaluation was that when the data for the workshops were combined, long and short term positive increases of participants' attitudes toward school desegregation were found to have resulted from the workshop experience.[1]

In an analysis of the results of the studies reviewed it seemed apparent that teachers were unprepared to enter the experiences of school desegregation with the normal set of experiences designed to prepare teachers. The studies reviewed indicated the problems associated with school desegregation are as prevalent among teachers as various lay groups. Altering attitudes is a basic objective of formal education. Various attempts have been made to determine the extent of the alteration of attitudes as a result of formal education. The results of these attempts have been inconclusive, especially related

---

[1] Ibid., p. 41.

to attitudes toward race relations. Very little evidence is available which supports a particular type of curriculum for teachers preparing to become involved in the school desegregation process.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to determine the effectiveness of two re-education experiences in altering the attitudes toward desegregation of teachers involved in a new professional experience of faculty desegregation. This research study was designed to determine the effectiveness of change procedures which were developed for purposes other than research. In order to present the procedures of the study this chapter is presented in the following sections: Procedure for faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System, Procedure for faculty desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System, Procedure for the development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Oklahoma City Public School System, Procedure for the development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Tulsa Public School System, the uniqueness of the experience of faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa Public School Systems, the design of the experiment, the selection of the sample, the selection of the instrument, and the statistical method used.

Procedures for Faculty Desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System

In October, 1961, Robert L. Dowell, et al., commenced a civil suit in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, against the Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public School District, I-89. The plaintiffs were seeking equitable relief to enjoin the Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools from "operating a qualified bi-racial school system . . .," from "maintaining a dual school scheme, pattern or implied agreement or understanding of school zone lines based upon race or color," from maintaining a "minority to majority" system of pupil transfers and from continuing other racial discriminatory practices within the school system.[1]

Resulting from the legal proceedings of the Dowell case was a plan for desegregation which on June 20, 1967, the Oklahoma City Board of Education filed in the U. S. District Court. On July 27, 1967, Judge Luther Bohanon issued a final order for the implementation of the plan for desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System. The school desegregation plan developed by the Oklahoma City

---

[1]Coleman Hayes, Oklahoma City Board of Education Attorney, in an unpublished Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, No. 8523, Jan. Term, 1967. The Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public School District I-89, et al., appellants with Robert L. Dowell, et al., appellees.

Public School System consisted of three major categories:

1. A combination of four secondary attendance zones which includes the pairing of Northeast Junior-Senior High School and Harding Junior-Senior High School, with Harding becoming a junior high school, and Northeast becoming a senior high school; and the pairing of Central Junior-Senior High School and Classen Junior-Senior High School, with Central becoming a junior high school, and Classen becoming a senior high school.

2. A majority to minority transfer policy which allowed a student attending a school where his race is in the majority to transfer to a school where his race is in the minority.

3. Desegregation of faculty which provides for racial balance in all school buildings in the Oklahoma City School district to be accomplished by the school year 1970.

The ultimate goal of the Oklahoma City Board of Education's plan is to bring about full and complete desegregation and integration of races in the schools comprising the Oklahoma City Public School System. Of major significance in this desegregation plan is the effort to desegregate faculties on a racially balanced basis. A minimum amount of faculty desegregation was in operation in the school system during the 1966-67 school year. In that year there were 19 elementary schools and 10 secondary schools in the Oklahoma City school system with desegregated

staffs. During the 1967-68 school year there were 38 elementary schools and 17 secondary schools with desegregated faculties.

As a result of a U. S. District Court Decision on July 27, 1967, the Oklahoma City Public School System developed a school desegregation plan in which the charge for the desegregation of faculties was made. Beginning in the 1968-69 school year the Oklahoma City Public School System was charged with the responsibility of accomplishing one-half of a goal of total faculty desegregation. The total goal is the desegregation of faculty which provides for racial balance in all school plants in the Oklahoma City School District to be accomplished by the school year 1970.

On April 10, 1968, the Oklahoma City Public School System presented a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education under the provisions of Title IV, Section 405, of Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. A major portion of the program outlined in the proposal was a section designed to develop procedures to deal with school personnel interpersonal relations problems as these problems pertain to faculty desegregation. This program consisted of a five-day pre-service training program for these school personnel designed to:

1. Develop understandings, improve communications, and provide for more effective human relationships.

2. Identify the problems, analyze and explore solutions to these problems arising in faculty desegregation.

A second phase of the program was an in-service effort during the 1968-69 school year designed to continue the support effort which began with the pre-service program.

During the second semester of the 1967-68 school year the director of elementary education and the director of secondary education in the Oklahoma City School System informed the principals of each building that racially balanced staffs would be achieved by the school year 1969-70. This goal was to be accomplished by adding one-half of the needed faculty members for the 1968-69 school year with the remainder to be added for the 1969-70 school year. The directors of elementary and secondary education developed the following priorities for the assignment of new staff members:

1. Volunteers for reassignment to achieve desegregation would be placed first as the vacancies occurred. Special consideration would be given to choices of faculty members desiring placement in a desegregated setting.

2. Resignations would be filled with faculty desegregation as first priority.

3. Principals would work together with the objective of exchanging faculty members to accomplish desegregation of faculties.

4. New teachers to the school system would be placed as needed to accomplish faculty desegregation.

5. The principals would designate specific faculty members for reassignment if the goal had not been previously accomplished.

With the priorities that were established and the recruitment process beginning in the early part of the second semester of the 1967-68 school year, the goal of achieving one-half of total faculty desegregation was accomplished by July 1, 1968.

Procedures for Faculty Desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System

In 1955 after the United States Supreme Court ruling of May 17, 1954, concerning school desegregation the Tulsa Public School System accepted the responsibility for the operation of all-Negro schools in Tulsa which formerly operated on a county-wide basis and received their financing by a county levy. The school attendance areas were established on a neighborhood basis. The policy was developed that as the Negro population grew and moved into other areas of the city, those youngsters became a part of the elementary and secondary schools serving the areas where they reside.[1]

After the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

---

[1]Excerpt from an unpublished policy statement by the Tulsa Board of Education.

the following amendments and amplifications to Tulsa Public Schools' plan for desegregation were submitted to the U. S. Commissioner of Education on May 19, 1965:[1]

> Assignment of all personnel to all positions in schools or classes shall be without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. No teachers, principals or other school personnel will be either discharged or demoted on the basis of race, color or national origin as a result of school desegregation in this district.
>
> With reference to instructional personnel, beginning with the regular school year of 1965-66, teaching staff vacancies will be filled and assigned with qualified personnel without regard to race, color, religion or national origin.
>
> The teaching staffs in six elementary schools, three junior high schools and three senior high schools have both Negro and white teachers. The special educational services staff, including reading clinicians, speech therapists, visiting counselors, attendance officers, nurses, psychologists and psychometrists work with all pupils needing their services.

Since this policy statement was established a minimum amount of faculty desegregation has been in operation in the school system. During the 1966-67 school year there were 13 elementary schools and 12 secondary schools in the Tulsa school system with desegregated staffs. During the 1967-68 school year there were 36 elementary schools and 22 secondary schools with desegregated faculties. The number of Caucasian and Negro teachers who were assigned to accomplish this amount of faculty desegregation was approximately fifty for the 1966-67 school year

---

[1]Excerpt from the Plan for Desegregation of the Tulsa Public Schools submitted to the United States Commissioner of Education, May 19, 1965.

and thirty additional for the 1967-68 school year.

As a result of the negotiation of a plan for the further desegregation of the Tulsa school system by the Tulsa Board of Education with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Justice, the Tulsa Board of Education decided to reassign teachers in the Tulsa school system in order for each school to have at least an 11 percent Negro faculty by September, 1969. This required the reassignment of 184 Tulsa teachers after this decision was made in July, 1968. The 184 reassigned teachers were in addition to those teachers who had already been teaching in schools with integrated faculty at the time of their employment during the summer vacation months.

On July 10, 1968, the superintendent of schools, Dr. Charles C. Mason, in a meeting of all building principals informed the principals that each school must have at least one-half of an eleven percent Negro faculty by September, 1968. The procedure for selection of staff members to be transferred was to be a joint effort by principals, the directors of elementary and secondary education, and assistant directors of personnel. Recommendations were to be based on the subject area and personal qualifications of the individual. At this meeting the principals were given the number of Caucasian or Negro faculty members needed on each staff.

After the teachers who were to be transferred were identified, a letter was sent to the transferred teachers notifying them of their new assignments. This letter explained that such reassignments were necessitated by "requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as interpreted by the federal courts."[1]

The letter also stated: "The selection of staff members to be transferred has been a joint effort of principals, directors of elementary and secondary education, and assistant directors of personnel. Recommendations were based on subject area and personal qualifications of the individual. It is their considered judgment that you are one who would provide a helpful influence in this endeavor. It is hoped that this change will be a stimulating challenge to you as a professional educator and that the coming school year will be a rewarding experience."[2]

As a result of this decision more than 250 teaching positions were affected, and at the beginning of the 1968-69 school year each of the system's 106 schools had faculties composed of Caucasian and Negro teachers.

---

[1]Excerpt from a letter dated July 18, 1968, from Dr. Charles C. Mason to the teachers reassigned to a faculty desegregation setting.

[2]Ibid.

Procedures for the Development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Oklahoma City Public School System

A planning committee of Oklahoma City teachers was selected during the summer of 1968 to plan the faculty desegregation workshop. This committee was composed of a bi-racial group of ten elementary and ten secondary teachers with previous experience in faculty desegregation. This committee met with the director of elementary education, the director of secondary education and representatives of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma on three separate one-half day sessions to plan the program for the workshop. Through a process of group work the committee developed the following purposes for the workshop:

1. To improve the interpersonal and intergroup understandings of Negro and Caucasian professional personnel involved in faculty desegregation.

2. To provide teachers an opportunity to discuss, freely and openly, matters relating to race with members of other races.

3. To alleviate some of the fears and apprehensions or possibly misapprehensions which teachers have about teaching on a desegregated faculty in a building where that teacher's race may be in a minority.

4. To help teachers establish the understanding and skills necessary to deal effectively with the special

education problems of minority group children.

5. To help teachers better understand that section of the community and school system in which they will be working.

6. To provide an opportunity for teachers to begin to identify areas where additional in-service effort is needed.

The procedures for the workshop were developed around small group activity in order to stimulate participant interaction. Twenty groups were formed according to experience, ratio of Caucasians and Negroes, grade levels and experience in school desegregation. Each group was moderated by an individual who had previous experience in desegregation. A part of the workshop was devoted to role-playing situations which portrayed to teachers actual problems that had been encountered in faculty desegregation. During the course of the workshop the participants were divided into various groupings in order to consider special interests. A copy of the program of the workshop is included in the appendix of this study.[1]

Procedures for the Development of the Faculty Desegregation Workshop in the Tulsa Public School System

The Tulsa Project, which is an administrative unit of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the

[1]See Appendix B of this study.

University of Oklahoma, has been in operation for two years and is designed to assist school personnel to deal with problems associated with school desegregation. The Tulsa Project has co-sponsored with the University of Oklahoma Consultative Center and the Tulsa Public Schools three Human Relations Institutes for school personnel and a Conference for Supervisory Personnel of the Tulsa Public Schools along with an Administrators Workshop for Principals and Supervisors.

The first Human Relations Institute had 80 participants (teachers, administrators, counselors, nurses and clerical personnel) from the central city schools, namely Central High School, Carver, Lowell and Roosevelt Junior High Schools, and the feeder elementary schools: Burroughs, Emerson, Irving, Johnson, Lombard, Osage and Pershing. Participants attended a series of seven consecutive Saturday sessions, March 11 through April 29, 1967 at the Roosevelt Junior High School.

The second Human Relations Institute was conducted by the Tulsa Center on Saturdays, September 23 through November 4, 1967 at the Roosevelt Junior High School. There were approximately 125 persons in attendance at each session, with 100 of these persons being educators enrolled as active participants.

The third Human Relations Institute was held on Saturdays, March 2 through April 6, 1968 again at the

Roosevelt Junior High School. Personnel from 15 additional schools outside the original target area of central city schools were included in the third Human Relations Institute. There were 150 participants.

A planning committee was organized during August to plan a fourth Human Relations Institute to deal with the problems of faculty desegregation. The planning committee was composed of representatives from formal educational organizations in Tulsa and a group of teachers who had been in past institutes. As a result of the discussions by the planning committee the following decisions were made.

The fourth Human Relations Institute was conducted for school personnel whose assignments for the 1968-69 school year came as a result of an effort by the Board of Education to accomplish faculty desegregation. The basic purpose of this institute was to provide in-service training for these persons which would help them gain the techniques, knowledge, and understandings necessary to enable them to become more effective in the desegregated schools and the classroom. The participants of the institute included teachers reassigned to a faculty desegregation position with appropriate representation of administrators and counselors from schools with desegregated faculties.

The objectives of these workshops as developed by

the committee were:

1. To develop understandings, improve communication and provide for more effective human relations with the group of administrators, counselors and teachers who are involved in faculty desegregation.

2. To identify problems and to explore solutions to problems arising in faculty-staff relationships.

3. To examine the problems which administrators, counselors, and teachers may have as they become involved with new interpersonal and intergroup experiences.

4. To bring about self-examination of attitudes and prejudices.

The staff of the Tulsa Project assumed the responsibility for administering and supervising the fourth Human Relations Institute. They developed the institute structure, made arrangements for physical facilities, recruited participants, prepared resource material kits, and structured small group activity. A copy of the program of the workshop is included in the appendix of this study.[1]

Uniqueness of the Experience of Faculty Desegregation in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa Public School Systems

The purpose of this study was not to compare two school systems concerning the approaches to the reassignment

[1]See Appendix C of this study.

of teachers involved in faculty desegregation. The Oklahoma City school system proposed in a school desegregation plan presented to the U. S. District Court to achieve a racially balanced teaching faculty in each school within the school system over a period of three years. The Oklahome City school system was aware of the number of teachers required to reach one-half of this goal for one year preceding the 1968-69 school year. Much time and effort was devoted to the method of reassignment to be used previous to the actual selections. Most of the reassignments had been made previous to the end of the 1967-68 school year with total selection accomplished by July 1, 1968.

The Tulsa school system reached a decision to substantially increase the faculty desegregation assignments during the summer of 1968 while arbitration between the school board's legal counsel and the United States Department of Justice was being conducted. As a result of the decision to desegregate the faculties of the Tulsa school system coming after July 15, 1968, the teachers were not appraised of this fact until after this date. This failure to involve the participating teachers in the plan later caused much trauma with many of the assigned teachers.

The two re-education programs were planned with the assistance of staff members of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma. This assistance created two programs with similar content.

On the other hand, many aspects of the program were different. Because of the impossibility of controlling the variables in the two school systems related to the assignment of the teachers, the status of desegregation in each school system, the ratio of Caucasian and Negro teachers, and other factors, no formal attempt was made to do a statistical comparison of the differences in the degree of effectiveness of the two re-education programs. The study was designed to determine how effective each of the programs was in changing attitudes of teachers toward school desegregation.

Design of the Experiment

As has been described a significant social experience has taken place in the school systems of Tulsa and Oklahoma City. This experience, faculty desegregation, was supported by a planned re-education program in each school system designed to improve the attitudes of teachers toward school desegregation and to accomplish the goals related to effective faculty desegregation. The study described in this paper was designed to determine the degree to which the attitudes of teachers were altered by the re-education experiences.

Although this study involved two groups of teachers in two school systems who were participating in similar teaching experiences and have been involved in similar re-education programs, no formal attempt was made to apply

statistical treatment to the data for the purpose of comparing the two groups. The conclusions drawn from the statistical treatment were made on the results of a pretest and posttest measurement of each group.

Method A

This study was divided into two sections. The first section of the study relates to the teachers involved in faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System and has been identified as the teachers prepared for faculty desegregation by the Method A program. The writer administered the survey instrument shown in Appendix A of this study to the teachers who met the criteria of faculty desegregation on August 12, 1968. The pretest instrument was administered to 142 teachers who were to be involved in faculty desegregation for the first time. The teachers participating in this effort were asked to complete the attitude survey in order to obtain information helpful in evaluating the results of the re-education program. The teachers were instructed to read the directions carefully and complete the instrument. Background information was obtained from each teacher in order to identify the various types of groupings under consideration. Approximately 30 minutes was required to complete the pretest. Immediately following the administering of the pretest these teachers were involved in the faculty desegregation workshop shown in Appendix B of this study.

During the week of October 21, 1968, the teachers who were prepared by the Method A program were invited to participate in a follow-up session of the workshop to be scheduled October 31, 1968. At the beginning of this follow-up session the teachers were identified who had taken the pretest attitude survey. These teachers were administered the same attitude survey as a posttest of the experiment. Since there was not total attendance at this follow-up session the number who took the pretest and posttest instrument was 117. This constituted the total number of subjects considered for this section of the study and involved faculty members in the Oklahoma City School System. The posttest was administered by this investigator. Approximately 30 minutes was required to complete the posttest.

Method B

The second section of the study relates to the teachers involved in faculty desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System and was identified as the teachers prepared for faculty desegregation by the Method B program. This investigator administered the survey instrument shown in Appendix A to the teachers who met the criteria of faculty desegregation on September 21, 1968. The pretest instrument was administered to 139 teachers who were to be involved in faculty desegregation for the first time. The teachers participating in this effort

were asked to complete the attitude survey in order to obtain information helpful in evaluating the results of the re-education program. The teachers were instructed to read the directions carefully and complete the instrument. Background information was obtained from each teacher in order to identify the various types of groupings under consideration. Approximately 30 minutes was required to complete the pretest. Immediately following the administering of the pretest instrument these teachers were involved in the faculty desegregation workshop for six consecutive Saturday workshops as shown in Appendix C of this study.

On Saturday October 26, following the final workshop session the teachers who were prepared by the Method B program were administered the same attitude survey instrument as was administered for the pretest as the posttest of the experiment. Since there was not total attendance at the final session of the workshop the number who took the pretest and posttest instrument was 122. This constituted the total number of subjects considered for this section of the study and involved faculty members in the Tulsa School System. The posttest was administered by the author of this paper. Approximately 30 minutes was required to complete the posttest.

Selection of the Sample

The final sample of this study included each teacher assigned to a faculty desegregation position who had completed the planned re-education experience in each school system.

There were approximately 150 teachers in the Oklahoma City school system who met the criteria of faculty desegregation as defined on page 16 of this study. Of these 150 teachers there were 142 who began the workshop experience on August 12, 1968. Of these 142 teachers, 117 attended the follow-up session and completed the posttest survey instrument. This total number was considered appropriate for the purposes of this study as it related to determining the extent of attitude change as a result of the re-education experience.

There were approximately 160 teachers in the Tulsa school system who met the criteria of faculty desegregation as defined on page 16 of this study. Of these 160 teachers there were 138 teachers who began the workshop experience on September 21, 1968. Of these 138 teachers, 122 were present for the final workshop session on October 26, 1968. These 122 participants completed the posttest survey instrument. This total was considered appropriate for the purposes of this study as it related to determining the extent of attitude change as a result of the re-education experience.

Selection of the Instrument

The Attitude Toward Desegregation Scale is a twenty-five item, modified Likert-type survey instrument developed by Milton E. Rosenbaum at the University of North Carolina.[1]

The items were selected on the basis of item analysis and all twenty-five items were found to discriminate the extreme quartiles of scorers at a high level of confidence. This procedure involved a comparison of the proportion of individuals in the upper quartile who answer each item correctly. If the difference was a significant one, the item was accepted as being one which discriminates. The high discriminatory power of the items was a testimony to the internal consistency of the survey instrument. The reliability of the survey instrument was determined by a test-retest reliability of .89. Shaw and Wright stated that the survey instrument had reasonably good content validity.[2] Shaw and Wright contended that this instrument was quite adequate for measuring attitudes toward segregation.[3]

The method of responding on the survey instrument was a modified Likert continum: agree very much, agree pretty much, agree a little, disagree a little, disagree

---

[1] Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 168.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

pretty much, and disagree very much. No neutral alternative was made available. Response alternatives to items were weighted from 6 (agree very much) to 1 (disagree very much) for prosegregation items. Scoring was reversed for anti-segregation items. The subject's score was the sum of the alternatives he endorses. High scores indicated prosegregation attitudes.

It was deemed necessary to increase the number of items on the original survey instrument in order to gain more complete knowledge concerning the attitudes toward school desegregation of the subjects involved in this study. According to Downie and Heath prediction can usually be made more accurate if the predictors are increased in number.[1] Prediction efficiency increases up to the addition of the fourth or fifth predictor. The additional items selected were obtained from several survey instruments including those developed by Carmichael and Ernest in studies conducted at the University of Oklahoma. Forty additional items were presented to professional staff members of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation and the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies at the University of Oklahoma for the purpose of judging the appropriateness of the items. The instructions were to place the items into categories of prosegregation or

---

[1]N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 205.

antisegregation attitudes. The second procedure for the judges was to select the twenty-five best items divided into two categories, thirteen prosegregation and twelve antisegregation items. The judges were asked to comment about the wording of each item for revision and clarification purposes. The twenty-five additional items were selected after this evaluation process by the judges.

The twenty-five item survey instrument was presented at this point to a group of twenty administrators and counselors from four desegregated high schools in the Oklahoma City Public School System for the purpose of making a critical analysis of the instrument. The members of this group were asked to classify the items into prosegregation and antisegregation categories and were then asked to make a critical analysis of each item. Of this group of twenty counselors and principals, seventeen placed each item into the correct category of prosegregation or antisegregation. The other three members of the group placed one item in the incorrect category. Additional revision was made of the twenty-five items from this information.

These twenty-five items were added to Rosenbaum's original survey instrument and comprised the total survey instrument administered to the subjects involved in this experiment. This instrument is shown in Appendix A of this study.

A final procedure for determining the suitability of this instrument was to administer the instrument to two pilot groups. The two groups were composed of Caucasian and Negro teachers involved in the desegregation process in the Beggs and Muskogee public school systems. There were twenty-seven subjects in the Beggs school system and fifty-three subjects in the Muskogee school system. The purpose of these two procedures was to determine the extent that the supplement to the basic Rosenbaum instrument discriminated between high and low scores and the extent that the original twenty-five items correlated with the additional twenty-five items. The original instrument developed by Rosenbaum had a quoted standard deviation of 26.2 on 502 subjects. The standard deviation on the revised instrument for the Beggs subjects was 35.7. The standard deviation on the revised instrument for the Muskogee subjects was 29.9.

These two deviations were considered to compare favorably with the deviation quoted on the original instrument. It could have been assumed that more variance would have occurred within the Beggs subjects because the total group included supportive personnel in the school system. This supportive personnel included two custodians, two cafeteria workers, three teacher aides and three lay persons. The Muskogee subjects included teachers involved in the faculty desegregation process as defined in this study.

Downie and Heath suggested that the correlation between two sets of test scores is a very common type of validity.[1]

In order to determine the validity of the additional twenty-five items, Pearson's product-moment coefficient of correlation was computed between the original twenty-five items and the additional twenty-five items with the two pilot groups.[2] A correlation coefficient of .94 was computed for the Beggs subjects. A correlation coefficient of .95 was computed for the Muskogee subjects. The size of these two coefficients indicates the total instrument was determining the same type of information as the original Rosenbaum instrument.

A further determination of the reliability and validity of the additional twenty-five items added to Rosenbaum's original instrument was made by computing a correlation coefficient on the subjects in this study. This correlation was made between the original items developed by Rosenbaum and the total items including the twenty-five developed by Rosenbaum and the twenty-five additional items developed for this study. The formula used with the two pilot groups was used to compute the correlation coefficient. The results of this treatment are presented in Chapter IV of this study.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 223.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

Statistical Method

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of two methods of preparing teachers for faculty desegregation on the attitudes of Caucasian and Negro teachers toward faculty desegregation. It is generally recognized that the social and educational background of the majority of teachers involved in desegregation has ill prepared them to deal with the problems occasioned by school desegregation. Each of the re-education experiences was designed to sensitize the faculty members to the problems of school desegregation. If the effort to sensitize teachers is successful, the teachers' basic assumptions about themselves and racial relationship would be subject to new appraisals. The two re-education experiences were designed to demonstrate that culture, cultural change, and social behavior are understandable and that to understand these one's own values, beliefs, and attitudes would have to be examined.

The Attitude Toward Desegregation Scale, shown in Appendix A of this study was designed to determine the attitudes of teachers toward the social issue, school desegregation. This survey instrument was administered to the two groups of teachers as a pretest and posttest instrument. As defined by the hypothesis, the objective of this study was to determine the significance of the change in attitudes from the pretest to the posttest

between various groups.

The "t" test of significance between mean scores was used to explore the following relationships: (1) the relationships between the pretest scores of teachers prepared by the Method A program and the posttest scores of teachers prepared by the Method A program, (2) the relationship between the pretest scores of teachers prepared by the Method B program and the posttest scores of teachers prepared by the Method B program, (3) the relationship between the pretest scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method A program and posttest scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method A program, (4) the relationship between the pretest scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program and posttest scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program, (5) the relationship between the pretest scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program and posttest scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program, and (6) the relationship between the pretest scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program and the posttest scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program. The significance of difference in each case was tested at the .01. The following formula was used.[1]

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{S_{DX}}$$

[1] Ibid., p. 143.

To determine the homogeneity of the variance of each relationship tested the F test was determined for each group. In order to determine if the variance of two population groups was similar, the null hypothesis of no significant difference at the .01 level using the formula $F = S_1^2/S_2^2$ was computed.[1] Acceptance of the null hypothesis indicated the data were not related to the same population group. When this occurred the Cochran and Cox formula for testing the significance of the computed t was used. The explanation of this procedure was presented by Downie and Heath.[2]

The McNemar Test for the Significance of Change[3] was used to explore the following relationships: (1) the relationship between the pretest and posttest scores of the teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program, (2) the relationship between the pretest and posttest scores of the teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program, (3) the relationship between the scores of the Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to the scores of the Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 141.

[2] Ibid., p. 143.

[3] S. Siegal, Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 63-67.

the pretest instrument, (4) the relationship between the scores of the Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to the scores of the Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the post-test instrument, (5) the relationship between the scores of the Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to the scores of the Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the pretest instrument, and (6) the relationship between the scores of the Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to the scores of the Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the posttest instrument.

The significance of difference in each case was tested at the .01 level. The following formula was used.[1]

$$X^2 = \frac{/\overline{A} - D - \underline{1}/^2}{A + D}$$

The McNemar Test for the Significance of Change is a nonparametric statistical model designed to test the hypothesis that change has occurred. The McNemar test describes whether any change occurs both with some pattern and with sufficient dimensional strength.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64.

Siegal stated that the McNemar test is particularly applicable to those "before and after" designs designed to test the effectiveness of a particular treatment.[1] Acceptance of the null hypothesis indicated the data were not related at the .01.

The McNemar test is not a standard chi-square test since change is the only factor taken into consideration. In a fourfold table with a "before-after" treatment the two cells with no change are not considered for treatment, only the two cells which indicate positive or negative change from the pretest to the posttest treatment are considered.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This study was concerned with the modification of teachers' attitudes toward school desegregation. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis and interpretation of the data by a comparison of the results of the several treatments to the null hypotheses that have been established. The discussion of the data was approached through the consideration of each of the hypotheses used to test the problem of the study.

The significance of difference between the pre-tests and posttests scores in teachers' attitudes toward school desegregation was tested for the following subjects: (1) the teachers prepared by the Method A program, (2) the teachers prepared by the Method B program, (3) the Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method A program, (4) the Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program, (5) the Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program, and (6) the Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program. Six additional relationships were investigated and presented as sub-problems. These sub-problems were concerned with the pattern and dimensional strengths of the change

that occurred with the following subjects: (1) teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program, (2) teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program, (3) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the pretest instrument, (4) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the posttest instrument, (5) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the pretest instrument, and (6) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the posttest instrument.

The null hypothesis of no significant differences was used to test each stated hypothesis in the study. The six major hypotheses were analyzed by the "t" test for difference between means in two samples of equal size. The six sub-hypotheses were analyzed by the McNemar Test

for the Significance of Change.[1] Significance in each instance was established at the .01 level. Before using the "t" test of significance in this study, the process for finding usable standard errors of standard deviations was calculated. Guilford described this process, signified by the symbol F as a method of testing whether or not two variances could have arisen from two populations with the same variance.[2] The formula for the F test is:

$$F = S_1^2/S_2^2$$

S is the estimate of the population variance. The ratio that satisfies the null hypothesis completely is equal to 1.00.

The Sample

Appendix D of this study presents the listing of raw scores of the subjects tested from the two groups. The total number of subjects tested in this study was 239 teachers in the two school systems. Of this total number 117 were involved in faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System and participated in the program identified as the Method A program. The remaining 122 subjects were involved in faculty desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System and participated in the program

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 63-67.

[2] J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965), p. 191.

identified as the Method B program. Each of these teachers participated in the total re-education programs presented in their respective school systems. Tables I and II present the breakdown by race, sex, age, experience and level of the teachers participating in the study.

As shown in Table I, approximately one-fifth of the teachers prepared by Method A were male and four-fifths were female. Approximately three-fifths of the teachers prepared by Method A were Caucasian and two-fifths were Negro. Approximately four-fifths of the teachers had ten years or less experience teaching with 65 percent of the teachers being under thirty years of age. Three-fifths of the teachers were teaching on the elementary level and two-fifths on the secondary level.

The total subjects prepared by the Method A program presented in Table I may be described as a comparatively young teaching staff with a majority of the teachers having less than ten years of ~~teaching~~ experience. This was true particularly for the Caucasian teachers with only two teachers having more than ten years of experience. The representation of Caucasian to Negro teachers with a ratio of two Negroes to three Caucasians was appropriate for the study, but represented fewer Negro teachers than the actual number assigned to faculty desegregation positions.

TABLE I

DATA ON TEACHERS PREPARED BY METHOD A

	Caucasian		Negro		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Sex						
Male	11	9.4	8	6.8	19	16.2
Female	60	51.3	38	32.5	98	83.8
Age						
21-30	51	43.6	27	23.1	78	66.7
31-40	10	8.6	7	6.0	17	14.6
41-50	9	7.7	6	5.1	15	12.8
51-65	1	.8	6	5.1	7	5.9
Experience						
0-10	69	59.1	32	27.4	101	86.5
11-20	1	.8	6	5.1	7	5.9
21-30	1	.8	7	6.0	8	6.8
31-45	0	.0	1	.8	1	.8
Level						
Elementary	47	40.2	23	19.6	70	59.8
Secondary	24	20.5	23	19.7	47	40.2

As shown in Table II, approximately one-fifth of the teachers prepared by Method B were male and four-fifths were female. Approximately two-fifths of the teachers prepared by Method B were Caucasian and three-fifths were Negro. Approximately three-fifths of the teachers had ten years or less experience teaching with 45 percent of the teachers being under thirty years of age. Slightly over one-half of the teachers were teaching on the elementary level and slightly less than one-half on the secondary level.

TABLE II

DATA ON TEACHERS PREPARED BY METHOD B

	Caucasian		Negro		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Sex						
Male	7	5.7	14	11.4	21	17.1
Female	42	34.5	59	48.4	101	82.9
Age						
21-30	21	17.2	32	26.2	53	43.4
31-40	8	6.6	12	9.8	20	16.4
41-50	13	10.7	16	13.1	29	23.8
51-65	7	5.7	13	10.7	20	16.4
Experience						
0-10	37	30.3	44	36.1	81	66.4
11-20	6	4.9	16	13.1	22	18.0
21-30	6	4.1	9	7.4	14	11.5
31-45	1	.9	4	3.2	5	4.1
Level						
Elementary	25	20.5	40	32.8	65	53.3
Secondary	24	19.7	33	27.0	57	46.7

The total subjects prepared by the Method B program and presented in Table II was a comparatively young group of teachers with a majority of the teachers having less than ten years of teaching experience. The percentage of young teachers in this group, however, was not as great as the Method A group. The proportion of two Caucasian teachers to three Negro teachers was appropriate for the study, but represented fewer Caucasian teachers than the actual number assigned to faculty desegregation positions.

In a comparison of the two groups each group

contained a large young group of teachers in age category 21-30. The ratio of Caucasian to Negro teachers was not the same in the two groups with the Method B group composed of a majority of Negro teachers. These factors, plus the low percentage of male subjects, were taken into consideration in the interpretation of the data.

Analysis of the Data

The principal purpose of this study was to determine the change effected by the two re-education programs on the attitudes of teachers toward school desegregation. Appendix D of this study presents a comprehensive listing of the attitude pretest and posttest raw scores of the teachers involved in each of the re-education experiences. The primary statistical problem in each hypothesis presented was that of evaluating the change shown between the pretest and posttest periods.

Analysis of the Major Hypotheses

The statistical analysis for the major hypotheses consisted of testing for the significance of difference in the amount of change which occurred between the pretest and posttest periods. The statistical treatment used to determine the significance of the change was the "t" test. Table III contains the results of this test of significance and the results of the F test for the homogeneity of variance for each of the six major hypotheses.

TABLE III

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF TEACHERS PREPARED BY THE VARIOUS METHODS

Teacher Groupings	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD	t-Ratio	F-Ratio
1. Method A (total group)	112.45	31.90	91.00	18.44	6.27	2.99
2. Method B (total group)	120.99	45.23	96.82	29.89	4.90	2.29
3. Method A (Caucasian)	120.06	36.88	93.97	21.01	5.31	3.08
4. Method A (Negro)	100.72	16.19	86.41	12.20	4.74	1.76
5. Method B (Caucasian)	151.90	51.97	115.08	32.93	4.15	2.49
6. Method B (Negro)	100.25	23.10	84.56	19.75	4.38	1.37

The first hypothesis relating to the attitude change of teachers was:

HO_1 There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From the Table F of Guilford[1] the F-ratio at 116 degrees of freedom for the greater mean square and

[1] Ibid., p. 584.

116 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.59 at the .01 level of confidence. The F ratio on Table III of 2.99 exceeded the .01 level. This permitted the "t" ratio to be considered at 59 degrees of freedom (1/2N). From Table D of Guilford[1] the t-ratio at 59 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.66 at the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was highly significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of teachers prepared by Method A were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

The second hypothesis relating to the attitude change of teachers was:

HO_2 There are no statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From the Table F of Guilford[2] the F-ratio at 121 degrees of freedom for the greater mean square and 121 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.54 at the .01 level. The F ratio on Table III of 2.29 exceeded the .01 level. This permitted the t-ratio to be considered at 61 degrees of freedom (1/2N). From

---

[1] Ibid., p. 580.

[2] Ibid., p. 584.

Table D of Guilford[1] the t-ratio at 61 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.66 at the .01 level. The t-ratio of 4.90 of Table III exceeded the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was highly significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of teachers prepared by the Method B program were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

The third hypothesis relating to the attitude change of teachers was:

HO_3 There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation of Caucasian teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From the Table F of Guilford[2] the F-ratio at 70 degrees of freedom for the greater mean square and 70 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.74 at the .01 level. The F-ratio on Table III of 3.08 exceeded the .01 level. This permitted the t-ratio to be considered at 36 degrees of freedom (1/2 N). From Table D of Guilford[3] the t-ratio at 36 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.73 at the .01 level. The t-ratio of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 580.

[2] Ibid., p. 584.

[3] Ibid., p. 580.

5.31 of Table III exceeded the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of Caucasian teachers prepared by Method A were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

The fourth hypothesis relating to the attitude change of teachers was:

HO_4 There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation of Negro teachers who were prepared by the Method A program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From Table F in Guilford[1] the F-ratio at 45 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.66 at the .01 level. The F-ratio on Table III of 1.76 exceeded the .01 level, thus permitting the t-ratio to be considered at 23 degrees of freedom (1/2 N). From Table D of Guilford[2] the t-ratio at 23 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.81 at the .01 level. The t-ratio of 4.74 of Table III exceeded the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of Negro teachers prepared by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 584.

[2] Ibid., p. 580.

the Method A program were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

The fifth hypothesis relating to the attitude change of teachers was:

HO_5 There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation of Caucasian teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From Table F in Guilford[1] the F-ratio at 48 degrees of freedom for the greater mean square and 48 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.96 at the .01 level. The F-ratio on Table III of 2.49 exceeded the .01 level. This permitted the t-ratio to be considered at 24 degrees of freedom (1/2 N). From Table D of Guilford[2] the t-ratio of 24 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.80 at the .01 level. The t-ratio of 4.15 of Table III exceeded the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 584.

[2] Ibid., p. 580.

The sixth hypothesis relating to the attitude changes of teachers was:

HO_6 There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation of Negro teachers who were prepared by the Method B program before the program and after nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting.

From Table F in Guilford[1] the F-ratio at 72 degrees of freedom for the greater mean square and 72 degrees of freedom for the lesser mean square was found to be 1.74 at the .01 level. The F-ratio on Table III of 1.37 was not significant at the .01 or .05 level. This required the t-ratio to be considered at 72 degrees of freedom (N-1). From Table D of Guilford[2] the t-ratio of 72 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.64 at the .01 level. The t-ratio of 4.38 of Table III exceeded the .01 level. Therefore, the difference between the mean of the pretest and the mean of the posttest was highly significant. It was concluded from these results that the attitudes of Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program were modified positively from the time of the pretest to the posttest.

In each instance the major null hypothesis was rejected. Considering the scores of each subject in the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 584.

[2] Ibid., p. 580.

various groupings, the change in scores was significantly positive with each examined group.

Analysis of the Sub-Hypotheses

At the beginning of this study it was anticipated that a total understanding of the change which occurred as a result of the re-education experience could not be acquired with the analysis of group data using the "t" test of significance. While this examination signified that positive change did occur, a closer analysis of the data was needed to determine what factors contributed to this change in attitudes. In order to determine the factors which contributed to the change in attitudes, the subjects in this study were divided into three categories --those who were positively affected as a result of the re-education experience, those who were negatively affected as a result of the re-education experience, and those who essentially did not change. In order to determine which subjects were positively affected, negatively affected, or did not change, each subject was classified into the categories of above or below the median on the pretest and posttest, keeping in mind positive scores were low scores on the survey instrument. A subject was considered to have been positively affected if he scored above the median on the pretest and below the median on the posttest. A subject was considered to have been negatively affected if he scored below the median on the pretest and above the

median on the posttest. If a subject scored above the median on the pretest and above the median on the posttest or below the median on the pretest and below the median on the posttest, it was considered that essentially no change had occurred.

Using a non-parametric statistical model, the McNemar Test for the Significance of Change,[1] it was possible to test the "before to after" change. The McNemar test describes whether any change occurs both with some pattern and with sufficient dimensional strength. To test the significance of any observed change by this method the data was recorded in a fourfold table of frequencies to represent the pretest and posttest set of responses from the same individuals. In the fourfold table when a "before-after" treatment is considered, only two cells represent the change, the cells which classify the positive or negative change that occurred. The formula for the McNemar test is:

$$X^2 = \frac{(A-D)^2}{A + D} \quad \text{with df} = 1$$

A and D represent the two cells under consideration which reflect the change. In order to provide a clear picture of the McNemar treatment the presentation of the data for sub-hypothesis one is presented in Table IV.

---

[1]Siegal, op. cit., p. 63.

TABLE IV

TOTAL INDIVIDUALS WHO SCORED ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEDIAN FROM THE PRETEST TO THE POSTTEST FOR THE TEACHERS PREPARED BY METHOD A

McNEMAR TEST FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGE

Pretest	Posttest: Above Median	Posttest: Below Median
Below Median	A: 5	B: 27
Above Median	C: 54	D: 31

Frequencies in each cell above revealed whether an individual either gained (Cell A) or lost (Cell D) or essentially did neither (Cells B and C) from the pretest to the posttest. Scores which fit the Cell D category would have demonstrated positive change. Scores which fit the Cell A category would have demonstrated negative change. The test yields a chi-square.

The McNemar test yielded the following results: X^2 total = 17.36. This result with one degree of freedom had a probability beyond the .01 level of confidence.

The first sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in scores was:

Sub HO_1 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in

attitudes toward school desegregation (from pretest to posttest scores) between the teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored below the median.

It is clear from the results of the McNemar test treatment with a chi-square score that is significant beyond the .01 level that the null hypothesis can be rejected. The results indicated that the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in scores from the pre-test to the posttest was positive. This treatment with rather extreme requirements of moving from above the median to below the median for positive change was significant. The probability was beyond the .01 level that this pattern of positive change would have occurred by chance alone. An interesting observation was that four of the five teachers who had negative change were Negro teachers.

The McNemar test yielded five additional chi-square scores for the additional sub-hypotheses. These appear in Table V.

The second sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in the scores was:

Sub HO_2 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (from pretest score

TABLE V

CHI-SQUARE SCORES FROM THE McNEMAR TEST TREATMENT

Sub-Hypothesis	Chi-Square	Level of Significance (All with 1 d.f.)
2	24.30	p: less than .001
3	2.11	p: not significant
4	1.46	p: not significant
5	9.99	p: less than .01
6	23.57	p: less than .001

to posttest score) between the teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored above the median and teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median. As indicated in Table V the results of the McNemar test treatment showed that the chi-square score was significant beyond the .001 level; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results indicate that of the 122 teachers, 29 were positively affected by the re-education program as indicated by moving from above the median to below the median. One teacher was negatively affected by the re-education program as indicated by moving from below the median to above the median. The remainder of the teachers essentially did not change by either scoring below the median on the pretest and post-test or by scoring above the median on the pretest and the posttest. The results indicated that the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in scores from the

pretest to the posttest was positive. This treatment with rather extreme requirements of moving from above the median to below the median for positive change was significant. The probability was beyond the .001 level that this pattern of positive change would have occurred by chance alone.

The rejection of null sub-hypotheses one and two was supportive of the rejection of the first two major null hypotheses. The "t" test treatment of the two major hypotheses indicated that the average change in the scores of the Method A and Method B groups was significant. By arbitrarily requiring individual scores to move from above the median on the pretest to below the median on the posttest in order to be positively changed and subjecting this treatment to the .01 level, the McNemar treatment was an additional indication that attitude change was positive and significant. With the results obtained this treatment was supportive of the "t" test treatment.

The purpose of the remaining four sub-hypotheses was to determine the difference, other than by chance, in the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers. In considering the classification of Caucasian and Negro teachers, the problem was to determine if either or both groups contributed significantly to high or low scores in each sub-hypothesis. This data was treated with the same chi-square procedure as has been described.

The third sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in the scores was:

Sub HO_3 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (on the pretest) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A who scored below the median.

As indicated in Table V, the results of the McNemar test treatment showed that the chi-square score was not significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. The results indicated that the pattern and dimensional strength of the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers comparing scores above the median and below the median were not significant. The results indicated that of the 117 teachers, 55 Caucasian teachers scored above the median and 30 Negro teachers scored above the median. At the same time, 16 Caucasian teachers scored below the median and 16 Negro teachers scored below the median.

The purpose of this sub-hypothesis was to determine if there was difference, other than chance, in the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers on the pretest. With the acceptance of the null hypothesis it was concluded there was no unique pattern of high or low scores with either Caucasian or Negro subjects. Neither Caucasian nor Negro

subjects contributed exclusively to high or low scores on the pretest.

The fourth sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in the scores was:

Sub HO_4 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (on the posttest) between the Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program who scored below the median.

As indicated in Table V the results of the McNemar test treatment show that the chi-square score was not significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. The results indicated that the pattern and dimensional strength of the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers comparing the scores above the median and below the median were not significant. The results indicated that of the 117 teachers tested, 39 Caucasian teachers scored above the median and 20 Negro teachers scored above the median. At the same time, 32 Caucasian teachers scored below the median and 26 Negro teachers scored below the median.

The purpose of this sub-hypothesis was to determine if there was difference, other than by chance, in the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers on the posttest. With the acceptance of the null hypothesis it was concluded

there was no unique pattern of high or low scores with either Caucasian or Negro subjects. Neither Caucasian nor Negro subjects contributed exclusively to high or low scores on the posttest. Although no such pattern developed, an examination of the two treatments together provided some insight into the change which occurred. Table VI presents the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program on the pretest and posttest.

TABLE VI

PERCENT OF INCREASE (OR DECREASE) FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST OF THE METHOD A GROUP

	Pretest	Posttest	Percent of Increase or Decrease
Caucasian (above median)	55	39	14% decrease
Negro (above median)	30	20	9% decrease
Caucasian (below median)	16	32	13% increase
Negro (below median)	16	26	8% increase

An examination of Table VI shows that slightly more changes occurred among Caucasian teachers than among Negro teachers between the time of the pretest and the posttest. Since sub-hypotheses three and four were accepted it was concluded the change which occurred in the Method A program was a chance distribution involving both Caucasian and Negro subjects.

The fifth sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in the scores was:

HO_5 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in the attitudes toward school desegregation (on the pretest) between Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored above the median and Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median.

As indicated in Table V the results of the McNemar test treatment showed the chi-square was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results showed that the pattern and dimensional strength in scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers comparing the scores above the median and below the median were significant. The results indicated that of the 122 teachers tested, 44 Caucasian teachers scored above the median and 47 Negro teachers scored above the median. At the same time, 5 Caucasian teachers scored below the median and 26 Negro teachers scored below the median.

The purpose of this sub-hypothesis was to determine if there was difference, other than by chance, in the scores of Caucasian and Negro subjects on the pretest. With the rejection of the null hypothesis it was concluded there was a unique pattern of high scores with both Caucasian and Negro subjects. Negro and Caucasian subjects

together contributed to high scores on the pretest.

The sixth sub-hypothesis relating to the pattern and dimensional strength of the change in the scores was:

Sub HO_6 There are no statistically significant differences in the patterns and direction of change in attitudes toward school desegregation (on the posttest) between the Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program who scored below the median.

As indicated in Table V the results of the McNemar test treatment showed the chi-square score was significant at the .001 level; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results indicated that the pattern and dimensional strength in scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers comparing the scores above the median and below the median were significant. The results showed that of the 122 teachers tested, 39 Caucasian teachers and 24 Negro teachers scored above the median. At the same time, 11 Caucasian teachers and 48 Negro teachers scored below the median.

The purpose of this sub-hypothesis was to determine if there was difference, other than by chance, in the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers on the posttest. With the rejection of the null hypothesis it was concluded there was a unique pattern of high and low scores. An examination of the data indicated that the number of high scores by Caucasian subjects (39) and the

number of low scores by Negro subjects (48) contributed to the statistical significance of the pattern and direction of the scores.

As indicated in Table V the fourth and fifth null hypotheses were rejected. As indicated in sub-hypothesis five the pattern and direction of scores on the pretest was in the high category for Caucasian and Negro subjects with both Caucasian and Negro teachers contributing to an unusual number of high scores. The pattern and direction of scores on the posttest was in the high category for the Caucasian subjects and in the low category for the Negro teachers with an unusually large number of Caucasian teachers contributing to high scores and an unusually large number of Negro teachers contributing to low scores. Table VII presents the scores of Caucasian and Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program on the pretest and posttest.

An examination of Table VII indicates that more change occurred among Negro teachers than among Caucasian teachers between the time of the pretest and posttest as determined by the procedure of placing subjects above or below the median. Since the pattern and direction of the scores was high on the pretest and low on the posttest for Negro teachers and high on the pretest and high on the posttest for Caucasian teachers, it was concluded that Negro teachers were more positively affected by the

re-education program than the Caucasian teachers.

TABLE VII

PERCENT OF INCREASE (OR DECREASE) FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST OF THE METHOD B GROUP

	Pretest	Posttest	Percent of Increase or Decrease
Caucasian (above median)	44	39	4% decrease
Negro (above median)	47	24	19% decrease
Caucasian (below median)	5	11	5% increase
Negro (below median)	26	48	19% increase

Reliability of Attitude Survey Instrument

Repetition of a test is the simplest method of determining its reliability. Although there was no indication of the retest interval, the author of the attitude survey instrument stated a test-retest reliability coefficient of .89.[1] In order to determine the reliability of the twenty-five additional items added to the original instrument the Pearson-Product Moment[2] coefficient of correlation (r) was calculated.

Using the split-half method of determining reliability the original twenty-five items on the instrument

[1] Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 168.

[2] Downie and Heath, op. cit., p. 84.

were correlated with the additional twenty-five items added to the instrument. The coefficient of correlation (r) was calculated and yielded a result of .97. This correlation was regarded as worthy of confidence, and with the author's stated test-retest reliability coefficient, it was concluded that the instrument was consistent and reliable.

Summary

The attitudes of the teachers involved in each of the re-education experiences were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period. In each instance the major null hypothesis was rejected. Considering the scores of each subject in the various groupings the change was positive and significant with each examined group.

The purpose of the six sub-hypotheses was to examine each group to determine the factors which contributed to the change in attitudes. The subjects were divided into three categories--those who were positively affected as a result of the re-education experience, those who were negatively affected as a result of the re-education experience, and those who essentially did not change. This treatment had rather extreme requirements of moving from above the median to below the median for positive change to occur. The results of the "before-after" treatment in the first two sub-hypotheses were significant.

These results supported the group treatment used in the "t" test treatment.

The remaining four sub-hypotheses were concerned with the consideration of Caucasian and Negro teachers to determine if either group contributed significantly to negative or positive scores on the attitude instrument. The teachers prepared by the Method A program had no significant differences in negative or positive scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers on the pretest and posttest. This did not discount the fact that change occurred, but did indicate that the change as determined by the above and below median classification was distributed equally among Caucasian and Negro teachers.

The teachers prepared by the Method B program had significant differences in negative and positive scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers on the pretest and posttest. On the pretest the negative scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers were significant, and, according to the treatment, this would not have occurred by chance. As measured by the McNemar test there was an unusually large number of negative scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers. On the posttest the Caucasian teachers had a distribution of negative scores and the Negro teachers had a distribution of positive scores which was significant and would not have occurred by chance. This showed that there was not enough shift from negative to positive

scores to be significant for Caucasian teachers. On the other hand, there were enough changes from negative to positive scores with Negro teachers to be significant. These results indicated that Negro teachers in the Method B program contributed to a greater extent than Caucasian teachers to the change from negative scores on the pretest to positive scores on the posttest.

The results of this experiment determined that the attitudes of teachers toward school desegregation were positively modified during a nine-week period. During this nine-week period each of the two groups of teachers were involved in a re-education program designed specifically to affect favorably the attitudes of teachers toward school desegregation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the effectiveness of two re-education programs in altering the attitudes toward school desegregation of teachers involved in the experience of faculty desegregation in two metropolitan school districts. Faculty desegregation has been proposed as one of the major approaches in achieving effective school desegregation. The assumption was made in this study that a positive attitude among teachers and administrators toward the new professional experience of faculty desegregation would contribute to the success of this venture.

The Oklahoma City and Tulsa public school systems embarked on a significant departure in personnel policies during the 1968-69 school year with the specific assignment of teachers to individual school buildings for the purpose of accomplishing faculty desegregation. Each school system accepted the general policy of achieving racially balanced staffs in each building within the system by the 1970-71 school year. This goal was to be accomplished

in each school system in stages with approximately one-half of the goal to be accomplished during the 1968-69 school year. Each school system in cooperation with the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma developed a re-education experience for the teachers involved in faculty desegregation. An expressed objective of each planned re-education experience was to improve the attitudes toward school desegregation of the teachers involved in the new venture.

Six major null hypotheses were developed to determine if there were significant differences in attitudes toward school desegregation before the re-education experience and after the re-education experience. The six major null hypotheses were developed for the following groups: (1) teachers prepared by the Method A program, (2) teachers prepared by the Method B program, (3) Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method A program, (4) Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program, (5) Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program, and (6) Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program. The design of the study required the testing of the null hypothesis of no significant differences of attitudes toward school desegregation between the pretest and posttest period for the various groups identified above.

In addition to the six major null hypotheses, six sub-hypotheses were advanced. These sub-hypotheses were

concerned with the pattern and dimensional strength of the change that occurred with the following subjects: (1) teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program, (2) teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program, (3) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the pretest instrument, (4) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the posttest instrument, (5) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the pretest instrument, and (6) Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the post-test instrument. All hypotheses were tested at the .01 level for significance.

The subjects were 239 teachers in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa school systems involved in faculty desegregation who participated in the re-education program. One hundred and seventeen teachers were involved from the

Oklahoma City school system and were identified as being prepared for faculty desegregation by the Method A program. One hundred and twenty-two teachers were involved from the Tulsa school system and were identified as being prepared for faculty desegregation by the Method B program. The total number of participants from each school system who completed the re-education experience was included in the study.

Prior to the re-education experience in each school system the modified survey instrument, A Survey of Attitudes Toward Desegregation, was administered as a pretest instrument to each group. This instrument is presented in Appendix A. Appendixes B and C contain an outline of the program of the re-education experiences provided in each school system. After the two re-education programs were completed and at the end of nine weeks of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting, the survey instrument, A Survey of Attitudes Toward Desegregation, was administered as a posttest to each group. The survey instrument was scored so that high scores indicated negative attitudes toward school desegregation and low scores indicated positive attitudes toward school desegregation.

The Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the reliability of the pretest-posttest attitude survey instrument. Factors considered in determining the reliability of the instrument were the

degree that the original items correlated with the additional items and the degree that the scores of the Method A group correlated with scores of the Method B group. The split-half method for determining reliability was used with the total scores of the two groups compared for reliability purposes. The coefficient of correlation was determined to be .97. The .97 was accepted as worthy of confidence and the total number of items on the attitude survey instrument was accepted as being reliable for the two groups.

Findings

At the conclusion of the experiment, the significance of the difference was tested between the changes in attitudes toward school desegregation as reflected by a comparison of the pretest and posttest scores for the various groups.

The 't" test of the significance of the mean difference was used to test the six major hypotheses of the study at the .01 level. The results obtained from testing the hypotheses were as follows:

1. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of teachers prepared by the Method A program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

2. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of teachers prepared by the Method B program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

3. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method A program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

4. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method A program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

5. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of Caucasian teachers prepared by the Method B program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

6. The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of Negro teachers prepared by the Method B program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, the attitudes of the teachers were positively modified from the pretest to the posttest period.

The McNemar Test for the Significance of Change

was used to test the six subhypotheses. The pretest and posttest scores of each subject were divided into categories of above and below the median. The classification above the median indicated a negative attitude toward school desegregation. The classification below the median indicated a positive attitude toward school desegregation. The results obtained from testing the subhypotheses were as follows:

1. The change in the scores of the teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, there was a significant number of teachers who had positive attitude change from the pretest to the posttest period.

2. The change in the scores of the teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program was significant at the .01 level; therefore, there was a significant number of teachers who had positive attitude change from the pretest to the posttest period.

3. The change in the scores of Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the pretest instrument was not significant; therefore, there were no significant differences in positive or negative

scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers on the pretest.

4. The change in the scores of Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method A program on the posttest instrument was not significant; therefore, there were no significant differences in positive or negative scores for Caucasian and Negro teachers on the posttest. This indicated that positive and negative scores were distributed evenly between Caucasian and Negro teachers.

5. The change in the scores of Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the pretest instrument was significant at the .01 level; therefore, there was a significant number of Caucasian and Negro teachers who had negative scores on the pretest.

6. The change in the scores of Caucasian teachers who scored above the median and below the median as compared to Negro teachers who scored above the median and below the median prepared by the Method B program on the posttest instrument was significant at the .01 level. In this grouping the number of Caucasian teachers was more numerous in the negative category and the number of Negro teachers was more numerous in the positive category; therefore, the conclusion was that Negro teachers in the Method B

program made a greater shift from negative to positive scores than Caucasian teachers.

Conclusions

From the results of the experiment, the re-education program in both school systems did contribute to the favorable modification of attitudes toward school desegregation. This favorable modification of attitudes was present with both Caucasian and Negro teachers. It was concluded that the extensive time and effort devoted to planning and developing the re-education experiences for teachers contributed significantly to the effectiveness of the experiment.

The extent to which most organized teacher re-education efforts will be effective depends in part, therefore, on the planning that takes place preceding the actual experience.

The large number of subjects with negative scores on the pretest instrument indicated there was a general lack of sensitivity on the part of teachers to the problems of school desegregation. In order to minimize these negative attitudes teachers must have the opportunity to recognize these negative attitudes and subject their prejudgments to reality testing. The re-education experience provided the teachers with this opportunity.

It was concluded that teacher re-education programs in other school systems characterized by the same careful

planning and implementation could modify teacher attitudes toward school desegregation.

Additional conclusions were made that were relevant to this study based on factors other than those presented in the major experimental design. These additional conclusions were:

1. The major burden of teaching in a faculty desegregation setting was assumed by younger teachers in the two school systems studied (approximately 75 percent of the total group had less than ten years experience).

2. It was concluded that the Caucasian teachers transferred to predominately Negro schools were represented disproportionately by teachers under 30 years of age. In the Oklahoma City experimental group Caucasian teachers under 30 years of age represented 43.6 percent of the total group. In the Tulsa experimental group Caucasian teachers under 30 years of age transferred to predominately Negro schools represented 17.2 percent of the total group.

3. The average pretest and posttest scores for the Tulsa experimental group were more negative than the average pretest and posttest scores for the Oklahoma City experimental group. This result indicated there were factors present in the Tulsa school system which had contributed to negative attitudes toward school desegregation. A factor which might have contributed to more negative attitudes in the Tulsa group was the late assignment of

the Tulsa teachers to the faculty desegregation assignments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented as a result of this investigation:

1. The findings of this study were based on two metropolitan school systems. It is suggested that further studies of faculty desegregation be made in various types and sizes of school systems.

2. Any serious attempt to develop procedures for the effective desegregation of school faculties should be combined with extensive, well-planned re-education experiences for the teachers.

3. Further research should be conducted in terms of the degree to which the attitudes of teachers affect the pupil behavior in the classroom. This is particularly important for the teachers involved in faculty desegregation because of the importance of this process to the total process of school desegregation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, Levinson, Daniel J., and Sanford, Nevitt R. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950.

Beck, James, and Saxe, Richard (eds.). Teaching the Culturally Deprived Pupil. Springfield, Illinois: C. Thomas Company, 1965.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Ellena, William J. (ed.). Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1964.

Coleman, James S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook on Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1964.

Havighurst, Robert J. Education in Metropolitan Areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated, 1966.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1967.

Kontos, Peter G., and Murphy, James J. (ed.). Teaching Urban Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1967.

Moore, Alexander. Realities of the Urban Classroom. Garden City, New York: Ancor Books, Doubleday and Company, Incorporated, 1967.

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

Passow, A. Harry (ed.). Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia Press, 1963.

Rogge, Robert, and Stormer, Franklin. In-Service Training for Teachers of the Gifted. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1966.

Rose, Arnold, and Rose, Caroline. America Divided: Minority Group Relations in the United States. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Rosenberg, Milton J. Attitude Organization Change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Sarason, S. B., Davidson, K. S., and Lighthall, F. F. Anxiety in Elementary School Children. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Schmuck, Richard, Chesler, Mark, and Lippitt, Raymond. Problem Solving in the Classroom. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, 1966.

Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Siegal, S. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Stoff, Sheldon. The Two-Way Street, Guideposts to Peaceful Desegregation. Indianapolis, Indiana: David-Stewart Publishing Company, 1967.

Swanson, Bert E. The Struggle for Equality. New York: Hobbs, Dorman and Company, Incorporated, 1966.

Tumin, Melvin M. Desegregation, Resistance and Readiness. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958.

United States Commission on Civil Rights National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunities in America's Cities. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, February, 1967.

United States Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Watson, Fred (ed.). Change in School Systems. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Weinberg, Meyer. Integrated Education. Beverly Hills, California: The Glencoe Press, 1968.

Wey, Herbert W., and Corey, John. Action Patterns in School Desegregation: A Guidebook. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959.

Articles and Periodicals

Davidson, Helen H., and Lang, George. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX, Summer, 1960, 107-118.

Gottlieb, David. "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class, but It's Not Easy," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI, October, 1967, p. 121.

Gottlieb, David. "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, LVI, Summer, 1964, 557-560.

Janssen, Peter A. "The Next Step: Teacher Integration," The Reporter, XXXV, November, 1966, p. 32.

Mays, Nebraska. "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers on Recently Desegregated Public School Facilities," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII, 1963, 218-226.

Stephenson, Chester M. "The Effect of a Course in Minority Group Relations on the Attitudes of College Students," Progressive Education, XXXII, January, 1955, p. 19.

Pamphlets

American Association of School Administrators. School Racial Policy. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1966.

Bash, James H. Effective Teaching in the Desegregated School. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1966.

Chesler, Mark A., and Segal, Phyllis. Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967.

Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association. Faculty Desegregation, Survey Update. Miami, Florida: Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association, 1966.

Educational Policies Commission. American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965.

Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Levine, Daniel U., and Dall, Russell C. Inner-City Schools and the Beginning Teacher. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1966.

Unpublished Material

American Association of School Administrators. "Resolution Adopted by the 98th Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators," Atlantic City, New Jersey: February, 1966.

Carmichael, Warren. "A Scale to Measure Attitudes Toward Any Minority Group." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Earnest, Wayne. "The Effects of Two Teaching Methods in Modifying Ninth-Grade Pupils' Attitudes Toward Minority Groups." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Geisel, Paul N. "I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: Racial Comparison." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962.

Hayes, Coleman, Oklahoma City Board of Education Attorney, in an unpublished "Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma No. 8523," January Term, 1967. The Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public School District I-90, et al., appelants with Robert L. Dowell, et al., appellees.

Purl, Mabel C. "Study of Desegregation in the Riverside, California Public Schools." Unpublished Preliminary Report of the Riverside In-Service Institute, Riverside Public Schools, Riverside, California.

Tulsa Public School System. "Excerpt from a letter dated July 18, 1968 from Dr. Charles C. Mason to the teachers reassigned to a faculty desegregation setting."

Tulsa Public School System. "Excerpt from the Plan for the Desegregation of the Tulsa Public Schools submitted to the United States Commissioner of Education," May 19, 1965.

United States Office of Education. "Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, As Amended for the School Year 1967-68," Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, December, 1966.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COPY OF INSTRUMENT USED IN THE STUDY

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD DESEGREGATION

This questionnaire represents an attempt to survey the opinions of individuals on the issue of segregation in the public school. This is a rather important issue, so in order to permit you to present how you feel as frankly as possible, your name does not appear here.

Instructions: Read each statement carefully. Indicate your feeling about each statement by putting a check ( ) in the appropriate column. Be sure to put a check after each statement.

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
1. Racial segregation is an effective and practical arrangement which has no serious effect on the vitality of democratic ideals.	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. The Negroes' main concern is with equal educational opportunities. They have no intention of interfering with the social patterns of the community.	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. The best safeguard of a democracy is the solid stability of social tradition such as is involved in the maintenance of segregation.	___	___	___	___	___	___

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
4. Integration threatens one of the principles of democracy, the right of each citizen to choose his own associates.	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. The end of segregation would bring a continuing increase in social conflict and violence.	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Although the IQ of Negroes in the South is on the whole lower than the IQ of whites, this difference in intelligence is mainly due to lack of opportunity for the Negro and will eventually disappear under an integrated school system.	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Since integration will require some painful adjustments to be made in changing from segregated schools, the best solution will be to leave the races segregated.	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Equal educational exposures in integrated schools will help both the Negro and						

	Agree Very much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
white students to profit from the best of the two cultures.	____	____	____	____	____	____
9. Desegregation can in most cases be accomplished without being followed by social conflict and violence.	____	____	____	____	____	____
10. Improving Negro education via integration will lead to a higher standard of living, accompanied by more and better jobs for everybody.	____	____	____	____	____	____
11. The Supreme Court's decision on segregation was a politically inspired invasion of states rights and represents a miscarriage of justice.	____	____	____	____	____	____
12. The Negro race is physically and mentally inferior to the white race and integration would not help to erase the innate differences between the two races.	____	____	____	____	____	____
13. Integrated and therefore better						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
education for the Negro via integration is certain to result in increased feelings of responsibility and cooperation on his part.	____	____	____	____	____	____
14. The successes of already completed integration attempts are clear evidence that the fears of extreme pro-segregationists are unfounded.	____	____	____	____	____	____
15. Negroes who are given the opportunity to go to integrated schools are apt to become demanding, officious, and overbearing.	____	____	____	____	____	____
16. Although certain radical Negro leaders try to make people think otherwise, the majority of Negroes do not want integration and would be satisfied with "equal but separate" school facilities.	____	____	____	____	____	____
17. Desegregation will develop a false sense of power among						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
Negroes and will move us closer to having a "Negro party" in America	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Our country has failed to adequately draw upon the resources of the Negro and integrated schools will enable the Negro to make a greater contribution to America economically and socially than they have been able to make with segregated schools.	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. The desegregation law is basically unfair to the Negroes who will now have to compete on equal terms with the whites.	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Once you start letting Negroes attend the schools of whites, they will demand complete social equality in all respects including dating and club privileges.	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Negroes and whites will find it easier to get along together in						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
the same school than most people think.	____	____	____	____	____	____
22. In dealing with the problems of desegregation we should always act in terms of the Christian rule of brotherhood and justice for all and not in terms of social attitudes based on tradition.	____	____	____	____	____	____
23. The practice of segregation cannot help but reduce our political influence in international affairs.	____	____	____	____	____	____
24. Desegregation will lead to a permanent lowering of standards in the public schools.	____	____	____	____	____	____
25. Desegregation is economically wise since the economic state of the segregated school system may in part be due to the double expense of segregation.	____	____	____	____	____	____
26. All Americans have the responsibility to help						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
the Negro better himself.	____	____	____	____	____	____
27. The Civil Rights Movement is allowing Negroes opportunities before they are ready to assume the necessary responsibilities.	____	____	____	____	____	____
28. The Negro has gained total equality through recent civil rights legislation.	____	____	____	____	____	____
29. Poverty for many Negroes has been caused by past injustices and discriminations.	____	____	____	____	____	____
30. White people have every right to set themselves above and apart from people of other races.	____	____	____	____	____	____
31. Minority groups are happier and have more freedom and initiative in their own separate communities.	____	____	____	____	____	____
32. Minority groups have lower standards of living mainly due to their lack of initiative.	____	____	____	____	____	____

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
33. Negro teachers should be integrated into all-white faculties as schools are desegregated.	___	___	___	___	___	___
34. I agree with the 1954 Supreme Court ruling that educational facilities that were "separate but equal" are in violation of the constitution.	___	___	___	___	___	___
35. Group aptitude tests tend to have a "culture bias" which operates against youngsters from a culturally impoverished environment.	___	___	___	___	___	___
36. Adequate opportunity has always been available to anyone who is willing to work hard.	___	___	___	___	___	___
37. Until housing patterns are changed school boards should continue to maintain segregated teaching staffs.	___	___	___	___	___	___
38. Developing knowledge and understanding of human rights should be						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
an important objective of the school.	____	____	____	____	____	____
39. A major obstacle to improved human relations in education is teacher attitude toward non-academic pupils and the non-conformist.	____	____	____	____	____	____
40. Equality of opportunity is possible even when there is racial segregation.	____	____	____	____	____	____
41. Integration of Negro and white students will never prove to be acceptable.	____	____	____	____	____	____
42. Favorable attitudes toward public school integration are extremely important and should be developed even in defiance of the more traditional social norms.	____	____	____	____	____	____
43. Desirable change in attitude toward integration is likely to occur as a result of planned self-study and interpersonal discussion among races.	____	____	____	____	____	____

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
44. Interracial contacts in the public schools will evertually bring about an acceptable modification of former negative attitudes toward minority groups.	____	____	____	____	____	____
45. Until student desegregation has become a reality school boards should continue to maintain segregated teaching staffs.	____	____	____	____	____	____
46. Desegregation in the public schools will only proceed with major difficulties and will not contribute much toward favorable attitudes and friendlier relations between races.	____	____	____	____	____	____
47. Communication between members of different races is extremely important in bringing about solutions to existing racial problems.	____	____	____	____	____	____
48. Forced integration is just as unsatisfactory a solution to segregation as separate						

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Dis-agree A Little	Dis-agree Pretty Much	Dis-agree Very Much
and equal facilities was an unsatisfactory solution to segregation.	____	____	____	____	____	____
49. Unless we radically change present social conditions, many children of minority groups will be unable to realize their full potentialities.	____	____	____	____	____	____
50. Social unrest in integrated schools will prohibit quality education in the long run.	____	____	____	____	____	____

APPENDIX B

COPY OF RE-EDUCATION EFFORT IN THE OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

FACULTY DESEGREGATION WORKSHOP

August 12-15, 1968

Monday, August 12

8:00 - 9:00 Registration and Coffee

9:00 -10:15 General Session - Room A-153

Welcome - Dr. Bill J. Lillard

Purposes of Workshop - Dr. Jesse Lindley

Keynote Address: "Why School Desegregation?"
Dr. Kenneth St. Clair
Oklahoma State University

10:15 -10:45 Break

10:45 -11:30 Organization of Small Groups and Discussion

11:30 - 1:00 Lunch

1:00 - 2:00 Symposium - Room A-153

"Teaching on a Desegregated Faculty"

Melvin Todd, Assistant Principal, Northeast High School
Orville Bradford, Madison School
Marion Myers, Kennedy Jr. High School
Ruby Thomas, Creston Hills and Dewey Schools
Stanford White, Star Spencer High School

2:00 - 3:30 Small Group Discussions and Break

3:00 - 4:00 Summarization - Dr. George Henderson
University of Oklahoma

Tuesday, August 13

8:00 - 8:30 Coffee

8:30 - 9:45 General Session - Room A-153

Tuesday, August 13 (cont'd)

Address: "Profile of an Effective Teacher for the Classrooms of Oklahoma City"
Dr. George Henderson
University of Oklahoma

Reaction Panel:

Mary Moon, Sunset School
Shirley Bensinger, Northeast High School
John Sadberry, Principal, Douglass High School
Claud Todd, Assistant Principal, Dunjee Elementary

10:15 -10:45 Break

10:45 -11:30 Role Playing Situations - Room A-153

Minerva Sloss, Northwest High School
Juanita McDaniels, John Marshall High School
Dale Reeder, Assistant Principal, Adams School
Betty Williams, Assistant Principal, Harmony School

11:30 - 1:00 Lunch Break

1:00 - 1:30 Film

1:30 - 3:30 Small Group Discussions

3:30 - 4:00 Summarization - Freddie Cudjoe

6:00 Picnic - Will Rogers Park

Wednesday, August 14

8:00 - 8:30 Coffee

8:30 - 9:45 Morning Session - Room A-153

Wednesday, August 14 (cont'd)

Address: "The Psychological and Sociological Bases for Effective Learning"
Dr. Gertrude Noar
NEA Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities
New York City

9:45 -10:45 Break

10:15 -11:30 Small Group Discussions

11:30 - 1:00 Lunch

1:00 - 4:00 Work Problem Sessions

Group A: Black Elementary Teachers -
Room A-153
Rosemary Jones, Leader
Elementary Helping Teacher, Central Office

Group B: White Elementary Teachers -
Room A-156
Claud Todd, Leader

Group C: Black Secondary Teachers -
Room A-122
Juanita McDaniels, Leader

Group D: White Secondary Teachers -
Room A-115
Marion Myers, Leader

Topics: "Contributions of the Negro to American Culture"
Bill Johnson, Douglass High School

"Areas of Sensitivity"
Jim Johnson, Principal, Northwest High School
Freddie Cudjoe, Central Office

"Pupil Evaluation"
Miss Gertrude Noar

"Organizing for Instruction"
Dr. Gene Shepherd
University of Oklahoma

Thursday, August 15

8:00 - 8:30 Coffee

8:30 -10:00 Area Meetings - New Groups Based on School Assignments (See the list of the 5 area schools in packet)

"Know Your Community" Panels

Northwest - Room A-153
- Chairman - Mrs. Ruby Wood, Principal, Sunset School
- Moderator - Mr. Robert B. Cheney, Principal, John Marshall
- PTA Representative - Mrs. Joe Hill
- Chamber of Commerce Representative - Mrs. Frances Beattie
- Community Relations Commission Representative - Dr. Charles Atkins

Southeast - Room A-122
- Chairman - Mrs. Dollie Roberts, Principal, Oakridge School
- Moderator - Mr. Dee King, Principal, Southeast High School
- PTA Representative - Mrs. Jean Ruby
- Chamber of Commerce Rep. - Mr. Wayne Campbell
- Community Relations Commission Rep. - Dr. Frank Cox

Northeast - Room A-156
- Chairman - Mr. Jack Bloomer, Principal, Lincoln School
- Moderator - Mr. John Sadberry, Principal, Douglass High School
- PTA Representative - Mrs. Wanda Davidson
- Chamber of Commerce Rep. - Mrs. Rosalie Starks
- Community Relations Commission Rep. - Dr. Louis Bernard

Star Spencer-Dunjee - Room A-115
- Chairman - Mr. Arthur Boyd, Principal, Dunjee Elementary
- Moderator - Mr. June Dawkins, Principal, Star Spencer
- PTA Representative - Mrs. Mary Farrow
- Chamber of Commerce Rep. - Mr. Melvin Rogers

Thursday, August 15 (cont'd)

Community Relations Rep. - Rev. Orra Compton

Southwest - Room A-153
Chairman - Mr. Robert Gaut, Principal, Roosevelt
Moderator - Mr. R. C. Crews, Principal, Prairie Queen
PTA Representative - Mrs. Karen Leveridge
Chamber of Commerce Rep. - Mrs. Helen Chlebica
Community Relations Commission Rep. - Sister Celine Townsend

10:00-10:30 Break

10:30-11:30 Small Group Discussions

Group Leaders:

Northwest - Carol Simmons, Madison School

Southeast - Earlisse Greene, Wheeler School

Northeast - Francis Hall Killian, Kennedy School

Star Spencer - Los Angeles Joseph, Star Spencer

Southwest - Frances Madison, Prairie Queen

11:30- 1:00 Lunch

1:00- 1:30 Panel Discussion - Room A-153

"Highlights of Conference" - Types of activities to be carried out after school begins

Mr. Earl Martin, Moderator

1:30- 2:15 Small Group Discussions - Original grouping. Complete evaluation forms.

Thursday, August 15 (cont'd)

2:15- 2:30	Break	
2:30- 3:15	Summarization of Workshop -	Dr. George Henderson Mr. Earl Martin Dr. Jesse Lindley

APPENDIX C

COPY OF THE RE-EDUCATION EFFORT IN THE TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

THE ADVANCEMENT OF HUMAN RELATIONS WITHIN THE EDUCATION PROFESSION

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21

8:00 - 8:15	Registration
8:15	Presiding - Mr. Curtis L. Glassco Associate Director for Tulsa Consultative Center
	Welcome — Mr. Cecil O. Benson, Executive Assistant, Superintendent for General Administrative Services Tulsa Public Schools
	Announcements and Institute Business
	The Relation of Desegregation to Curriculum Dr. Hiram Alexander, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Tulsa Public Schools
	Problem Areas of School Desegregation: An Identification Donald J. Hall, Assoc. Director Consultative Center University of Oklahoma
9:45	Coffee
10:00	Keynote Address - Major Areas of Conflict and Tension and the Responsibilities of a Democratic Society Dr. Paul Anthony, Executive Director Southern Regional Council Atlanta, Georgia
11:00	Response by Participants to Dr. Anthony's Presentation
11:30	Evaluation
11:45	Small Group Activity Dr. Anthony visits Small Groups
12:45	Meeting of Small Group Chairmen - Assembly room

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28

8:00	Presiding - Mr. Charles Ross, President TEA
8:15	Teacher Attitudes and the Climate in the Classroom Mr. Silas Craft, Administrator Montgomery County School System Rockville, Maryland
9:30	Response by Participants to Mr. Craft's Presentation
10:15	Coffee and Buzz Session
10:30	Small Group Activity Mr. Craft visits Small Groups
12:45	Meeting of Small Group Chairmen

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5

8:00	Presiding - Mr. Landol Coker, President TCTA
	The Coleman Report: A Survey of Equality of Educational Opportunity Dr. Paul McCloud, Director Research, Tulsa Public Schools
9:15	Response by Participants to Dr. McCloud's Presentation
9:45	Coffee and Buzz Session
10:00	This is Tulsa: A Sociological Perspective Dr. Barry Kinsey, Chairman Department of Sociology University of Tulsa
11:00	Response by Participants to Dr. Kinsey's Presentation
11:30	Small Group Activity
12:45	Meeting of Small Group Chairmen

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12

8:00 Presiding - Mr. Robert J. McCartney, President
Secondary Principals Association

The Anatomy of Prejudice

Dr. George Henderson, Professor
Sociology and Education
University of Oklahoma

9:30 Response by Participants to Dr. Henderson's Presentation

10:15 Coffee and Buzz Session

10:30 Small Group Activity

Dr. Henderson visits Small Groups

12:45 Meeting of Small Group Chairmen

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19

8:00 Presiding - Mr. Emil Schellestede, President
Elementary Principals Association

Problems Related to Faculty Desegregation as Experienced by Tulsa Educators

SYMPOSIUM

Moderator: Mrs. Ruth Tibbs, Advisory Specialist
Consultative Center for Tulsa

Provocatuers:

Mrs. Grace Brookfield, Teacher,
Hale High School
Landol Coker, President, T.C.T.A.
Mrs. Pocohontas Greading, Supervisor, Elementary Arithmetic
Miss Linda Hall, Teacher, Washington High School
Mrs. May Newby, Teacher, Bunche
Elementary School
Granville Smith, Reading Clinic,
Dunbar Elementary School
Dr. Maxine Vickers, Counselor,
Hawthorne Elementary School

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19 (cont'd)

9:30 Response by Participants to Symposium

10:15 Coffee and Buzz Session

10:30 Small Group Activity

12:45 Meeting of Small Group Chairmen

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26

8:00 Presiding - Mr. Curtis L. Glassco

Approaches to Improved Human Relations Education in the School

Mr. Lonnie Wagstaff, Manager
Program and Resources
Postal Services Institute
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies
University of Oklahoma

9:15 Response by Participants to Mr. Wagstaff's Presentation

9:45 Coffee and Buzz Session

10:00 Small Group Activity - Evaluation of Institute

11:45 Symposium - Evaluation of Institute - Assembly Room

Mr. Lonnie Wagstaff
Dr. Hiram Alexander
Dr. Joe Garrison
Representative - Small Group Chairmen

APPENDIX D

SCORES ON THE INSTRUMENT USED

SCORES ON THE INSTRUMENT USED

Subjects	Method Group A			Method Group B		
	Race	Pretest	Posttest	Race	Pretest	Posttest
1	W	126	83	N	94	76
2	W	103	92	W	226	172
3	N	94	98	N	103	85
4	N	110	87	N	174	139
5	N	86	69	N	105	72
6	W	67	57	N	128	113
7	W	137	111	N	76	73
8	N	80	71	N	135	88
9	N	119	75	N	91	94
10	W	142	94	N	105	112
11	W	77	67	N	91	74
12	N	84	87	N	70	73
13	N	89	86	N	77	60
14	N	98	92	N	94	52
15	N	115	92	W	127	124
16	W	101	61	N	113	87
17	W	92	96	N	124	105
18	N	88	92	N	81	67
19	N	70	81	N	100	82
20	W	83	94	W	144	111
21	W	115	108	W	166	92
22	W	106	87	N	77	52
23	W	72	72	N	61	62
24	W	90	61	N	139	80
25	N	86	82	N	58	65
26	W	175	80	N	126	65
27	W	153	125	W	144	141
28	W	126	72	W	127	89
29	W	73	79	N	137	104
30	W	101	103	N	96	94
31	N	100	84	N	117	94
32	W	98	69	N	148	103
33	N	115	95	N	87	72
34	W	73	65	N	104	81
35	N	109	85	N	69	67
36	N	105	87	N	117	98
37	N	101	83	N	76	74
38	W	87	60	N	123	134
39	N	87	92	N	131	83
40	N	87	87	N	67	64
41	W	176	106	N	74	72
42	W	153	116	N	126	108
43	N	131	112	N	110	96
44	N	109	85	W	98	84
45	W	87	82	W	114	98

APPENDIX D (continued)

	Method Group A			Method Group B		
Subjects	Race	Pretest	Posttest	Race	Pretest	Posttest
46	N	117	91	W	205	142
47	N	83	79	W	139	117
48	N	82	79	N	90	79
49	N	97	76	N	134	95
50	W	192	130	W	84	75
51	W	83	80	N	132	84
52	W	151	127	N	81	89
53	W	119	113	W	200	128
54	W	141	104	N	95	68
55	N	103	72	W	109	103
56	N	98	81	N	95	60
57	N	113	112	W	204	141
58	W	130	121	N	93	67
59	W	119	100	N	73	55
60	W	175	126	W	137	97
61	W	130	102	W	121	99
62	W	230	128	N	96	69
63	W	74	68	W	170	163
64	W	128	108	W	198	140
65	W	119	83	W	66	54
66	W	133	81	W	198	166
67	W	78	64	W	93	65
68	W	126	87	W	227	156
69	N	119	102	W	231	121
70	N	123	106	W	110	71
71	N	89	94	N	117	104
72	W	150	128	W	101	99
73	W	174	93	W	208	125
74	N	120	90	W	112	96
75	N	115	90	W	129	102
76	N	88	65	W	72	55
77	W	181	158	N	109	113
78	W	129	122	N	150	154
79	W	119	89	N	88	96
80	W	90	81	N	118	103
81	W	109	96	N	118	124
82	N	101	70	N	74	74
83	N	82	90	W	212	141
84	N	134	96	W	115	83
85	W	93	92	W	136	126
86	W	127	93	W	113	99
87	W	105	109	N	105	79
88	W	118	106	W	131	160
89	W	91	83	N	109	109
90	W	228	124	W	76	73

APPENDIX D (continued)

	Method Group A			Method Group B		
Subjects	Race	Pretest	Posttest	Race	Pretest	Posttest
91	W	133	86	N	72	68
92	N	93	69	W	114	112
93	W	155	102	N	104	78
94	W	105	94	N	67	64
95	W	116	75	W	147	116
96	W	87	81	W	125	98
97	W	178	89	N	107	113
98	W	95	92	N	127	81
99	W	99	93	W	205	90
100	N	82	87	W	240	167
101	W	155	119	W	171	150
102	N	99	75	W	71	70
103	W	63	62	N	86	73
104	N	116	108	N	158	103
105	W	75	74	N	79	71
106	N	134	96	N	90	76
107	N	70	54	N	101	68
108	W	101	86	W	132	80
109	W	121	105	N	83	88
110	W	78	78	N	99	90
111	W	136	119	W	193	125
112	W	115	97	W	185	145
113	W	88	70	W	293	180
114	W	169	114	N	88	78
115	N	92	76	N	129	127
116	N	102	93	W	122	93
117	N	118	102	N	88	72
118				N	78	77
119				N	87	79
120				N	95	90
121				W	219	166
122				N	73	74

APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THE STUDY

July 25, 1968

Dr. Bill J. Lillard, Superintendent
Oklahoma City Public Schools
900 North Klein
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Lillard:

I am presently engaged in developing a doctoral prospectus under the direction of Dr. Glenn R. Snider, College of Education, at the University of Oklahoma. This research proposal is also being done in cooperation with the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma.

The problem will be concerned with an investigation of the attitudes of faculty members involved in the new experience of faculty desegregation, and I am interested in discovering the attitudes of these teachers as they become involved in faculty desegregation. I would like to request your approval to conduct this research with a sample of the teachers to be involved in faculty desegregation in the Oklahoma City Public School System.

I would appreciate your approval for conducting research with this group in the Oklahoma City Public School System. Thank you for your consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Donald J. Hall

July 25, 1968

Dr. Charles Mason, Superintendent
Tulsa Public Schools
Education Service Center
P. O. Box 4174
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74114

Dear Dr. Mason:

I am presently engaged in developing a doctoral prospectus under the direction of Dr. Glenn R. Snider, College of Education, at the University of Oklahoma. This research proposal is also being done in cooperation with the Consultative Center for School Desegregation at the University of Oklahoma.

The problem will be concerned with an investigation of the attitudes of faculty members involved in the new experience of faculty desegregation, and I am interested in discovering the attitudes of these teachers as they become involved in faculty desegregation. I would like to request your approval to conduct this research with a sample of the teachers to be involved in faculty desegregation in the Tulsa Public School System.

I would appreciate your approval for conducting research with this group in the Tulsa Public School System. Thank you for your consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Hall

cc: Cecil Benson
Dr. Byron Shepherd
Dr. Hiram Alexander
Dr. Paul McCloud

July 29, 1968

Mr. Donald J. Hall
1113 S. W. 62nd Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Don,

The research committee met and approved your study. We feel that it will be very beneficial to the Oklahoma City system. I shall be glad to assist you by furnishing whatever data you deem necessary. However, please give us four or five days.

Sincerely,

William L. Shell

WLS/af

TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Tulsa, Oklahoma

Cecil O. Benson
Deputy Superintendent

February 6, 1969

Mr. Donald Hall, Associate Director
Consultative Center
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Hall:

The research committee has approved your study in connection with faculty desegregation. We feel the study will be beneficial to the Tulsa Public School System.

Sincerely yours,

Cecil O. Benson
Deputy Superintendent

COB:kc

August 28, 1968

Dr. M. E. Rosenbaum
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Dr. Rosenbaum:

I am presently engaged in developing a doctoral prospectus under the direction of Dr. Glenn R. Snider, Professor of Education, at the University of Oklahoma. The problem will be concerned with an investigation of the attitudes of teachers involved in faculty desegregation, and I am interested in using the instrument developed by yourself and I. A. Zimmerman, Attitude Toward Segregation Scale. This scale is found in the book Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes.

I would appreciate your approval for the use of this instrument in this study. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Donald J. Hall

October 7, 1968

Mr. Donald J. Hall
Consultative Center
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Dear Mr. Hall:

You have my full approval for use of the scale. I would appreciate receiving a summary of any results you obtain from use of the scale.

Sincerely,

Milton E. Rosenbaum
Professor

bg